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Page xliv—line 31, for (Rev. xvii. 18) read (Rev. xvii. 16, 17).
ADDRESS TO THE READER.

Dear Sir,

Had you lived four or five centuries ago, when the accidental discovery—the most important in the history of science—was made by two Florentine juveniles (I think they were Florentine); when the most happy and the most blessed of all the means of temporal enjoyment was presented by a gracious Providence, through the hands of these children, to all future generations of our race—I mean the discovery of the use of optical lenses; what would you have said to the man who should have made the observation, that because these youths were unable to render a scientific explanation of the wonderful fact they had disclosed, it was itself unworthy of attention? Now, I beg to say, that this is just the way in which—on the subject of a discovery equally accidental, equally important I will not say—you have acted towards me. On the 10th of May, 1852, I placed in your hands a full exposition (as I deemed it at the time) of the wonderful numerical sign $\chi^666$, to be found at the end of Rev. xiii. The exposition was in itself, I confess, a pretension to a complete development of the mystery, and was as if the Florentine youths had really undertaken, on appeal being made to them, to unfold in full the properties of the lens, properties which it has since required much learning, and a no less person than a Newton, fully to evolve. But if you were not satisfied with the explanation I gave—and herein
you were undoubtedly right—it surely ought to have occurred that the fact imparted remained, and was deserving of your most serious attention. Has it received any such attention? I believe not. Now, it is in the same spirit in which, I say, you ought to have viewed the fact I placed before you, that I have myself proceeded to examine more closely into its merits. This volume is the result. I venture to invite your attention to it; under the full persuasion that, however imperfect, perhaps mean, as a literary performance, it will be found to contain hints on various subjects of Prophecy, which, in better hands, might be hereafter turned to an excellent account. I cannot help still recommending to you a perusal of my little pamphlet (price sixpence), if it be only to show the several steps which led to the discovery of the Name of the Beast—an acquisition which has been my Pole-star in all subsequent investigations, and which has led me to an almost totally new system of interpretation of Prophecy. I pray you in the name of sacred truth, not hastily to reject my lucubrations: let them only have the privilege of mingling with your own, and they will have achieved all that I desire. For the mysteries of Prophecy require a stronger light for their elucidation than my unaided lamp affords; while also, I am sure, you will agree with me in saying, that they are pressing more forcibly, from year to year, upon the attention of Christ's Church. Let there be no room at the Lord's coming, with regard to this portion of His word, for the taunting question, "Shall He find faith in the earth?"

After all, my discovery of the "name" was not so purely and blindly fortuitous. I had been led to take up the Greek Testament in search of the "name." And I really think this circumstance so much advances my claim to attention, that I beg to place the occurrence in detail before you. In reading Mr. Frere's Expositions of Prophecy, particularly his "Letter on the Infidel Individual Antichrist, 1833" (mark the year), I had come upon such passages as the following:

"I allude to the circumstance of the death of Napoleon the Great, in the year 1821, after he had fulfilled all that is predicted of the Infidel
Antichrist of the last days, from Dan. xi. 21 to 39; but before he had fulfilled the latter verses, 40 to 45, which appear to be ascribed to the same individual.” (p. 10.) “The correct general view of this Prophecy (i.e. from v. 21 to v. 45) is, that it has for its main object the history of the Infidel Individual Antichrist of the last days; represented also in the Apocalypse under the symbol of the eighth and last head of the Roman beast, who will be the leader of the nations to their final destruction at the battle of Armageddon.” (p. 11.)

“The death of Napoleon the Great, at a time when verr. 40—45 (Dan. xi.) remained as certainly unfulfilled as verr. 21—39 had been fulfilled by him, would seem to be fatal to the supposed unity of that part of the prophecy which consists of verr. 21—45; were it not that Rev. x.vii. 8—11, treating of the past short-lived seventh headship of the Roman Empire, which was held by Napoleon the Great, and of the future eighth headship to be held by the Antichrist, . . . . says, that the eighth ‘is of the seven;’ which, taken in its most emphatic sense, would signify that the seventh and eighth headships would both be held by the same individual; or that there would be such an union between the two, as would account for their being thus decidedly identified together in this last prophecy of Daniel.” (p. 15.) “The eighth head of the Roman Empire is there (i.e. in Rev. x.vii.) denominated ‘the beast that was, and is not, and yet is’; and the fact that this form of prophecy is without precedent, may justly lead us to the conclusion that there will be something peculiar and unprecedented in the circumstances of the rise, and in the character, of the individual who is the subject of it. I may therefore on this ground also suppose (at least for the present, and until the event shall have cleared away all difficulties) that he will be so united in character and situation with Napoleon the Great, who held the seventh headship of the Roman Empire, as to be considered in the prophetic writings as the same individual, though he shall yet not be the same.” (p. 16.)

“Whatever individual shall then attain the throne of Rome, will necessarily be the expected eighth and last head of the Roman Empire, which has remained without a visible or acknowledged head ever since the fall of the short-lived seventh headship in April, 1814, and will be the Antichrist of the last days, and the fuller of Dan. xi. 40—45. The young Napoleon, as King of Rome, having himself shared the brief seventh headship of the Roman Empire, seemed qualified in an extraordinary manner to answer the various conditions of the prophecy of Rev. x.vii. 8—11, and thus also to be admitted as the representative of Napoleon the Great, in the fulfilment of the concluding portion of the prophecy of Daniel . . . His late decease has in no degree affected my original confidence in the final result, which ought never to rest upon apparent probabilities or possibilities, but upon the certainty of the prophetic word.” (pp. 17, 18.)

“I have never changed my opinion as to the literal interpretation of Dan. xi. 21—45, or considered it otherwise than as professedly describing...
throughout the actions of a single individual; whatever anomaly I have latterly been compelled to admit there must be, in the fulfilment of the concluding verses of it." (p. 19.) "We find that Antichrist, in his first manifestation, is departed from the scene, and there is now an entire deficiency in the Roman Empire of any other individual qualified, either by personal influence or descent, to sustain the character as anticipated alike by the ancient and modern Church. Here, then, again, is written mystery." (p. 21.)

"That which we are ignorant of respecting these manifestations is, why Dan. xi. represents the acts of the two successive heads of the Infidel Western Roman Empire as being those of the same individual; and whether the declaration of Rev. xvii. 11, that the eighth 'is of the seven,' is to be considered in connexion with this peculiarity in the earlier prophecy." . . . . "That the identity implied by the prophecy of Daniel may be satisfied by a mere similarity of character . . . . would certainly be altogether a conclusion so lame and impotent, drawn from prophetic terms apparently so connected and pregnant with meaning—although that meaning may be for the present wrapt up in mystery—as to be utterly unsatisfactory and inadmissible." (p. 24.)

Now I think I shall be able to show that the chief deduction drawn in these passages is erroneous; but letting that pass, I ask you, who that professes any respect for prophecy, on reading in the year 1852 observations such as these, that had passed through the press in 1833, and allowing his thoughts to range for ever so short a moment over the astonishing events of the interval, but must feel the excitement of a reverential curiosity? I said to myself, if truth be here, then must the famous number six hundred, sixty, and six, be within our grasp at last. The first thing that surprised me, on resorting to the Greek original, was, that the number is not written in words, but in ciphers. I confess it was with a precipitancy not to be defended, but far from being to be deplored, that I came on this account to the conclusion that the numerical expression was to be viewed in a symbolical sense. My conviction was instantaneous. In consequence I looked at the construction of the Greek numeration table, and found a reason for believing that the figure 666 pointed allegorically at the number 6,000,000. The reason is given at length in my little pamphlet; and it is one which, I still affirm, has not been refuted, and cannot be gainsayed; but as I do not intend in the present volume
to bring it forward, I shall not trouble you with it. It has served its turn in suggesting the truth—viz., that the name of the "beast" is six million, and now, as an empty bottle, I put it aside. Proceeding however at the time on this tack, I found that the number 6,000,000 involved the natural "mark of the beast"—presuming the beast, in this part of Prophecy, and in the present age, to be the Napoleonic dynasty.

But the "mark of the beast" is not the only, nor the most important, thing that invites our investigation; there is also the "name of the beast." To constitute a full interpretation of the numerical enigma at the end of Rev. xiii., I think that a very cursory perusal of the latter verses should suffice to convince any one, that more than one thing is necessary. It is true that, in the last verse, the only thing mentioned is "the number of the beast"—as if the number 666 were the one only expression intended, in simple reckoning, of the beast’s name; but in the preceding verse we read, "save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name"—a sentence which, I need not say, contains a plurality of such points. There are not in this sentence three things presented to our notice, but two, as will be shown in its place from the notes of Griesbach; the two being—"the mark of the beast’s name," and "the number of his name." The question arises—in what manner, having attained the mark, shall we possess ourselves also of the number of the beast’s name?

In my pamphlet I have advanced the notion, that when a varia lectio of a text presents itself, equally well authenticated in early MSS. as the text commonly received, it is very possible both may have been given by inspiration. Thus there would be an absurdity in the supposition, because St. Matthew indites the words "forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors" in the Lord’s Prayer, and St. Luke writes—"forgive us our sins, for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us," that the one form of words is to be considered less vouched by the Inspiring Spirit than the other. Now, there is found a certain "various reading" of the text χξης (600,60,6)—viz., χης (600,10,6), of which Irenæus testifies that it was much received by the learned
in his day, though he himself strongly condemns it, receiving without any doubt the better known Χές. The question is—whether a "various reading," presenting itself under such pretensions, may not, by possibility, deserve to be regarded in a higher light than that of a mere alternative, and as having been imparted by the Holy Spirit as a concomitant portion of the original text. Of course, being a case where number is concerned, and all the precision of number required, it would be folly to regard this numerical variation with the same indifference, as the merely verbal variation above cited from the Lord's Prayer; but I can see no improper violence in the proposition—seeing the whole passage to have the appearance of defectiveness, and the sacred enigma to require two members instead of one in the form of its answer—that some number such as this, regarded now only as a "various reading," may have slipped by some means or other out of the inspired word. It is not pleasant in this early page to be resorting to conjecture; but at least I have high precedent for the proceeding. Irenæus, in endeavouring to account for this change from Χές to Χές (666 to 616), where the value of fifty is lost to the latter term, has put forward the idea that some scribe, in transcribing into Roman numerals, must have accidentally left out the L; and that, in retranscribing into Greek, the omission became permanent. Begging pardon, I do not think it very creditable to the learned Father to start a conjecture which depends for its worth upon a double mistake. There is no book of the New Testament which supplies—perhaps it would not be far beyond the truth to say that not all the other books of the New Testament put together supply—so much matter to the Table of "various readings," as does the Book of the Revelation:—in other words, nowhere else has the author of falsehood so energetically and so successfully exerted himself to mystify the inspired text. I say then, that in the passage where the sign Χές is found—a passage inferior in importance to none throughout the prophetic writings; nay, a passage to which the prophecies relating to all future times seem to point, as to the key expressly provided for their own unlocking; it is not only not unlikely, but much to be expected,
that Satan shall be found to have put forth his most anxious
efforts to distort and mutilate the features of the pro-
phesy. We know, however, that he strives against a rock,
and that the Word of God will ever stand.

Having thus referred to the hypothesis that a certain
"various reading" may have formed a part of the original
text—a notion which still maintains, I confess, a certain hold
on my own mind—I beg now to say that I abandon it alto-
gether, and exclude it from my argument. In my pamphlet,
what is said on the point was received with no sort of favour
—indeed, was utterly disclaimed; proving that the "various
reading" in question, if it is to stand at all, must do so by
help of another kind. But in abandoning this hypo-
thesis, I am compelled to take refuge in another, which some,
perhaps, may deem as little tenable; but I must preface it
with some remarks.

That the single number, if single, indited by St. John,
was χελ (600,606), I hold to be incontrovertible, standing
as it does not only on the best external, but still more firmly
on the surest internal evidence,—"those who saw John face
to face attesting it, and reason teaching us (a remarkable
expression) that it must be so." So says Irenæus. But this
Father had no difficulty in perceiving that not only the name,
but the character, of Antichrist was involved in this peculiar
number. Thus he describes it as compounded of three sixes
and three tens—meaning, no doubt, that whatever moral
qualities were commonly expressed in his day by the num-
bers six and ten, in a figurative language which has now unh-
appily, passed into oblivion, these were to be found in a
threefold (i.e. an infinite) state, in the character of him who
was to come. Furthermore, he caught with great facility
the idea, that the "beast" is multitudinous: take the word
Δαρείως which he mentions—a generick term, and of mul-
titudinous application—in proof; a term, however, which
he has handed down with but slender approbation as the con-
jecture of others. Now if χελ be multitudinous, while also
it involves within itself (for so says the text) the "number
of a man" ("αριθμὸς γὰρ ανθρώπου ἡ τι")—(query "the
man"; i.e. the number of the man's name who, as I hope to
prove, shall be the great head and exponent of the Anti-Christian system)—nothing is more likely than that the early Fathers should have made this the special subject of their inquiry. Made what the subject of their inquiry?—Why, not what man’s name simply (e.g. that of Nero, or Domitian, or Diocletian) might be found to make up the number 666; but what “number” (which, according to the text, would prove to be the “number of a man’s name”) might be extracted from 666, as the first term of the progression it exhibits in its constitution; which extracted number would, in a simple form of reckoning, exhibit the Head of the multitudinous body which 666 symbolised. They would be led to examine the peculiar features of the “number” given (600, 60, 6)—the combination it exhibits of the “six” and the “ten” on a plan of ever-progressing increase, with a view to obtain the original seed from whence such vast developments could spring. They would have said, “If we see before us this sign—a sign of multitude—in the midst, or the extreme of its growth, there must also have been a first step—a rudimental number—which (we are told) will represent the number of a man.” Above all they would have said, “What more clear than this, that when we are invited to ‘count the number of the beast,’ and are told immediately after that ‘his number is 600, 60, 6,’ it must be meant that the number to be counted, or computed, must be extracted from the number 600, 60, 6; and that, if rightly computed, it will exhibit the number—not of the bestial power, which is this same 666, but—of its future Head, the ‘man’ spoken of.” So, I venture to think, the ancient Fathers may have reasoned; regarding the depths of 600, 60, 6 as those of the forest in which the individual “beast” held his lair, and as being the source from whence the “mark of the beast,” and the “name of the beast,” were both in separate numerical devices to be obtained.

Now if this be so, it should not be matter of surprise to find some well-authenticated number descending from the highest antiquity, occupying perhaps the hazardous position of a “various reading,” which the very act of giving preference to a competitor at once dooms to annihilation;
but being really a comment upon the original text, and offering itself—not in the character of a supplanter, but—as a result of the early belief that the mysterious number given contained an inner mystery, the indispensable household-god (as it were) in the inmost recesses of the building. Much would depend upon where such a number was found. If the early MS. really embodied it in the text, dispossessing its competitor χρες of its rightful place, I, for one, should deem it an impostor, to be immediately rejected. But if the early MS. should present it as a marginal reading, it seems to me that we should be more entitled to consider it proposed as a comment upon, than as a substitute for, the text of greater pretension.

Thus have I placed before you another suggestion regarding the origin and nature of a certain various reading (as it is disparagingly called), which has come down to us from ancient times. If you should be disposed to consign it to the same fate as my first suggestion, then I must leave it to time and other hands to unravel the mystery of its existence. But this I say with confidence, as regards my own judgment, notwithstanding—that its proper place among writings is in some higher class than that of "various readings." I argue from the result—a better guide, confessedly, in the regions of Prophecy, than any ordinary rule of criticism. Just consider the case. It is as follows:—

I am led by Mr. Frere's remarkable exposition to recognise in Louis Napoleon the "eighth" King of Rev. xvii., seeing that he exactly fulfils the conditions anticipated by that eminent writer:—in this particularly, that the "eighth" king would be found to stand in some mysterious and close relation to the "seventh" overthrown—previously shown to be the great Napoleon—which would issue in his elevation to the reconstituted imperial dignity. Again, I am led by my own ideas on the structure of Prophecy, to consider the latter half of Rev. xiii. as descriptive of the same (the eighth) prophetic "kingdom" of the "beast," and the same portentous character of the latter days; and I observe that both a "mark" and a "name" are spoken of as means by which to recognise the subjects of the beast's kingdom. It
must surely occur to every one that there is a great difference between a "mark" and a "name"—both of them signifi-
cative of property, but the latter of a greater strictness and intimacy of that claim than the former. Putting these con-
siderations alongside the facts foreshown by Frere, and now enacted by history, what more likely than that the "mark" should denote the general course of the Napoleonic dynasty, and the "name" that portion of it when, after a terrible subversion, it should be reconstituted in renewed vigour and augmented power by Napoleon's second self—for such, in the imagery both of Rev. xiii. and xvii., he is described. But it is said in the text that the "number of the beast"—(not the mark nor the name of the beast, but his "number")—is 666. Considering that two things are required, and but one number is here given; and considering that, on making the experiment, this number is found to yield one of the things required—the mark (not in a direct, but an enigmatical manner, as might have been anticipated from the depths of a secret which Inspiration had condescended to exercise itself upon)—what more likely than that this single number should prove to be the depository of the other thing required also? I look around: is there no friendly finger to point the way in this additional search? Imagination fails! The "name" is lost! But behold! I observe a number descending from apostolic times, greatly differing from the number given, yet bearing a family resemblance to it. I determine to try my hand upon it. I find in the first place—regarding the given number \( \chi \xi \) again as a sign—that this new number yields the component parts and chief characteristics of that sign, in particular its roots \((10 + 6)\), and first germination \((10 \times 6)\); just as when (putting aside allegory) it is intended to draw forth from a multitude some individual to be its leader (as when Saul was chosen to be king), the selection will naturally fall upon one who most eminently embodies its general character,—as did Saul the chief features of the sons of Jacob, as developed in the most favoured of their tribes. Secondly, treating this apparent offspring still as a sign—a tripartite sign such as is the parent, but constructed as a derivative—I find that, placing its
members in a position relatively to each other which, in 
unison with the universal custom of mankind, is held to 
abrogate the character of a sign, and to exhibit the thing sig-
nified, it renders the name in full length of Louis Napoleon. 

Now, if the method by which this result is obtained be 
not circuitous and fanciful in a greater degree, than might 
have been expected in a case where, notwithstanding, Fancy 
is the very faculty appealed to by the inspired penman, I submit 
that it should command our acquiescence more readily than 
any more direct one; for the reason that, if Omniscience be 
pleased to indulge, in its great condescension, in so peculiar 
a means of human communication as the Science of Enigma— 
seeming to say "Humani nihil a me alienum puto"—it is pre-
sumable that it would bestow a full measure of the compli-
ment intended, by showing its perfect skill in all the mys-
teries of the science. Furthermore, consider the name 
"Louis Napoleon;" its numerous letters—the numerous 
surnames to be put together; and the absolute necessity that, so 
put together, they shall render an exact and well-defined 
number. Consider too, that my resort to the experiment 
was not idly made (as if, for instance, I had looked for the 
name of the late Russian Emperor in our national spleen 
against him); but that reasons interwoven with the general 
texture of Prophecy, pointing to the very age, the place, 
and the dynastic name, had previously suggested the search. 
Consider these premises, and then I would beg of you to 
reflect awhile on the incalculable, the infinite amount of 
chances against the successful issue of such a search, unless 
we had truly found our way into the narrow track of Truth, 
as of old designed and determined. Impelled by the force 
of these considerations, I have adopted (I repeat) the perfect 
persuasion, that the second number accompanying the given 
"number of the beast," is to be regarded as the especial gift 
of Providence, for the use of His elect Church in these last 
eventful days. It is easy to imagine that—the numeric sign of 
a large body being given, it was practicable of old to deduce 
from it a natural form of head (for every body must have a 
head)—just as it is within the power of the naturalist to 
pronounce upon the form of the head (the only part perhaps
wanting) of a gigantic fossil frame he may have discovered;—
and whether we choose now to regard the numeric sign in ques-
tion (the "head," as I am supposing it to be, of the body
666) as having originally been placed in the text by St.
John; or (as said above, and more likely) as having been ex-
tracted from the text by some learned student of his day—
*skilled in the rules of its enigmatic construction*, it really can-
ot now much signify.

But let me make this final observation;—I should be quite
content, now that this interloping number has placed me (as
I believe) in the true path of interpretation, that it were
itself considered as *non-existent*. Like the Greek numeration
table, which helped me to the truth in the case of the
"mark," I can now afford to regard this number also as a
tool that has done its work;—it has recommended to me a
particular view of the numeric enigma, has opened to me a
"hole in the wall," and it only remains through it to read
off the mystery.

We have not yet got to the end of our preliminary diffi-
culties.

I have said that the ancients would have argued upon the
*construction* of the original sign χές (600,60,6). They would
have observed especially the *concealed* agency of the number
ten; and—by virtue of that life-giving agency—its ever, and
*ever-regularly*, increasing proportions. Taking my stand
upon this ground, I do not hesitate now to say, with the ut-
most assurance, that the "reading" χές (600,10,6), of which
only as yet we have spoken, is a *complete error*. What regu-
larity of growth, or of proportion, is there in the parts
600,10,6? *Six* may denote the Spirit—the family character;
*Ten* the power of multiplication, the sign of which is neces-
sarily brought out to view in an examination of the *means* of
the great progression; but look at the adjacent part—600,
which ought indeed to be the *product*! There is manifestly
an abandonment of due proportion. If we regard the three
parts of the sign as members of a living (living, because
*progressive*) body, there is palpably a departure from symme-
trical rule, a neglect of reasonable congruity, in the
collocation of the 600 with the 10 and the 6,—a feature
which at once negatives the idea of its exhibiting the first step of the original progression 600,60,6. I am sorry to be obliged to enter thus, in a preliminary address, upon views which find their more proper place, and are of course enlarged upon, at the very end of the volume.

Now it happens that this accidental or supplemental figure χις has been presented to the world by the great Griesbach in another form—viz. ξις (60,10,6). I feel I have a right to call it “another form” of the same reading, rather than another reading, because in no place are the two figures assembled together as different “readings” of the same text—that is to say, one only of them ever appears at a time. In this form—which is no number, but a sign, are set forth (as seen at a glance) not only the materials of the original sign—the sources of its power; but the rule, the proportion, and (in the 60) the first step of its increase; the first step (that is to say) in a series, of which the final step, when divested of its emblematic garb (666), is 6,000,000.

I will only add one further word in anticipation. This individual beast—the Head of the Antichristian system—becomes the eighth king of Rev. xvii., in obedience to the law of Harmony (for harmony enters essentially into the construction of prophetic numbers) which determines that the eighth of a series is ever the return of the first—the complementary note of the octave. And thus it happens that we are at liberty to regard this redoubtable character, either as the head or the issue of the Antichristian system; just as Christ, whom he would supplant, is both the root and the offspring of the house of David. Now if, in compliance with the argument we have held, the derivative sign ought to be convertible into the “number of a man” (or of the man)—i.e. ought to render the numeric value of the man’s name who is destined to hold the post of the individual beast, or head of the Antichristian system—that system having first been shown to bear at the time, dynastically, the “mark” of Napoleon; it is certainly a most astonishing fact that the numeric sign 60,10,6 presents in full detail, and with the utmost precision, the name of Louis Napoleon.

It is necessary now to examine into the extent of the
scriptural pretensions of the sign $\xi\tau\sigma$. And here, anticipating the verdict of a jealous criticism, I must make the avowal with deep regret, that, even as a "various reading," it rests upon a sadly slender foundation,—so much so, that I have been induced above to say, that I would be content were every other than the one view of the original text suppressed, and that text ($\chi\xi\tau\sigma—666$) were allowed to stand alone; whereby the truth would be left to be determined entirely by a process of analysis.

Finding in 1852 that my little pamphlet was rejected by some, on the very account that the reading $\xi\tau\sigma$ was not acknowledged; although it appears in several consecutive editions of Mr. Bagster's Polyglott Bible; I was led to make inquiries of that eminent publisher, first by letter, and the following year personally at his house in Paternosterrow. The following is the information I obtained. After many years of expectation on the part of the academical world, Griesbach presented to it, in the year 1796, the first volume of the large octavo edition of his "Critical examination of the text of the New Testament," published at Halle. The second volume did not make its appearance until ten years later, in 1806. During this interval the inquiries for the second volume, and the requirements of the public, were so urgent, that the learned author was induced to put forth for immediate use a shorter work, which seems to bear the name of his "Manual Edition," published at Leipsic in 1805. In the larger work of 1806, the "various reading"—the subject of our inquiry, printed in the margin, is $\chi\xi\tau\sigma$; but in the "Manual Edition" of 1805 it is $\xi\tau\sigma$. Now, although the edition of 1806 is later than that of 1805, and would therefore seem to supersede the claim of the latter, it is equally true that the edition of 1805 was sent last to the press. And it is observable that the "reading" of 1805 ($\xi\tau\sigma$) is placed by Griesbach, by a sign of reference, among "those passages relative to which he, on account of some variety in the punctuation, or some various reading which he rejects, has inserted a proposed alteration at the foot of the page." I have italicized what in this biblical notice you must allow to be most curious. Not to speak of "punctuation," about which I am
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in the dark, I may fairly put the question,—What is the "various reading" which the great critic rejected? It certainly is not χξςς: and no other one than χςςς was ever heard of. If the rejected reading was χςςς, he must have had for the proceeding, and for proposing ξςςς as an improvement, some remarkable reason, the loss of which is much to be deplored. But the more important question is—May Griesbach be considered as having returned in 1806 from ξςςς to χςςς? Mr. Bagster expressed to me the opinion that the two editions—the Leipsic edition of 1805, and the last volume of the Halle edition of 1806—were "printed simultaneously." This is likely enough, and would be favourable to the view I would defend, of ξςςς having been drawn from Griesbach's original stores; and would make it in fact his last emendation.

It was from the "Manual Edition" of 1805 that ξςςς was copied into the margin of Bagster's Polyglott, where it maintained its position through numerous editions until the year 1840; when, in a reprint, the more approved reading χςςς was adopted. The reason given for this change is exceedingly unsatisfactory, as I think, viz., that in the copy of the 1805 edition in Mr. Bagster's possession, but which had once belonged to Dr. Tregelles, the pen (it is presumable of Dr. Tregelles) had been put across the ξ, and χ inserted instead,—a reason which, at its utmost, goes only to show that this last eminent critic preferred the χ. However, in consequence of this, I requested Mr. Bagster to write to Dr. Tregelles for an explanation; and in a note dated 24th May, 1853, he writes me as follows:—"I have just heard from Dr. Tregelles in reply to my inquiry, does ξςςς rest upon any authority? His answer is decisive against its validity. He says, 'In Griesbach's "Manual Edition" (1805) in Rev. xiii. 18, there is an erratum in the var. lect. ξςςς should be χςςς. To that edition there was a short list of errata appended (about four I think) in which this was not noticed; but Göschen (the publisher) afterwards got out a leaf of errata (a copy of which I have) containing about two dozen, half of which were in the Revelation. In this list this erratum was pointed out.'" Now this will be
received, of course, as inflicting a death-blow on the pretensions of ξίσ. No one, unless it were another Griesbach, would have a right to defend it on ordinary grounds of criticism. Yet do I submit again, that at least it may claim to be judged on its own merits. Also it must be observed as very remarkable, that in "the appended list of four errata," this important one should not have been found—a circumstance which seems to show that Griesbach’s subsequent return to ξίσ was only in obedience to his balance of claims, and not that ξίσ was a mistake on his part.

I must now mention that about the time I have spoken of, in a conversation I had on this subject at another great house in London—Mr. Boldock’s in Holborn—an important fact was elicited. It appeared that Griesbach’s “Manual Edition” (1805) was a reprint at Leipsic of an edition of 1775—7; printed because the second volume of his larger work was not forthcoming, as said before. This puts the 1805 edition in a very different point of view,—no longer as an abridgement (as it were) of the larger work in expectation. It is on the contrary the much older work of the two, and gives the mind of Griesbach so far back as 1777, when (it is presumable) he was in his chief vigour of intellect and power of research. I observe that Mr. Hartwell Horne mentions this edition in his “Introduction” (vol. v. p. 22); and in speaking of Griesbach’s two editions (1775—7 and 1796—1806), he makes the following very important remark,—“Dr. Hales prefers it (the former) to the second edition, because he thinks that Griesbach was at that time more scrupulous of innovating upon the text than he afterwards was.” I observe that in Mr. Bagster’s large print critical Greek Testament (1851) there is no varia lectio given at all of the text ξίσ,—a circumstance which the ordinary reader may dwell upon with sadness, as evincing how much the truth is dependent, as well upon the honesty, as the learning of the critic.

I know of no other question connected with prophecy so interesting at this moment, as the still open one,—how Griesbach became possessed of, or was led to indite, the expression ξίσ. It is most difficult to get at the truth.
I have nothing more to place before you on this all-important subject. But I cannot help finally expressing my own opinion—judging, I admit, from only internal evidence—that Griesbach originally, either brought forward \( \xi \) as a genuine "reading" from some little known MS. of antiquity, but was afterwards, on reflecting on the immensely superior claim of \( \chi \), induced to return to that mode of writing it; or that, having been led by his own observation of the defective condition, or presentation, of \( \chi \), arising from some effect of "punctuation" on its first letter * (as above stated) to propose what he considered a more natural and probable reading, he was afterwards "frightened from his propriety," on reflecting on his own temerity. I beg you now, considerate reader, to judge for yourself, not failing to call to mind that the prince of critics to whom I have appealed—however ill-authenticated may be the text \( \xi \) brought forward by him—has positively rejected as untenable the one which, as a collector, he has handed down. Two courses were open to Griesbach to choose between in the case of \( \chi \); either to strike it out altogether, which perhaps he would have feared to do, or to propose an amendment; and certainly we are to understand him on the latter ground as saying—"\( \xi \) might be admissable, \( \chi \) is false." This rejection of \( \chi \), accompanied with the suggestion of \( \xi \) as a substitute, stamps the latter with a greater value, than does the mere recognition of its existence, by Irenæus, impart to the former.

I must now ask your permission to say a few words on the correspondence you and I had together, chiefly through mutual friends, in the year 1852.

In your kind note dated from Kelsall you observe—"The whole pamphlet rests on an assumed correspondence between 111 and 1,000,000 as the utmost power of a unit in the Greek and Arabic notation." This statement you think untrue: and I for my part (I repeat)—though believing it,

* Is there not something remarkable in the providential arrangement (for by Providence all things consist) whereby \( \chi \) and \( \xi \)—letters of so close affinity—represent respectively 600 and 60—numbers of equally close affinity. For as a rule, the Greek letters are taken as signs of numbers, in the order wherein they present themselves.
do not intend to bring it forward again. But were it true, the truth would surely not be impaired by stating as a consequence, that 666 corresponds with 6,000,000. I cannot imagine therefore what you can mean by saying, "Besides, even on the view assumed, the extreme numbers would be 666 on the one side, and 6, 666, 666 on the other." In the following pages, there is no point (as I think) which more clearly comes out, than that 666—I will not say "corresponds" with, but—developes itself into 6,000,000. Again, you object to my "mode of numbering a name by taking the consonants alone, and using their numerical value as factors." This, you say, "is unnatural in itself, and unknown to the days of St. John. I have never known it used in any emblem of later times. The clear scope of the passage is, that the letters of the beast's name make up 666, just as the Greek letters of the name Jesus make up a similar number 888." I am greatly surprised at this objection. I am engaged in seeking out an appropriate "mark" for the beast, whose oral designation I had previously been led to believe was Napoleon. This "mark" would have among its purposes, not only to enable him to claim his own, but rather (if we may judge from the number 144,000 in the next verse) to show the dimensions of his Anti-Christian host. What mark more natural, in relation to the construction of the name, than N.P.L.N.—in conformity with the idea and the illustration of Dr. Wordsworth's, given in my pamphlet? And how are the dimensions of that name—i.e., the number of those who call upon it—to be determined, but by a process of multiplication? It is impossible to wish for a better illustration on this point, than the one you have yourself proposed; only let us take it in its full extent. The name of our blessed Saviour is Ιησοῦς Χριστός. The first part of this appellation, which is his personal name, as the one Saviour, consists of letters which, when regarded numerically and added together, make up the number 888; and why added? Because the letters are the component parts of an incommunicable name—a name (that is) which cannot attach to a multiplicity of objects, and cannot therefore be subject to multiplication. In compliance herewith, I have added together the letters form-
ing the name of Louis Napoleon—the one head of the Anti-Christian system. But now—what is to be said of Χριστός? Am I wrong in saying it is a noun of multitude—comprehending in itself all to whom the gift of Christ's Spirit is imparted? Hence, first, Jesus is Χριστός—the especially anointed One; and secondly (says Parkhurst) the word "denotes the Christian Church, or that society of which Christ is the head: thus Theodoret, on 1 Cor. xii. 12, says, 'The Apostle in this place calls the general body of the Church Christ, because Christ is the head of this body.' Compare 1 Cor. xii. 27; Col. i. 24; Gal. iii. 27, 28, &c." Now how would it be necessary to proceed, were it proposed to give a numerical form to Χριστός—a word of so wide application, wherein its multitudinous signification should be preserved;—should we take the sum or the product of its letters? For an answer to this question, we may point again to the number in Rev. xiv. 1,—"Lo, a Lamb stood on the Mount Zion, and with him an hundred, forty, and four thousand, having his Father's name written in their foreheads." The name, given by the Father was, I presume, Χριστός—as signifying one of the anointed multitude: and observe—there are 144,000 who bear it, a number evidently contrived on a plan of multiplication. And of this vast symbolic multitude each bears the name; which name thus becomes multiplied the specified number of 144,000 times. It would surely then be just as unreasonable to write, in the one case, Χ + ρ + ι + σ, &c., as it would be contrary to truth, in the other, to write 12 + 12:—for if the latter be written 12 × 12 in obedience to a rule, that rule would not lose its force were the letters of Χριστός taken, instead of the emblematic units of number, as the material of the name required.

Writing from Stinchcombe, you make some valuable remarks on the subject of numbers. You say, "But on this subject of numbers I am more than ever inclined to think that it has no relation to the written characters or cyphers, and as such to be guessed at as a riddle or enigma; but that the subject has a reference to the hidden mystery and meaning of numbers, which would be the same in every language under the sun. Nothing has ever astonished me so much as the hidden wisdom of numbers, from the slight glimpses I
have had into that system as alluded to by St. Ambrose, Augustine, and others. It is to me like astronomy or any other vast field of knowledge which fills one with wonder. Where the number 600 occurs in the Bible as in the age of Noah at the flood, or 666 as the gold of Solomon, this appears to me quite another thing to the same numbers occurring in the history of Napoleon; because I look on the Bible as suggestive of the sacred mystery of numbers, and as such a sacred language, different from the history of the world."

You must allow me to say, that I read in the latter portion of these remarks a prevailing, and to me most unintelligible notion, that there are Scripture figures and symbols which are suitable and applicable to the events of the old world, but by no means so to those of modern times. Surely the Holy Spirit, who is here presumed to have referred in the symbolical language of numbers to the age of Noah and the gold of Solomon, might not think it out of place or time—being the God of all—to speak, in the use of the same language, of the slaughterer of six million of men in ten years, notwithstanding that such a hero's day should be cast in these remote ages. Nor do I see any reason why the transcendent idolatry of the nineteenth century after our Saviour, should not be susceptible of the prophetic "mark" of the ever-increasing "six," just as much as that of the days of Noah. You speak of the "numbers" of prophecy, as to be understood in only a mystical sense:—the instances referred to are not happy in bearing out this view; for Noah lived literally 600 years before the flood; and the gold brought to Solomon in one year amounted literally to 666 talents; so that, at least, there were physical facts to illustrate and correspond with the mystical sense. In your book on the Apocalypse (p. 205) the number "ten" multiplied into "seven" is said to be an emblematic expression "of mercy combining with judgment,"—the "ten" and the "seven" having both about them "intimations of good." Now this would be a very barren and useless statement, unless accompanied with a physical illustration. And so you seem yourself to have thought, when adding an instance of the application of the numbers—that of the Captivity; observing that "seventy
years was the period of the captivity, the *chastening of Israel for forgiveness.*" There can be no doubt that "numbers" were endowed of old with a mystical signification; it is the essential thing to be borne in mind in reading prophecy, and even sacred history. Herein they become hieroglyphics and symbols. But it is no less essential to observe, as the general rule that governs them, that while mystical, they are *at the same time literal and real* in their reference:—in fact a type *really numerical* can be made intelligible only by means of a physical application. The opinion your words express is shared, I observe, by Dr. Wordsworth; he says (p. 261)—"The numbers of the Apocalypse, and especially those which refer to *future times,* represent certain *ideas,* and not *precise quantities.*" He quotes too Dr. Lightfoot as saying, respecting the famous period of 1260 days, or 3½ times,—"They mean times of trouble, and are used to express that, and not *any fixed time.*"

In answer to these formidable opinions I must observe that I should be disinclined, indeed afraid, to acquiesce in a scheme which—by thus suppressing the very idea of *number* and reducing numerals to a mere alphabet entirely foreign to their original use—is as incapable of conveying the *assurance* of truth, as is the polar noon-day sun in winter of giving light. My persuasion is, that *figure and fact* go together in all prophetic symbolism. I would ask—how will this theory consist with the declaration of Scripture, that the Creator "has ordered all things in measure, *number,* and weight" (Wis. xi. 20)? He has not only "measured" the spaces of infinity, has "numbered" the worlds that inhabit them, and "weighed" the latter—that they shall ever preserve their relative position; but has done the same to *all things.*" And if "the times and the seasons" are comprehended in this numbering of "all things,"—and that they are so must be conceded at once by every one not an Atheist,—how can we be warranted in saying that a figure (1260) which professes to be a numbering of the "times," is *entirely emblematical?* Were there *really* forty years of the wilderness—forty years of rest to the land—forty days of temptation? If so, why not as *really* 1260 years of the triumph of the "beast?"
Regarding the view your note takes of Louis Napoleon, probably had it been written yesterday instead of five years ago, it would scarcely have expressed itself thus:—"I think there is so very much caution necessary not to be carried away with passing events: but of all interpretations that to poor Louis Napoleon seems to me the most innocent, as his position does seem so ephemeral."

In your kind note, dear reader, from Exeter, about the same time, was not the following very similar observation rather too quickly hazarded:—"The idea of St. John being inspired for the purpose of prophesying respecting such a thing as Louis Napoleon, appears to me to bear its own refutation"!

Writing too from another part of the world, in a note further to be noticed by and bye, be assured, Mr. Reader, it was no proof of your sagacity to have said, "That personage seems to me to occupy a very undue place in the author's mind:" The tempest was preceded of old by a cloud "of the size only of a man's hand."

For your very laborious note from the county Fermanagh—a note not the less pleasing because so caustic—my best thanks are due. You have indeed brought down the "high looks" of my pamphlet, which states in its commencement the "undeniable fact, that in every language into which the original has been translated, it has received a false translation"—in that the Greek number Χξς ought to have been rendered, not "six hundred, sixty, and six," but 666;—that is, "that the prophet, when writing, wrote Χξς, and not in full, the number which he intended:" "and this (say you), which is the basis of his whole system, he quietly assumes." In examining the evidence of this proposition, you have, I confess, entirely effected its overthrow, by the reference you make to no less than ten or twelve ancient MSS. of high esteem, in which the mystic number is written at length; proving undeniably (as you express it) "that the scriptio plena was the rule, that in letters the exception." And you further say, "Thus in this preliminary question, it would appear to me that the weight of MSS. authority is in favour of John's having written not in siglis, but in full: not Χξς, but
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εξακοσιων
αυ· εξηκοντα εξ·
α

In the peculiar manner here exhibited of writing the number, you endeavour to account for the various reading in the gender of the first numeral, by ascribing it to St. John's bad writing; for you say—"it would seem that α might be readily made out αυ, or αυ, or α"(!) Again, in endeavouring to account for the corruption of the letters χς (666) into χς (616)—a reading so strenuously repudiated by Irenæus, you bring forward with approval the guess I have above-mentioned of this father, that the Latin scribes had accidentally let fall the L from the expression (!) Now really, on looking at these ingenious guesses, I say to myself—"what have I done more than guess—indeed have I done so much as guess—on the subject of my various reading (ξς) which has been the subject of your severe castigation?" But thus it always is: people receive with eagerness the ideas of others, however destitute of proper basis, that fall in with their own preconceptions, and reject with bitterness those that are opposed. I confess I begin to think that the version εξακοσιων
αυ· mentioned as it is by Griesbach—is not at all the writing of an honest scribe puzzled with St. John's bad writing, yet anxious to preserve every aspect of the text in which there was any probability; but is the actual dictation of the Holy Spirit; and that if the lost method of expressing ideas by numbers should ever be recovered, it will be found that the idea of all-inclusiveness—a characteristic so essentially enfolded in a right idea of the "beast"—is meant hereby to be conveyed.

But now let us examine the crushing consequence of your having exposed with so much skill the "sandy foundation" of my argument. Is it meant to say that because the original is written (granted) in words, and not in numerical characters, I am precluded from assuming an allegorical sense, and any but a direct sense, for the mystic number? Unless this much be meant, your pungent diatribe is written (so far as I can see) without an object. Now observe that the number of
the elect (144,000) of the very next verse, does not pretend to have been given "in siglis," but in words: yet they indisputably have an allegorical meaning:—why should the six hundred, sixty, and six (written also in words), be supposed to require a more direct acceptation? On looking at your favourite Bengel, I observe that he notices the idea of a preceding commentator, that the number six hundred, sixty, and six, ought to be received in a figurative sense; and certainly the commentator he alludes to did not build his notion upon my unfortunate "fact" that the number was written originally in characters. Bengel writes thus of him:—


He further says:—

"Miro adhuc, quo pacto numerus 666 pro magnâ multitudine quest accipi, et factâ quidem comparatione cum electis 144,000 siquidem hi illos magnopore excedunt. Quid agnoscess Car. Gallus, 666 homines in totidem myriadas hominum audacter commutat." . . . . "Alia interpretatio accipit 666 pro 6666, 6666 pro legione, legionem pro multitudine hostium ecclesie."

Hence it appears that Carolus Gallus, and not your humble servant, is entitled to the credit of having first imagined a figurative signification in the mystic number. Poor man! He has got it richly for the presumption of exercising his judgment. He had however more wit than his censor—I am persuaded. A genuine critic, such as Bengel, has—one may say, by profession—that rigidity of thought, which like a wirework cover on a window, impedes immensely the free entrance of truth. Was there ever anything so feeble—nay, perverse—as his reason for the conclusion, that the number 666 is a fixed quantity: to be inferred (he says) "ex ipso calculandi jussu"! Why, is there no other process of calculation than that of "counting"? Is not multiplication—indeed, is not every investigation in figures—a calculation? Furthermore, as the figures 666 and 144,000 are of different construction—the former being of the nature of a perpetual series, the latter not so, I think
Gallus was right in not being deterred by the disparity, however interpreted, between these numbers, from attributing an enormous development to the 666:—provided only he did not do so (and it does not appear he did) on the ground mentioned, that, on a comparison of the relative numbers of the saved and the condemned, that of the latter ought ever to be represented the greater. Scripture nowhere informs us of such terrible triumphs of the adversary. Where is anything like the following said of the multitudes of the condemned: "After this I beheld, and lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands." (Rev. vii. 9.) It is true that "many are called, and but few chosen:" that is to say, of those that are called—that are admitted into the Christian Church—few are chosen:—but are not the millions of other nations, under other dispensations, to be taken into the account? These, drawn in from the "highways and hedges" of the world, and even the Christian Church itself when brought under Christ's personal dominion, with the "utmost heathen for his inheritance," shall yield such multitudes of souls to glory, as far to exceed the numerical conquests of Satan: so that the Lord Christ (to accommodate a phrase otherwise applied) "shall in all things have the pre-eminence." And thus it is presumable the numbers 144,000 and 666, if taken strictly, would afford a fair comparison (not, certainly, that it was ever intended) of the relative strength of the opponent hosts in the last day. Let us part friends.

In your book entitled the "Christian Remembrancer," you call me a "silly person." I have not your observations before me; but I remember that among them is one to this effect,—"60, 10, 6: it looks mightily like 76." Now as you wish to establish plain speaking between us, I take leave to say that this remark—wherein of course is offered not only the amount, but the intended meaning of the figures 60, 10, 6—is the remark of a blockhead. Is εἴσ (60, 10, 6) the right Greek expression for 76? You know it is not. If then it were possible to show that the number 76 is, notwithstanding, the solution intended, there would of necessity be an addi-
tional meaning in this remarkable division of it; and herein clearly lies the mystery. Thus in one of Daniel's prophecies we read,—"Seventy weeks are determined, &c.;" but afterwards, these "seventy" are divided into 62, 7, 1. Is there any but a blockhead would say, "Let us look; 62, 7, 1—this means 70, nothing more"! It is clear to me that your words have really no purpose in them excepting as a vent for ill-nature—the usual mark of "silly" persons.

In some comments upon my pamphlet, from your Rectory of Brasted, you question whether "the Arabic system of decimal notation could be rationally introduced here." If I catch the point of the observation, it is that you object to the Arabic system altogether as a means of exposition, on the ground that the "number of the beast" is given in Greek numeral letters,—a restriction which would confine the Antichrist to the times when these were in use, perhaps even to the Greek nation,—a restriction more stringent than even that of Bishop Newton, who observes, "it is evident that it must be some Greek or Hebrew name;" (the remainder of his observation is more valuable) "and with the name also the other qualities and properties of the beast must all agree." (iii. 246.)

I understand you then to affirm, that as the Arabic system was unknown in St. John's day, I am not warranted in employing it as an instrument in the present; and that as without it I acknowledge my speculations cannot be made presentable, they can be nothing worth. Now, this opinion I shall meet by stating the very opposite one I hold, that the fact alluded to—of the superior adaptation to the task before us of the modern numeration table, affords a most conclusive proof of the divine origin of the Prophecy—the unmistakable evidence of His handicraft, who, "seeing the end from the beginning," and tracing with unerring ken the progress of the human mind through all its paths of discovery and invention—nay, determining that progress, adapts His language with equal facility, whether to the present or the far distant state of man's attainment, and his means of literary communication. It is, indeed, a very curious circumstance, that the Arabic numerals now in use were unknown throughout civilised Christendom, for at least a thousand years after
St. John’s time; and it is my belief that, without them, no plan of interpreting the sacred numbers could be made intelligible, for the reason that there would be no sufficient access through the eye to the imagination. Take the single instance of the decimal expansion (which we shall find to be necessary) of the unit “six” into seven terms—as thus, 6, 60, 600, 6000, and so on to 6,000,000; and contrast with these the same progression in Greek figures—as thus, 
\[ \xi, \chi, s, \xi, \chi, s, \ldots \]
Can any one thing be more inferior to another in lucidity? And, as to expressing the same series in Roman numerals, the undertaking would be to plunge into the most hopeless thicket of figures.

There is no more folly, surely, in supposing that the Holy Spirit would—if not appoint, yet—take advantage of a change He foresaw at the distance of a thousand years, in the method of numeric computation to be adopted by the Church, than that He should make allusion to the hidden signification of numbers—arbitrary and at the best conventional—appointed by man; and that He has condescended to this all commentators are agreed. But—not to speak of the recognition of man’s contrivances—will it be said that the change from the cumbrous Roman system to the Arabic might not have been, as it regards the Sign in the Revelation, by the very appointment of Providence? As well might one say the art of printing was given without any view to the promulgation of the Gospel! To my mind, the transference of the “number of the beast” from the ancient systems, Greek and Latin, to the modern, is one of the most beautiful features of the prophetic arrangement in the case we are considering; for if the Antichrist (whom on other grounds we must first believe to belong originally to Christ’s Church)—if he did not appear for the first thousand years, and that we are consequently obliged to view him as of modern times, it is surely as satisfactory, as it is remarkable, that the change which has supervened in the course of these ages in the system of numeric notation—the language wherein his name is written, has not cast a greater obscurity upon that name; but, on the contrary, has tended greatly to facilitate its examination. Let us suppose it granted that the Antichrist
belongs to an age not earlier than the present;—is it not a reasonable view of the prophetic word that it will have taken, not only the long interval, but its accompanying circumstances, into the account, when setting forth the numeric enigma?—and that, while giving the "name" in the value of Greek letters (which we must of necessity believe), it will have admitted the system of notation that should prevail in the age and nation to which the Antichrist should belong, to a share in the development. I hope to show that, hereby, the essential connexion has been kept up between the day of giving the prophecy and that of its fulfilment; and that, by intending the numeric sign to be unfolded in accordance with the modern system, and the enigma of its construction brought to light by its more easy manipulation, whilst assigning to its letters their value in Greek; a contrivance truly divine is set before us—a method of transference to distant ages, such as is worthy of the Prophetic Spirit, and of our highest admiration.

You go on to make a grave charge against my scholarship, observing that "No Greek, and no Greek scholar, could ever spell the name of the present autocrat of France, Louis Napoleon. That person seems to me to occupy a very undue place in the author's mind." I have not forgotten that ων is the proper termination in Greek of a nominative case of this sort; but by what right (I ask) should I proceed to give a Greek termination to a Roman name? Furthermore, the Lexicons tell us that ω is an assemblage of two o's, and I would wish to be informed—the proper spelling of a certain name being Napoleon—by what right I should proceed to write it Napoleoon? And, because it is not Napoleoon, are we to understand that this chief could not possibly have been within the view of the Prophet? Why is the Holy Spirit to be bound by the rules of classical orthography? That the name alluded to should be compounded of letters common to the Greek and the language in which the beast's name of the latter days should be written, was to be expected, and we find it is so,—every letter in the word "Napoleon" belongs equally to the Greek and the modern alphabets. And this characteristic, when extended to a double name, as in the
case of the present ruler of France, should at least have the
effect of propitiating our judgment, for I need not mention
that there are many names amongst us—e.g. Frederick,
Alfred, William, &c.—which, not admitting of being writ-
ten in Greek, could none of them be the "beast" sig-
nified.

In your kind note from Oxford, the following observation
occurs, expressive (you say) of the sentiment of Irenæus—
that "St. John would have given some hint of the solu-
tion of the enigma, had it been intended that we should
solve it." I cannot undertake to say what the Prophet, or
rather the Holy Spirit, would or should have said, under any
particular view of His intention; but in this I think you
will agree with me—that the above observation is applicable
with equal force, in the case of every riddle that has ever
proved beyond the reach of an audience; and that in saying,
"I give it up," a vanquished wit should always in justice to
himself add, "You have given no hint for its solution." I
contend, however, that St. John has given a hint, and a very
broad one; he has said, "for it is the number of a man."
And I take this opportunity of expressing my undoubting
rejection of the forced and sterile view of these words taken
by many commentators, and which has even found its way
into the margin of our Bibles, to the intent that they are to
be received in a like sense with the words, "according to the
measure of a man," in Rev. xxi. 17; and that they conse-
quently mean, "for it is according to the method of man's
numbering!" A broader hint can scarcely be imagined,
when rightly viewed, than these words offer; being intended
to declare that the name of an individual—the personal
"beast," is involved in that of the multitudinous "beast,"
as I hope in its place to show. As the opinion of Irenæus
is valuable, he having conversed with those who had had the
privilege of conversing with St. John, I must beg to ques-
tion the precision of your report of that opinion. You
would make it to be, that at no age of the Christian Church
was it intended the enigma should be solved, antecedently to
the coming of him who was the subject of it. But Professor
Stuart speaks of the opinion of Irenæus as being, "that
John would himself have disclosed it, had he wished it to be made public at that time:” (p. 785)—“at that time!”—an expression which leaves the question raised still open. I do not believe that St. John could have told us what the Spirit’s intention was on this point; but if we may judge from the peculiar efforts of the adversary to mystify the whole text of the Revelation, (including the “name of the beast,”) by enveloping it in a cloud of “various readings” and falsified copies, I should say that, on his part at least, there was indication of a very especial fear (no proof, certainly, of the Divine purpose) of predisclosure. There is no writing of Christian times so calculated to inflict a final blow on the kingdom of Satan, as—by the anticipations it inspires—the book of Revelation,—the book of the promise of Christ’s real presence in all the transactions of human government undertaken in His name or fear, and of the struggle He in them maintains with the powers of the world. Without the light of this book—however faint, yet ever brightening, the light of the ancient prophecies would have been spent long since in the ever lengthening distance of time; but with it—placing as it does within our very grasp (so to speak) the assurance, that the ages are all numbered, and the machinations of evil strictly limited in their effects, to the end of the world; it is in vain that the adversary endeavours to “weary” the Saints by the semblance he contrives of a constant recession of the objects of our faith, and the additional mantle of obscurity he is permitted to cast on the foreshown scenes of futurity. But if you object to the examination of the numbers given in the Revelation—an element which, from the exactness of its own nature, is of all the least calculated to lead an inquirer into visionary conclusions, I presume the objection extends to all prophetic matter the book contains: and thus is this holy deposit rendered of scarcely any value. It is my humble opinion, on the contrary, that—if we must needs err, it would be wise it should be in too closely cherishing and examining a document which, in this very use of “numbers” more than in any other feature, exhibits the tracery of God’s fingers on the predetermined map of human history; and
which declares more clearly than any other the perpetual presence of the Church's Head, and the control He universally assumes. "Herein (i.e. by keeping the eye intent upon the limitations He has fixed) is the patience of the Saints," in the long-drawn ages of the Lord's delay. While Satan is ever prompting the question—"where is the promise of His coming," they watch earnestly for, and thankfully greet, every accession of light; persuaded that the concealment of God's purposes will endure, notwithstanding the wiles of the enemy, not a day longer than was originally intended in the Divine mind: and how (allow me to ask) can Expectation be kept alive, if we are to forego for her the very aliment—Research, by which alone it is possible she can live?

And now, friendly reader, in a parting word let me caution you against the formidable obstacle just alluded to, which would bar the very entrance of our proposed investigation—the notion that Prophecy can be understood only in, or after, its fulfilment. Not choosing to dwell on a text so uncertain in its import as "no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation" (2 Peter i. 20), on which this notion seems to be founded; I ask rather, is no note to be taken of the following expressions, "seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book" (Rev. xxii. 10)? and—with reference to the subject of our present research, the "name of the beast"—of the positive invitation to exercise our understanding upon it, "Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast?" (Rev. xiii. 18.) There is in the world of Bible-readers a great deal of spurious humility, under the chilly shade of which not seldom idleness, and not seldom even pride shelters itself; and which (to say the least) is too satisfied with its own merit to discern, that, in avoiding (as it says) the charge of presumption, it encounters the equally dangerous one of prescribing limits to the Divine favour and methods of grace. What if the Lord did intend that the Antichrist should be recognised as soon as he should appear in the drama of the world, but before entering upon the part assigned him in that drama!—and that, through the blindness induced by this unhealthy notion, aided by the flattering tongue ascribed to the desolator (Dan.
xi. 21—3), he were able to elude the observation of surrounding governments, until observation could lead to no useful ends! What would be the self-reproaches of this favoured nation—the chosen seat of God's spiritual dominion in the present age, when their eyes should at length open to the full force of the neglected warnings of the Most High, but when too they should find themselves enclosed within a ring of irremediable evils! It may with equal truth be said of a spiritual warning as of material good,

"Not to know a blessing's worth,
Till time has stolen away the slighted good,
Is cause of half the misery we feel."

Example, as gathered from sacred history, is entirely opposed to the conclusion I would impugn. The vision of "seven fat kine and seven lean kine" was not shown to Pharaoh in order that, after its fulfilment—in other words, after several millions of his subjects should have perished by famine—he and his court might recognise the Divine foreknowledge. The famous prayer of Daniel, when he would be better informed of the expiration of the captivity of his people, should reprove us. The age of Daniel (by the bye) presents an opportune incident, which answers at once the question—whether a name prophetically determined ought not to be regarded as a forewarning. The name of Cyrus was written by the pen of Prophecy (Isaiah xlv. 28) a good hundred years before that conqueror was born, and the circumstance was mainly the reason of his favouring the cause of the captive Jews. Now of Cyrus we know that he was the pre-appointed destroyer of ancient Babylon: and of the Antichrist we likewise know, that he will effect the destruction of the Babylon that is (Rev. xvii. 18)—a singular coincidence!—the more so, as it attaches to the only two conquerors (at least that I am aware of) whose names have been pre-written in Holy Scripture.

There is certainly a very discouraging diversity of interpretation among commentators, on all the leading topics of unfulfilled prophecy; whereby people are led naturally, but too easily, to rest in a convenient application of the text.
"thine ears shall hear a word behind thee" (Isaiah xxx. 21); as if they were invited to be content with the discovery they should eventually make, that the objects they pass on their way had been pre-arranged. If it be true that the secrets of Prophecy were deposited of old in the hands of the Church with a view to their very distant development, it is also true that a "time" is foretold when all these things shall be understood:—"They (the saints) shall know all these things" (Dan. xii. 7, lxx.): and the question is—whether the "time of the end" here referred to is yet arrived, or even near at hand. And if it can be shown (and it is my opinion it can) that this portentous "time of the end" is not yet fully arrived, we are not the less under the obligation to trim the lamp which God has given, so as to transmit it onwards, in a state befitting its high original, to that generation on whom the "end" may fall.

Now as a diversity of interpretation was undoubtedly both foreseen and permitted by God,—who seems up to this present time to have meted out His illuminations, with a view rather to the exercise of faith than the reward of investigation—might we not expect, from the general analogies of the Divine government, that when the last age of the world—the age of abounding evil—should be at hand, a summons more loud than usual would be made to God's people, inviting them to preparation, patience, and confidence? Might we not hope that some peculiar inducement would be placed before them, to examine more closely the deposits of His prescient wisdom?—that some sure landmark hitherto unobserved in the wide region of the prophetic word would start to view?—some rock or headland in this trackless ocean be sighted, enabling them to correct their earlier reckonings, and determine their future course? Such a rock, springing from out the conflicting waves of modern interpretation, I fully believe to be the written name of him whom the Church has been accustomed to designate the Antichrist. He rises on the horizon of the prophetic page, like the sudden flame of Ætna in the dark night to the watchful steersman. There is no mistaking him: the flaming object comes naturally within the range of the ship's course: it is marked on the Bible-
chart with which the vessel of the Church is provided: we learn from it our latitude on the sea of time. Now from the same chart we learn (Rev. xv. 2) that the "glassy sea" of the true Church's present tranquillity is mixed with "fire"; and that, while reflecting the image of the heavens, she must be prepared to walk in the midst of that all-consuming element, trusting in the never-failing presence of her Deliverer—"the fourth (in the midst of the fire) like unto the Son of God" (Dan. iii. 25)—if she would eventually sing the song of triumph and thanksgiving. She knows that all will be well in that great day, when the Lord Christ "shall so come in like manner as he went into heaven."
ANTICHIST.

The purpose of this treatise is to institute an inquiry into the grounds there may be for believing, that the Antichrist—the redoubtable character of whom the early Church universally entertained the expectation, that he would appear in single personality in the last days—is now present on the earth, and at this moment seated on the Imperial throne of France. It will be admitted that the providence of God, as seen in the remarkable circumstances both political and scientific by which the present day is distinguished, when viewed in connexion with the anticipations which his holy Word supplies, lends encouragement to the entertainment of this question, particularly if it can be presented under an aspect not hitherto obtained from the sacred writings:—now the writer professes to have made discovery of the very name of this personage, written at full length in the Scripture,—written (that is to say) in "the number of his name," his numerical signature—in the last verse of Rev. xiii. He freely admits that were the question dependent on no other consideration than this, it might fairly be urged that enthusiasts in all ages have read in this mystical number the name of some great oppressor of the Church:—be it then further stated, that he is prepared to show the age in which this personage appears, and the position he occupies, to be
precisely those assigned to the Antichrist, in what he takes
leave to call the *prophetic table* of the great rulers of the
world.

It has often been observed by those who find a Divine
philosophy in the events of human history—and the student
of prophecy must needs be of the number, that a reigning
chieftain may, as a general rule, be looked upon as a not
inaccurate index of the public morality of his age. The
same, with reference to religion, has been said of the spiritual
overseers of Christ's flock; and the manner in which St.
John addresses the "angels" of the seven Churches, imputing
indifferently to them and their people the praise or the
blame he was commissioned to pronounce, is an illustration
of the important truth.* And thus it happens, under the
providence of God, that princes and governors, like the lights
in the firmament which are ordained "for signs" as well as
"for seasons" (Gen. i. 14), do not only lend their names to
designate, each one, the epoch of his rule; but also, by
reflecting in their recorded characters the moral condition of
their times, transmit to future ages a desirable vindication
of God's dealings towards their people. We can scarcely err
in applying this truth to the remarkable rise and career, so
far as it has hitherto proceeded, of Louis Napoleon. He is
the true son of his age and nation; and not less the exemplar,
than the present head and director, of the spirit that produced
him. When saying, as once he did, that "France, in
raising him to the throne, did but crown herself," he might
have added—"having found among her sons a head exactly
moulded to fill her revolutionary crown." He belongs essen-
tially, in the developments hitherto of his character, to the
"latter days," or "last times"†—times, to be signalized

* "The fact that the Church and its angel, or bishop, are so blended as
to have rendered it matter of question which is addressed, is in itself
instructive, as proving that as the bishop, so is the Church in the long
run; as the Church, so the bishop." "An evil bishop is because the
Church has become worthy of such; the labourer sent depends on the
prayers of the people." (Williams, Apoc. 53.)

† In these terms is not included what the Scripture calls, "the time of
the end;"—to which we shall find reason for ascribing a more exact and
specific sense.
alike by hypocrisy and earnestness, by persecution and constancy, by departure from the truth and zeal in its behalf. As an instrument in God's hand, he will be found fitted (who shall doubt it), if not by strength of grasp, yet by adroitness of hold, to bestride the thunder-cloud on which he sits; and, biding his time with eagle eye, to launch forth the lightnings of those events which are predicted of the time of the true Antichrist.

But what is meant by "the Antichrist"? As to the spiritual features of this character, they are described in the sacred page as manifesting themselves in measures for the exaltation of himself and his office, either by the way of direct opposition to the pretensions of the Saviour; or of an impious substitution within the Church of other objects of worship than Him—it might be even of himself; or in the encouragement of a religion more in accordance (as it is said) with nature—i.e., of "natural religion," the religion of the infidel:—for the word Antichrist (as Bishop Newton observes, ii. 411) admits of this variety of signification. But upon this part of his character we have nothing whatever to say: it is only with his political genealogy and position we are concerned: indeed it will be well at once to state, that it is entirely in deference to the ancients, and because the term is scriptural, we make use of it at all.

The question meets us at the threshold of this inquiry, whether the character of Antichrist as foreshown in Scripture, ought not to be regarded as receiving continually its fulfilment in the succession of persons who sit in the chair of the Roman See, rather than (as we have said) in the career of an individual—some prodigy of talent and energy to appear in the end of days, high in power, unscrupulous of means, and receiving with avidity the inspirations of evil. The first of these opinions has a traditional hold on the mind of the present age; but the latter is not without its defenders. Were the writer to say for himself that he steadily embraces the first opinion, it might seem that he thereby renounces any further entertainment of the question; for that to view the Papacy as the power designated, is to put aside at once the individual theory. It is not however quite so. It may
happen that, if we look closely into the nature of things generally, or (if that will not offer sufficient help) if we examine duly the general arrangement of prophecy, the conviction may arise that every succession of men requires a head—the originator, or consummator, or in some way the exponent of the system;—a "head" from whom to descend, as the Jewish priesthood from Aaron, or to work up to, as to an ultimate issue—the more usual course in the progress of evil. This question is the first subject of our investigation.

Now the character whom we thus designate "the Anti-christ" is the last manifestation of the character described in Rev. xiii. as the "Beast from the sea," and whose name is written. The beast, or wildbeast, is a remarkable symbol! What is meant by it? The symbols of Scripture carry with them, we may be sure, intrinsically the excellence, if not at first sight the evidence, of a Divine selection; and to have a clear conception of what is meant by the symbol—the "Beast" is an essential requisite as the first step to be achieved.

A wildbeast (\(\Theta\nu\rho\iota\omega\nu\)) is the image of a power which maintains itself by the unrestrained exercise of its natural propensities and faculties. Unlike to domestic animals who, in subjection to the discipline of man, from him expect their sustenance, the beast of the forest depends upon its own strength and stratagem, "devours much flesh" of the weaker sort (Dan. vii. 5), and has no particular respect for the Lord of the creation. Now the Apocalypse (as commentators have shown) is full of contrasts; and the symbol to which that of the "Wildbeast" is opposed is the "Lamb." It is the most important and continual of all the contrasts in this sacred book. It is \(\tau\omega \Theta\eta\rho\iota\omega\nu\) (the wildbeast) exerting his ungodly dispositions in counteraction of \(\tau\omega \Alpha\nu\iota\omega\nu\) (the Lamb): and it is the remarkable observation of Dr. Wordsworth (Apoc. 384) that whereas St. John, in speaking of the Lamb in his epistles, always employs the word o \(\Alpha\mu\nu\iota\)s, in the Revelation he writes always \(\tau\omega \Alpha\nu\iota\omega\nu\), evidently for the sake of its contrast in sound with \(\tau\omega \Theta\eta\rho\iota\omega\nu\). The wildbeast then, in this sacred drama, is the Lord's opponent in the conduct.
of human affairs; and we may add with assurance that, so far as the symbol is seen in contrast with the Lamb, it is a power—in the present dispensation—within the Church.

The "Wildbeast" may be understood as the incorporation, or visible manifestation, of that code of principles which constitutes the rule of the world, in contradistinction to the "Lamb," which expresses the rule of God and the Gospel. When the Lord established a government upon earth in his elder Church, He might well have expected that it should shed its light among the surrounding nations, and have engaged the heathen sages in the study and promulgation of His moral laws. When Christ ascended from the earth, leaving the commission, and with it the power, to preach His kingdom, He might well have expected that the hopes of that kingdom would fasten universally on the human heart, and His laws of peace and good-will lead speedily to the emancipation and enlightenment of all nations. To Αρνιον—a symbol which we understand as expressing, not so much Christ, as the imparted power of Christ—would have ever been, if unopposed, the sufficient light of the world; but the antagonist το θηριον—unsanctified human power, fed with zeal from below, has directed all its efforts from the beginning, to undermine and countervail the Divine influences. From the days of the prophet Daniel, when the "Beast" first took his place on the page of Prophecy, to the present day of his last manifestation, the humbling principles of Christ's kingdom have ever been treated as the dung of the moral earth; in which, as in a compost of acknowledged richness—but only a compost, to plant the gaudy sunflower of the world's self-applauding morality. Among the great and powerful of every age, this moral code of human origin has been allowed to lift its haughty front; and its maxims, well-known amongst us under the designation of the "principles of the world"—not to deny, but to supersede the obligations of the Divine law. Under the guise of these attractive resemblances of what is good, there is not a vice but has assumed the character of its opponent grace; no false or selfish pretension but has been dignified with the name of wisdom and charity. Indifference to sacred truth
takes the name of light; expediency in politics steps into the
place which fainting fortitude abandons; the savage cry of
the million is Divine inspiration; and successful carnage,
though it be of Christian brethren, is a robe of glory. The
cry is lost, "Lord, lift thou up the light of thy countenance
upon us:" and instead is heard on all sides, "Who (i.e.,
among the creatures) will show us any good?" The reign of
the beast is, in fact, the reign of the carnal mind, "from
whence come wars and fightings" (James iv. 1), democracy,
extortion, pomp, the eager grasping at one's own, and
neglect of the poor. Its canonical rules are such as these,
"Every one for himself and God for us all."
"The good
old plan, that he should take who has the power, and he
should keep who can."
"Assert your dignity": "Show a
becoming spirit": "Maintain your own." Such is the
spirit of the bestial kingdom—το θηριον assuming the guise,
but impatient of the presence, of το Αρνιον.

Now the symbol "the Beast" expresses (we say) the
visible incorporation of this spirit:—where is it to be seen?
History shows that the Power to whom has been committed
in all ages the care of God's Church, or at least, within
whose dominions the Church has been located, has always
been, and is, the predominant Power upon earth. The
spirit of the Beast may exist,—indeed is spoken of as exist-
ing, in other nations as well as the predominant one (vide
Rev. xvi. 19); but "the Beast" is ever the exterior envelope
of the visible Church; and at the present time it is the
Roman empire. The prophet Daniel in the famous vision of
chap. vii. sets forth, under the symbols of "four divers
beasts," four empires which were to last to the end of time.
It cannot be a question but that these empires were brought
within the ken of prophecy, not solely, nor chiefly, because
of their predominance of rule, but because of their having
held successively within their precincts the Church of God;
serving as a lantern to hold and preserve the light, but as a
dark lantern—not so as to benefit the surrounding nations.
They are denominated Beasts rather than Men, because of
deriving their laws and maxims from the earth, rather than
from heaven: for as laws are the aliment of states, we should
call to mind that, at the creation, the "beast" was made to bend for his food towards the earth, while "man" looked up towards heaven, gathering emblematically the pendent fruit that grew above him. (Gen. i.)

Now it will be found that prophecy gives the designation of "the Beast," not to the predominant empire only, but to the ruling Head of the empire also. This is done in agreement with the universal custom of mankind; for there is not a people who would not say, indifferently, "Russia is at war," or, "The Emperor of Russia is at war." The head stands for the whole system. Thus it happens that, in the famous text which has given rise to this dissertation, it is said (Rev. xiii. 18) "count the number of the beast, for it is the number of a man"—that is, "of the man," as will be shown in its place: the number of the Beast, or Roman empire, is to be tested by the number of its actual ruler. In this chapter it is evident that, in verses 1 and 2, the Beast is an empire; whilst in verses 4 and 5, he is an individual; and it will appear that, in verse 18, the famous cypher enforces both empire and individual. But the most irrefutable text on this point is Rev. xvii. 12, where "ten kings" receive power "one hour with the beast." Here, in all consistency of language, the "kings" and the "beast" must be of like constitution; and the "beast," consequently, must be an individual. And whether, in any particular instance, the Beast is to be regarded as multitudinous or single, must be judged of by the context and the occasion. That a Beast can ever signify a Church, as some have interpreted, is an absurd mistake, arising from a failure to perceive the nice propriety of the Divine symbols:—can a Church, which exists only, as such, in her connexion with God, find her appropriate symbol in the irrational creation! Spiritually the "Beast" signifies worldly rule; bodily it signifies an empire; representatively an emperor.

Now in this last quality the Beast, as Head, is supreme over all estates of man, and all interests, within his realms,—in like manner as the head of a living animal is the depository and source of all its faculties and energies. This, in the general constitution of things, is an arrangement, to be
recognised as much in the social as in the physical world. It is however a well known fact, illustrated by the history of many centuries, that in the Roman world another arrangement has prevailed; and that the chief functionary of one estate of men—the spiritual, has achieved for himself, and in great measure for his hierarchy, an emancipation from the subjection due to the sovereign Head; has even proceeded to the length of lording it over that Head, and of assuming to himself a *temporal* rank and distinction, even more exalted than that of his true Sovereign; nay—has even assumed to be, himself, the one fountain of all secular dignity and authority. It is not our purpose to inquire through what steps of usurpation on the one hand, and infirmity on the other, this anomaly in government has been effected; the fact itself, undoubted and undisputed, is all with which we are concerned, and it is one of the utmost significance: it has attracted the notice of prophecy, and it is the right clue to the great vision we are presently to examine, of Rev. xiii.

Christ has said that his kingdom is not of this world; and to mix up in one a spiritual and secular authority, the former possessing itself of the rights of the latter with the avowed purpose of establishing on earth our blessed Saviour's temporal kingdom, is clearly contrary to His declared will, and therefore an Antichristian arrangement:—it annuls the Saviour's claim to present humiliation, if of himself so of his ministers; and with perverted views of the honour He really claims, forces Him into a throne which is unworthy to receive Him. Of such an usurping and parasitical power the Pope of Rome is the head—who therefore is in the position of Antichrist. In befitting presumption he calls himself the "Vicegerent of Christ;" and sits conjointly with, nay, overtops the imperial "Beast" in his earthly throne. It cannot then be doubted that the Roman Pontiff in his succession, bearing not only the stamp that Gregory the Great indicated as that of Antichrist—the acceptance of the title of "Universal Bishop," but raising himself also above "all that is called god" among the secular powers of the world, is the true *exponent* from age to age of the spirit of Antichrist.
Now to constitute the Antichrist (presuming him to be endowed with individuality) another step in the Antichristian course may be imagined: it is when he who is legitimately the Imperial Head, and thereby supreme over all orders of men, additionally assumes to himself the office of Spiritual Head, herein improving upon the example which this latter had set up. Such an one would be seen to sit, transcendently, in that universal throne which belongs to Christ alone; and—forestalling his future dignity—to wield the double sceptre of both princely and priestly dominion. It is in the way of conjecture only that we venture on this idea of the Antichrist; not however without a basis to build upon, sufficient to sustain the expectation of some such anomaly in government soon to appear;—it may be (we say) that the secular head of the Beast will be proclaimed the spiritual head also of the truckling Church, and all her rights as derived from on high be vested in him: that he will come forth the Son of a base concubinage between Religion and Imperial power, and so the great Antichrist. As the most violent humours determine themselves to a point; and as the longest process of ratiocination leads only to the establishment of a single proposition; so we may conceive that Rome's ambition and blasphemy, issuing through so many ages from the mixed fountain of her spiritual and secular power, may lead to the production of a single character, who, gathering into himself all the aspirations and energies of the duplex system, becomes the "image" of all its wickedness.

Among the reasons for rejecting—not as false, but as insufficient, the supposition that the reigning Pope is ever the Antichrist, may be named the following. It seems improbable that the "last days"—the days assigned to the usurper's power, should have been enduring some twelve or fourteen centuries, without coming to the predicted issue of perdition (Rev. xvii. 11); but to regard this as a necessary period of gestation, before the birth of the expected prodigy in a single person, is not so improbable; especially with reference to the well-known opinion of Irenæus, to the effect that the Antichrist will exhibit in his person the accumulation of all preceding iniquities. And further, if we regard
the "last days" as embracing the whole times of the Papacy, the great events that are predicted to come to pass within them—the universal promulgation of the Gospel, the restoration of the Jews, the unsealing of the prophecies—will thus have been in abeyance for at least fifteen hundred years of the presumed period,—a strange commentary (to say the least of it) on the nature of prophetic language, and especially of the expression—"the last days."

Again, according to St. Paul (2 Thess. ii. 3) the appearance of the "man of sin," whom all commentators regard as the same power, or person, who is otherwise denominated "the Antichrist," is preceded, as any effect by its cause, by a certain "falling away;"—"except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition." This passage evidently points, not simply to a decline from the purity of Christian truth, but to some gross spiritual debasement arising from the inworking of the spirit of the world, progressive in its nature, and excessive in its exactions upon the judgment and understanding of men,—such (in a word) as we behold in the present state of the Church of Rome. In a moderate application of the expression "falling away," it would seem to require many ages of a blinding superstition, or of the neglect of truth, to lower the educated mind of Christianity to the point which the Scripture marks, and where only it would be prepared to welcome the infidel "man of sin," and to accept his blasphemous propositions—whatever they may turn out to be. A recent occurrence within the Roman Church, too apposite to be passed by without notice, exemplifies—beyond any other for many centuries, to what a degree will-worship has vitiated her intellect, and clouded her appreciation of the Christian scheme:—we allude to the circumstance of fourteen French bishops (vide "English Rev.," Sept., 1849, p. 226) signifying their belief in the most monstrous and blasphemous tenet of the Virgin's "immaculate conception," alleging reasons which can be received only as evidence of that imbecility and wilfulness which precede idolatry.* This "falling away" does

* Since the above was written this scandalous speculation has been constituted an article of faith by Papal authority.
not imply, necessarily, a fall from faith to infidelity, though, doubtless, it will often lead to that result;—not a fall from heaven to hell, but from heaven to earth; from the kingdom of Christ to that which the prince of darkness has set up—denominated that of the "Beast," the maxims of which—though clothed in borrowed attire from Holy Writ, are entirely those of the profane unsanctified world, descending unaltered from heathen times. In the Church of Rome it would be presumptuous to doubt but that there are many thousands of excellent Christians, notwithstanding the corruption of the system:—such cannot be of the "falling away." Reversely, it is very easy to suppose that many who profess a purer faith are in that category; in like manner as we have already seen the "Beast" to extend, in outlying portions, beyond the confines of the Roman empire. Nevertheless, as this "falling away" is specifically connected, as a promoting cause, with the revelation of the "wicked one," it must be presumed to refer primarily to the innumerable hosts of infidels who have drawn their first milk from the breasts of Rome, and have eventually, in the ordinary use of their understanding, rejected her unhealthy communion:—and consequently, unless we should confound the "falling away" with the "revelation of the man of sin," as having the character of a single procedure (which would be contrary to the Scripture account) it becomes exceedingly difficult to see how the latter event can possibly coincide with the suces-

sional occupation of the Papal chair.

Again St. John says, "He is Antichrist that denieth the Father and the Son." As the hierarchy of Rome have never done this, how can their pontiff be the Antichrist? It is inconceivable too that, in any probable future state of the Christian world, a Power should be found in a literal sense to "deny the Father and the Son,"—to deny as well the great Creator of all, as Him who is revealed as his only begotten Son,—though it did reach to this point in the great French revolution. The passage must mean, that the Antichrist will deny the doctrine of "the Father and the Son together," as from all eternity co-existing, co-equal, and
co-operating. He will deny the Son,—will promote the base spirit of deism: and in the sense that "who so denieth the Son hath not the Father" (1 John ii. 23) will virtually deny both the Father and the Son: for without the Son the Father is not known. For these several reasons we reject the idea that the Roman pontiff is the Antichrist.

On the other hand, in favour of the personal Antichrist, we may adduce, first, the general language of Scripture, which, on the opposite hypothesis, can only be accounted for by supposing continually an indirect sense; secondly, the proposition in itself natural (and which in one remarkable instance—that of the seven Churches, the book of Revelation has been already seen to confirm) that every system of large growth requires an exponent or head; thirdly, that the ancient Church, more versed than we are in figure and symbol, held for many ages the "individual" theory. In proof of this last point, take the following passage extracted by Mr. Frere ("Three Letters," p. 34) from a Roman Catholic writer, "From this and similar passages of sacred Scripture, the ancient fathers gather and conclude the Antichrist concerning whom we now treat, to be one particular and determinate man, as Irenæus, Tertullianus, Hippolytus, Martyr, Ambrosius, Chrysostmus, Hieronymus, Augustinus, Hilarius, Theodoretus, Cyrillus Alexandrinus, Gregorius Magnus, Damascenus, Ephrem Syrus, Prosper, Beda, Haymo, and the rest who have written upon Daniel and the Apocalypse." To this united voice of Christian antiquity we may add, however undignified the appeal, the opinion of the Moslems—an opinion entitled the more to respect, as it regards a question connected with Eastern literature:—Jervis says (Disc. on Genesis, p. 107) "The Muslims believe that Christ is to come again upon earth, to establish the Muslim religion, and perfect peace and security, after having killed Antichrist. This future adversary of the truth, and counterfeit of our Lord, they call 'the false Messiah,'...the personality of whom has been preserved by Eastern tradition from the very first. The Arabs could yet teach the followers of Mede and his confederates, that Scripture is not
ANTICHRIST.

quite so variable as a chameleon; and that it does not veer about with every wind of European doctrine." The Apostle says, "He will be revealed in his time"—an expression which, if it does not absolutely demolish the idea of a continuous course of ages as the "time" of his appearing, as in the case of the Papacy; at least admits of a more natural interpretation, in its restriction to a point of time, as in the case of a single birth. And when we find it said that there must be a falling away "first"—i. e., before the "man of sin" can be revealed, is it not (we ask) clearly implied, that the "man of sin" springs out of this apostacy? He receives his being from a mother of like nature with himself. Let it rest with those who contend that the Pope of Rome, and he only, is the "man of sin," to show from what "falling away," sufficient in its kind to suit the expression, did the Papacy spring.

We sum up then what has been said on the two subjects of the "Beast" and the "Antichrist"—separate, though intimately united, by saying, that the "Beast," described as having "seven heads and ten horns," is the manifestation (whether in the governor, or the body governed—the imperial head of empire, or the empire itself consisting of many nations) of the unsanctified, proud, and violent spirit of the world; by no means hostile to religion, though indifferent to its truths; but rather supporting it as a means of consolidating its own worldly system. Again, that the Antichrist is the receptacle and offspring of this spirit in his own generation; that he is the last head (a thing to be shown) of the seven-headed beast; that the age of his appearance, though commencing with him, is not necessarily confined to his term of life; that he personally imbibes from his carnal-minded mother—the Roman Church, in addition to his inherited spirit of the "Beast," the secret spirit—excited and inflamed by circumstances—of a more daring blasphemy, to be manifested in some peculiar undertakings of transcendent impiety and self-exaltation.

Let us now proceed on our way.

As it is in chap. xiii. of the Revelation that the name of
the Antichrist is given, and that we profess to have discovered that name, it is from this chapter—as being indited throughout in the same tone of mind that wrote the name, that we might legitimately expect to derive some general and certain principle to govern our interpretations: such a principle we conceive may be extracted from the three first verses, which are as follows,

"And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads the name of blasphemy. (2) And the beast which I saw was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion: and the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority. (3) And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed: and all the world wondered after the beast."

It will be convenient to conceive of this and other visions that will come under review, as though they were groups of statuary; such as the winged bulls of Nineveh, or the huge figures engraven on rocks according to the custom of ancient times—for instance, the famous group of Bésitoon in Persia (which the writer has had the pleasure of visiting) representing, according to Kerr Porter, the ten tribes of Israel on their way into captivity. This last conception would be peculiarly apposite, as the adjacent rocks, not less than much of the figures themselves, are covered with inscriptions, relating no doubt to the history visibly represented in the figures; the history being thus set forth, as are the scenes of prophecy universally, in both written narrative, and emblematic representation. If we regard the three verses cited, together with the eleventh verse, as constituting the group, the other verses up to the last will be the description; and in the last, on (as it were) a pedestal, will be inscribed the subject of the piece, or the name of the chief actor, or both. This name we shall find, in accordance with the double meaning of the "beast," to be the name both of the empire, and its head. Whether this notion be a just one or not, we intend it shall direct the plan of this dissertation; which will be—first to examine the configuration and accompanying character of the "beast"; secondly, his name.
The principal personage is here described (ver. 3) as the restorer of an overthrown dynasty: indeed, in the assertion of a close identity, as the resuscitated "head" of the dynasty, after having received a mortal wound. This symbolism has been very variously interpreted. It has received a spiritual interpretation, as signifying the restoration of heathenism in Papal Rome, after its succumbing to the light of the Gospel. And among several secular interpretations, it has been made to designate the overthrow of the Roman empire under Augustulus in the fifth century, and its restoration between three and four centuries after, in the person of Charlemagne. When it is considered that the mind is invited to range at will over the vast expanse of ages since St. John's time, this variety should not occasion surprise; but the writer here takes the first benefit of his discovery of the "name of the beast," and pronounces—under the guarantee (as he confidently believes) of Scripture—the restored "head" to be Louis Napoleon. As said in the preface, this "name" is as a rock thrown up by volcanic agency, in the midst of the trackless ocean of time, whereby we are invited to correct our reckonings.

But if the head after recovery be Louis Napoleon, the head before being smitten must be the great Napoleon. An immediate and most important inference here presents itself—requiring (as the writer humbly conceives) no other support than what this example affords; viz., that if the "head" of the beast in one instance be the great ruler of his age, so also must the other six heads be in their respective times. And thus it happens that the "seven heads" of the "beast," instead of signifying seven imaginary forms of Roman government—"kings, consuls, decemvirs, military tribunes," &c., &c., as generally received (a most absurd idea!), are in fact none other than seven great conquerors—worthy "heads," each in his day, of the ever enduring "beast"; each representing, or heading a long age of the Beast, and so marking the progress of his existence from the days of Daniel to the end of time.

Now the "head" that was smitten was the seventh head of the seven-headed "beast"—a point to be made good
presently. But the terms of the prophecy show that the beast "rose from the sea" in the time of an anterior head, the sixth—another point to be made good: this sixth head we shall endeavour to show was Charlemagne. And thus the whole vision in chap. xiii. will be found to be a representation of the "holy Roman empire," founded by Charlemagne in A.D. 800,—still continuing,—and still to continue. The sixth "head" then is the first that will require elucidation.

The earlier genealogy of the Beast from the sea, with "seven heads and ten horns," is found in Daniel, chap. vii., where he appears under the semblance of four beasts, which the prophet saw rise successively from the troubled sea. These have seven heads among them, for the third beast has four. The "beast from the sea"—the last of Daniel's four beasts, is an union of the three preceding, for his various parts are derived severally from them (Rev. xiii. 2). He shows for the most part as the leopard—Daniel's third beast, but with the feet of a bear and mouth of a lion—the second and first of Daniel (ver. 2). In Rev. xvii. 3 is another notice of the same beast and his seven heads. This seventeenth chapter may be regarded as a supplement in some respects to the thirteenth; but rather (as the writer views it) as a collateral history referring to the Papacy, while the thirteenth is more concerned with the secular rule of the empire. It will be our business to show, that the vision of chap. xviii. belongs to the same times as those of chap. xiii.; and in the seventeenth chapter—"it is expressly said, (ver. 10) that "five heads are fallen, and one is,"—which last is therefore the sixth. The verse proceeds thus, "The other (head) is not yet come, and when he cometh he must continue a short space." This "other" is of course the seventh; and his continuing a short space is equivalent to his being slain in the imagery of the earlier chapter. The next verse speaks of "an eighth (head) who is of the seven": which "eighth" head (as the beast has really only seven) is equivalent to the seventh being restored in chap. xiii. from his "deadly wound." It is then, under the sixth head (as said above) that the "beast" rises from the sea: and being risen, he lives on in the same vision to the seventh, and secundo.
seventh or eighth, heads; respecting which last we have said that his identity is proved by his written name.

The usual method of investigating the four "beasts," or "kingdoms," of Daniel has been, by considering them under the forms and limitations transmitted by the pen of history; but unless it can be shown that the prophet was under a necessity to divide and array the kingdoms of the world under the same forms and designations as the historian finds it convenient to do, it is evidently to encounter the great risk of error, to adopt without questioning, when consulting him for the facts of history, his ideas upon the right division and succession of its ages. To illustrate what we say,—the "four kingdoms" have been universally received as the Babylonian, the Medo-Persian, the Macedonian, and the Roman: but in this enumeration there has certainly been a great mistake, for (unless we are under a very strong hallucination) we shall show presently that Daniel's "fourth kingdom"—the "beast with iron teeth, and strong exceedingly" (vii. 7)—generally considered to commence as the Roman "kingdom" a couple of centuries before our Saviour—commences really (as said already) in A.D. 800, with Charlemagne. Now the prophecy provides a means hitherto unheeded, of dividing and apportioning the vast plain of time comprised under the "four beasts, or kingdoms"; and this means, to which we have been directed by the discovery of the Beast's name in his present stage of existence, we now beg to bring forward as furnishing the new and the true principle of interpretation, to which allusion has been made: it is this—that instead of counting the ages of the Beast by "four kingdoms," we should distribute them under "seven heads,"—these being rulers, and therefore natural indices of time:—for rulers are the suns of the political world, as is the sun in the heavens of the natural, and are instituted like it for "signs and for seasons." Our principle then is—that the times of the "four kingdoms" are arranged under "seven heads," or kings; to be verified in their line by a supplemental "eighth"—a repetition of one of the seven;—whose own name is placed beyond all doubt by being written.

As the bestial rule, commencing with Daniel's prophecy,
and set forth by that prophet under the emblems of "four beasts," is displayed by St. John under the similitude of a single "beast"; whereas, in each exhibition alike, there are "seven heads," it is evident that, of four and seven, the latter number is in prophecy the least subject to variation; or at least, is the most suitable of the two for the purposes of analysis and distribution. Moreover, there is observable in the construction of prophecy, some mysterious link, or relation, between the numbers "four" and "seven";—some interchange of help (as it were);—as if that which was conceived under the impression or rule of "four," could become efficient, or appreciable, only under the counting of "seven." Examples will best explain our meaning. In the vision of the "seven seals" (Rev. vi.) there came forth, at the opening of the first four seals successively, four horses—white, red, black, and pale; whereas, not only are there no horses under the remaining three seals, but the imagery is of a totally different character—as may be seen: it surely cannot be a matter of doubt, that the relation (whatever it be) here subsisting between the numbers four and seven, should guide the interpretation. When the angels with the seven trumpets (chap. viii.) began to sound, the scenes disclosed during the first four are of that terrific and awful nature, that one would almost imagine they could not be exceeded in this respect; but the three last are distinguished from the preceding by being called, pre-eminently, "woe" trumpets: and whereas the four first are comprised in six verses, the three woe trumpets require whole chapters to contain them. In examining the account of the "vials" (chap. xvi.) we are not struck immediately with this singular feature; but on a closer inspection the reader may perhaps be induced by and bye to adopt the opinion, that it is only less apparent. This mode of fashioning the groups of prophecy descends from the chisel of Daniel, and will be seen in his laboratory in other instances than that of the "four beasts" (chap. vii.)—though that is, perhaps, the best example. On certain other occasions Scripture seems to record the observance of this plan. In St. Mark's gospel (viii. 1—9) the multitude that followed our Saviour, consisting of four thousand, were three days
with Him, without anything to eat:—they were fed with seven loaves; and of broken meat there were taken up seven baskets. Of a like kind is the consideration, that the universal Gospel is built and substantiated on the square foundation of four Evangelists; but is committed as an animating principle, to the keeping of “seven Churches” (Rev. i.),—which Churches (as Mr. Mede imagines) “besides their literal respect, were intended, and it may be chiefly, to be as patterns and types of the several ages of the Catholic Church to the end of time””—in which instance we observe the broad field of the Gospel to be hedged in (as it were) by the number “four,” and its seasons of fertility to be assured by the number “seven.” It would appear then that, like to this, the “kingdom” of the Beast is divided into four empires; but that, as the rise and fall of empires are ill-defined in time, it has been the wisdom of Prophecy to point to seven heads, marking as many divisions, of imperial rule. In all these instances there is either a direct protraction of the “four” into “seven,” the parts four and three being one in kind; or, if the four and the seven differ in kind, the “four” seems to avail most as an expression of solidity and form, the “seven” of activity and execution. At the end of this treatise we shall find it necessary, perhaps, to trace the rationale of this remarkable rule:—in the mean time, it is by no means the requirement of truth, or of modesty, that our ignorance should debar the use of the hint it supplies.

* The “five loaves and two small fishes” which fed “about five thousand men” (the weaker portion of the wandering throng being alluded to apparently in the “fishes”)—and which yielded “twelve baskets” of fragments, present an equally emblematic, though different, combination of numbers. The expression of our Saviour (Matt. xvi. 9, 10)—“the five loaves of the five thousand . . . . and the seven loaves of the four thousand”—is proof of there being something mystical in the selection of these numbers.
DANIEL CAP. II.

We now commence the "History of the Beast." As it is desirable to trace the reproachful symbol from its earliest appearance on the page of prophecy, let us turn to the second chapter of the prophet Daniel, not because the Beast is there mentioned—for he is not, but because his spirit is there first to be recognised.

In this chapter the prophet interprets to Nebuchadnezzar a splendid vision the great king had seen in a dream, when "an image of excellent brightness"—excellent by its own intrinsic worth, while also it was bright and dazzling to the worldly mind—stood before him.

"Thou, O king, sawest and behold a great image. This great image, whose brightness was excellent, stood before thee; and the form thereof was terrible. This image's head was of fine gold, his breast and his arms of silver, his belly and his thighs of brass, his legs of iron, his feet part of iron and part of clay. Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them to pieces. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them: and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth." (ver. 31—35.)

This image is a representation of the predominant dominion of the Gentiles, and of the changes in their social and political condition, from the day in which it was seen to the end of prophetic time. It may be observed that Gentile dominion is nowhere noticed in the sacred oracles, except in its connexion with the elect Church of God: and as from the age of the captivity it was intended that the chosen people should, in their worldly interests, be more dependent than theretofore they had been on the great powers of the world, this may be a reason (they being at the time in Babylon) for its being declared to King Nebuchadnezzar, and through him as head of their line to all the sovereigns of the Gentile empires then to be foreshown, that his kingdom was the gift of God for His elect's sake—that for them He had appointed its "power, and strength, and glory;" the
inference being thence obvious to all, that human government is constituted in the Divine counsels, mainly for the end of sheltering and preserving the spiritual seed of the Most High.

This Gentile domination (says the prophecy) may, in the fulness of its career, be typically beheld in the figure of a man: its actual head is of pure gold; its future members will be found of inferior metals: but on arriving at the feet, its metallic substance will be found in combination with friable clay. Then shall another Power, that shall have been a long time in preparation, smite the image in this its infirm foundation, and possess itself of the full breadth of its dominion. In the present age it is of course to the latter days of this image that we look with supreme interest; for the reason (expressing the opinion without, we hope, any undue boldness) that the latter days are certainly at hand. The opinion the writer holds regarding the Power to arise in the latter days—the "stone" that is about to fall on the feet of the "image"—he wishes at once to say is, that it is Great Britain, in conjunction (it may be) with the reassembled people of Israel. For an exposition of this opinion in its first portion, viz., that "the stone cut out without hands" is Great Britain, the reader may be referred to several authors, but with most advantage perhaps to that excellent work "The Kings of the East;" it would be out of place to dilate upon it here. This opinion is not incompatible with the ancient belief, that the "stone" means, primarily, the true Church of Christ; for it may be that Great Britain—though we would not arrogate to her exclusively to be the true Church—is by God's providential appointment her exponent in the present age, in like manner as the Roman empire is (we have said) the actual exponent of the Beast's "kingdom"; not meaning to infer but that the spirit—whether of the true Church or of the Beast, may be recognised elsewhere also. Furthermore, if the Jews are destined, in the day when the Lord Christ shall assert his reign, to carry forth the word of his Gospel, it must be done undoubtedly under the auspices of some Christian Power:—what other than this faithful, protesting, and spiritually cir-
cunctised nation? Let us return to the earlier days of the image.

The image is divided into four prophetic "kingdoms;" but in obedience to the law of the prolongation of four into seven, it is likewise divisible into seven periods of rule, viz., the head, the breast, the arms, the belly, the thighs, the legs, the feet; these parts will govern the investigation:—and first as to the "Head."

It is observable that the head of the image—the Babylonian empire—is spoken of in the person of its then actual ruler;—wherefrom we derive the hint, that the founder of an empire, in the view of prophecy, is regarded as its representative or exponent. But also, as head of the entire image, Nebuchadnezzar is to be viewed as the exponent of all that the image represents, i.e., of the whole system of Gentile rule:—his spirit pervades the entire period; and his name should be regarded as extending, in the duration of the image, to the present times. The remaining six parts are named in pairs, each pair a "kingdom":—another important hint. For however diverse the two Powers contained in each pair may prove to be, it will be seen that there is no change of territory between them; and thus it happens, that whereas the vision speaks of "four kingdoms" by territorial admeasurement, this does not stand in the way of the same "kingdoms," as sections of imperial rule in time, being in number seven,—an excellent example of the relation between the "four" and the "seven." The unity of the image and the continuity of the vision, as contrasted with the more broken visions of Daniel, are not to be overlooked: it assures us of the continuance without intermission of a predominating rule, and the civilized state of mankind; and therein of a suitable asylum for the true worshippers of God. This magnificent Image is considered the gauge and measure of all the prophecies that succeed it, and claims in consequence our most minute examination.

The gold of the head changes into metals of inferior value. What these several changes may signify has been variously interpreted: the most obvious solution, and the one the writer rests in, is, that the gold of the Chaldean kingdom
represents a pure autocracy; from whence descend the various systems of oligarchy, aristocracy, the constitutional element, and finally unmixed democracy. Hence it would seem that, in the "head of gold," the principle of autocracy is commended to our admiration; and that we should regard the various changes which ensue as so many instances of deterioration of the imperial power. It is the certain testimony of sacred history that the autocracy of the Chaldean king was productive of excellent results, so long as his heart remained submissive to the Divine will: "The tree grew, and was strong, and the height thereof reached unto heaven, and the sight thereof to the end of all the earth: The leaves thereof were fair, and the fruit thereof much, and in it was meat for all," (iv. 11, 12):—that is to say, the safe and happy protection of his rule extended to the utmost regions of the earth, and justice and prosperity universally prevailed.

Undoubtedly the experience of ages testifies to the advantage of a concentration of power for all purposes of great achievement; and that public affairs are never so prosperous as when under the direction of one supreme will—provided, of course, that will be under the influence of charity:—"nunquam libertas gratior extat quam sub rege pio." But fallen man is not to be trusted. If autocracy—the form of government most like to the Divine, is fraught with the greatest power of good, so also it is of evil. As an instance of the former, we need not shrink from naming the home government of Napoleon Buonaparte, of whom Lord Holland says, "In repressing the injustice of all authorities inferior to his own, he was impartial, severe, and inflexible. Neither minister, prefect, officer, nor military authority, could venture to exceed the letter of the law." (Reminis. 267.) Again, "Equality before the law, impartiality in the administration of justice, and certainty of redress in cases of any injury, either from individuals or from civil and military authorities, have not been greater, or even so great, under the succeeding governments during peace, as they were under Napoleon at war with half the world." (ib. 269.) For an instance of the latter, we have not need to go so far back in time; but to call to mind that one only vice allowed and
cherished in the mind of the late Czar of Russia, was sufficient to bring misery upon many nations. Hence it would be unwise, and we are not called upon, to speak in commendation of autocracy, further than is necessary—by referring to its proper nature—to vindicate the Divine symbolism.

It is necessary, moreover, to remember, that we are not quite sure about the force of the references in respect of the several metals, and whether it is really intended in every case of change, and under every aspect, to assert an unmitigated deterioration. Of the four metals enumerated, it is observable that while their comparative value is in the direct ratio of their rarity, their usefulness is in the inverse ratio:—iron is more useful than brass in the arts of life, brass than silver, silver than gold. And thus human government—the object typified, may be understood in the representation as gaining in usefulness what it loses in concentration—as advancing in value by the diffusion of its power. Again, that there are other things referred to in the social condition of nations, besides their government, can scarcely be doubted: particular ages have borne particular marks of character, to which corresponding ones in the metals seem to apply—looking, as we are at liberty to do, at each metal, without relation to the rest. Thus Bishop Newton supposes (erroneously, however, except in the assertion of the true principle of interpretation) that the eloquence of the Greeks is alluded to in the age of "brass!" (i. 415): and assuredly we may add that the art of war, in the variety and perfection of its means of destruction, must be glanced at as a principal feature of this present age of "iron."

Looking again at the "head of gold" irrespectively of comparison, the excellence of Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom is said to have arisen from his being a "king of kings." (ii. 37.) This prosperous conqueror, after subjecting to his sceptre Phœnia, Arabia, and Egypt, had extended his dominions westward to the Pillars of Hercules and into Spain; from whence he led his army into Thrace and Pontus; having surpassed in exploits all the Chaldeans who reigned before him. (Bishop Newton, i. 410.) Thus he was the "head of gold," not only in respect of the absolute, but also the central
and universal nature of his rule, wherein is the greatest resemblance to the Divine government. Like a "mighty tree" extending its shelter to the ends of the earth, not only did the subjects of his patrimonial rule, but also the uncivilized inhabitants of many distant lands, ("beasts of the field, and fowls of the heaven," ii. 37-8), dwell under it in undisturbed security, rejoicing in the protection of the far-reaching "boughs thereof." (iv. 12.)

It was, doubtless, the emblem of his glorious kingdom as seen in the "bright image," coupled with the flattering interpretation it received from the prophet—"Thou (i.e., thou personally) art this head of gold"—that subsequently led the transported monarch, in a period of declining piety, to set up on the plain of Dura the golden image, to which he commanded the adoration of all nations. Now in the life of Nebuchadnezzar every thing is typical:—and as the head in symbolism stands for the whole body, (i.e., in the case of the Great Image, he—the head—is the exemplar and pattern of the whole course of imperial rule from him descending) it should almost be a matter of expectation to find, in the foreshewn delineations of his history, some circumstances having reference to the lower portions of the Image, and their times:—keeping this in view, let us pursue the history.

In raising the "golden image" of Dura—at once the image of his empire, and of himself as identified with it, the great king seems to have put forth the claim to Divine honours on the ground of being the sole constructor of his wide dominion, and sole source of good to his subjects, "Is not this great Babylon that I have built by the might of my power, and for the honour of my majesty?" (iv. 30.) In the same hour his kingdom departed from him: he was driven out from men, and "his dwelling was with the beasts of the field." "Seven times passed over him," until he began to know that "the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men." These "seven times" are emblematical of the seven ages of inferior dominion, that should ensue after the fall of his kingdom of gold. These seven ages are portrayed in the visions of Dan. vii., where they appear under the type of four bestial kingdoms, apportioned in time under seven
heads. "The heart of a beast" was given to the outcast king (iv. 16), and he "eat grass as oxen, and his body was wet with the dew of heaven, till his hairs were grown as eagles' feathers, and his nails like birds' claws." (iv. 33.) That is to say—human government typified in him, intent on present good, and forgetful of what is due to Him who reigns supreme, like to a beast who by nature knows not God, shall seek its sustenance from the earth; ever bending its neck downwards, like an ox, in search of the grasses—expediency, popularity, present advantage—upon which it fattens: content with the plain "herb" provided for the lower animals, and avoiding the "herb bearing seed"—herb fraught with the elements of a never-ending life, provided for man. (Gen. i. 29, 30.) It shall confine its desires to the fatness of the earth (the "dew of heaven") regardless of the sanctuary; until from its degraded spirit shall be obliterated wholly the "likeness of God in man," as manifested by any wish to promote his mediatorial kingdom and glory. And here we should observe the words, "his hairs were grown (not like the hair of an ox, but) like eagles' feathers, and his nails like birds' claws." This refers of course, in time, to the last age of the bestial rule, which is spoken of as that of its greatest degradation. Is it possible that in the type of that last age, as here described, a reference is made to the rapacious bird which sits upon the Gallic standard, and goes the greatest distance for its prey?

Now this condition of human government is to last to an appointed time:—to what time? This is a question which presses every day with greater gravity, and for which (as we believe) the present march of events is preparing an early solution. It will be (according to the vision) "until a stone cut out of a mountain without hands shall smite the image upon his feet, and brake them to pieces: and itself become a great mountain, and fill the whole earth." (Dan. ii. 34.) A stone cut out of a mountain, is a Church cut out of a larger one; and as this "mountain" can be none other than the politico-ecclesiastical state of Rome, the "stone"—of like physical constitution with it, of course—must be a state likewise, the germ and exponent of another system,—a kingdom
erecting its power, systematically, on the true charities of the Gospel; and increasing, itself, in proportion with the increase of Christ's kingdom, which it is essentially engaged (its crown of glory) in carrying out among the nations. But this marvellous expectation finds its warrant, equally, in the typical history of the Babylonian king. Pursuing that history we learn from Daniel (iv. 34—6) that "at the end of the days" Nebuchadnezzar "lifted up his eyes unto heaven, and his understanding returned unto him; and he blessed the Most High, and praised and honoured Him that liveth for ever:" and then "for the glory of his kingdom, his honour and brightness returned unto him."

By this return to sanity of the degraded king, and its glorious result, it is proclaimed that at the end of the seven ages of the beastial dominion, the rule of man, on its lifting up its eyes unto heaven in search of the enlightenment which is from above,—in other words, on its free adoption of the principles of the Gospel, shall be raised again to more than its pristine glory and majesty:—a consummation to be effected (as above said) when the "stone"—the chosen nation now in course of preparation—shall fall upon the feet of the "bright image;" and when the "Stone," rejected of man, shall take unto Himself his power, and become the head-stone of the political edifice. Time alone can show the full sense and scope of the figure—to "smite the Image upon his feet."

Lastly, from the "head of gold," in its relation to the children of the captivity, may be learnt the great truth, that where the Lord putteth his hand, even be it to establish a despot's throne, may be expected to spring up a blessing. It was natural that by the waters of Babylon the captives should sit down and weep; but how infinitely greater were the ills that beset those of their nation, who, resolving obstinately to remain in their native land, refused to follow the steps of their brethren towards the great city—the place of safety prepared for them. (Vide Jer. xxvii. 12, 13.) In truth the great image, in its entire stature and many kingdoms, may be looked upon as a vast conservatory constructed with frames of various metals, and prepared by God thus early.
for the preservation and development of the exotic plants of his own planting.

After the times of the "head of gold," the image sets forth an "inferior" kingdom bearing the resemblance of "silver." By the Kingdom of Silver we understand the empires of the Medes and Persians and of the Greeks—the empires denoted by the breast and arms of the Image. If the Persian empire succeeded the "head of gold," so also did the Macedonian empire succeed the Persian, on the same territory; for the latter was first established at Babylon, and at Babylon Alexander was engaged in fixing his seat of empire when he died. Daniel in another vision which had reference to these two Powers (chap. viii.) is anxious to point out that the object of Alexander was singly the overthrow of the Persian empire, and to establish his own upon its ruins. The Macedonian came "from the West on the face of the whole earth, and touched not the ground" (ver. 5)—meaning that he moved with the celerity of one who had a single object in view: and the prophet twice mentions (ver. 2 and 6) that the overthrow was in the centre of the realm, "by the river of Ulai," where the Macedonian king "cast him (the Persian) down to the ground and stamped upon him" (ver. 7.). We are warranted then in saying—speaking with the latitude that is taken by the prophet himself—that the Macedonian empire was the same in position as the Persian. Silver applies admirably, though in somewhat different senses, to both these empires; as also do the particular parts—the breast and the arms—to the historical distinctions they present. First as to this latter point. The breast is the seat of the heart:—now all Gentile Governments are to be regarded with approval and gratitude, in proportion as they have been serviceable to the well-being of God's elect Church. The Persian rule was distinguished by the several decrees—those of Cyrus and Artaxerxes in particular—in favour of the Jews, leading to their return from Babylon: and thus does Persia establish her claim to be the breast of the Image, the seat and source of the good affections. This will receive a further illustration in the next vision. The arms spring from the breast:—and regarding the Macedonian empire as terri-
torially identical, in its chief measurements, with the Persian, it nevertheless stretched out its "arms" on either side, in the time of its great founder, in the shape of rapid expeditions—
reaches of the arms,—to Hindostan on the one side, and the Lybian deserts on the other. And further, as the arms gradually dwindle in nature into the smaller members of the fingers; so the Grecian empire was broken up after Alexander, and ended in the construction of numerous smaller kingdoms;
—numerous (we say) not four, as commonly said; but as it is stated in the first book of the Maccabees—"His (Alexander's) servants bare rule every one in his place: and after his death they all put crowns upon themselves; so did their sons after them many years, and evils were multiplied on the earth." There were then ten (the number of the fingers)—i.e., many kingdoms, rather than four, springing out of Alexander,—a circumstance that we must not forget in a future vision.

Both these empires are of silver, a metal pure and costly, and inferior only to gold,—symbolical of a descent from autocratic to aristocratic rule. Thus we find the first Persian monarch beset by "the presidents, governors, and princes" to sign a decree of their own making (Dan. vi.) which issued in the prophet Daniel's being cast into the den of lions: from whence the king could not deliver him, because "the law of the Medes and Persians altereth not." In the Greek empire—in great measure contemporaneous with the Persian,—as the "breast" and "arms" ought to be, the Athenian, Spartan, and Theban states afford examples, more or less, of the prevalence of aristocratic government. But may we not justly claim "silver" as pointing to music and the arts? What other metal than it strung the lyre of Apollo, the chief of Grecian deities? What other metal is so consonant with the graces of that cultivated people? The Rev. Mr. Birks, who will have the Greek empire to be the third or kingdom of "brass," claims brass (1) as the "symbol of eloquence, in which the Greeks surpassed all other nations" (Birks on Dan., p. 52.):—the silver tongue we have heard of, but never of the brazen. The Rev. Gentleman alludes also, in defence of his "brass," as does also
Bishop Newton, to "Χαλκοχιτωνες Δαχαιοι," (brazen-coated Greeks):—we call Apollo again to our aid, of whom it is said "Δεινὴ δὲ κλαργηγιακὴ ἔνεται ἀργυργευτοῖ βιοῦ" (terrible was the clang of his silver bow: Π., A. 49).

The third, or kingdom of "brass," is made up of the "belly and thighs" of the Image (ver. 32—39)—i. e., of the fourth and fifth divisions. This is a representation of the Roman empire, at first one and homogeneous, but subsequently, (i. e., after the times of Constantine) separated into two grand divisions, the Eastern and Western empires. All below the head of the Image relates (we repeat) not to kings, but to kingdoms; on which account it is not possible to be precise in dates, as there will ever be, during the decline and rise of two adjacent powers, a transition state of struggle, which will endure (it may be) for more than a century of contemporaneous existence. We shall not err much in supposing the brazen portion of the image to date from about a century before the Christian era. The characteristics supplied of this kingdom are so marked, as scarcely to require comment. It was to "bear rule over all the earth" (Dan. ii. 39)—a feature which, as every one knows, belonged in a pre-eminent sense to ancient Rome; whose capital—the "queen of nations"—the "mistress of the world"—"maxima rerum Roma"—did, and does, "reign over the kings of the earth." And as the eagle, whose home is on many mountains, is ever the symbol of wide dominion, it may be mentioned that Marius adopted the silver eagle as the standard of the Roman army, about 95 years before Christ:—hence the date we have chosen.

Rome was the great "belly," or source of aliment, in all things that constitute the aliment of nations—laws, (legumque pares Roma), arts and sciences, general civilization. As "the belly," it lasted (say) four centuries, up to the time of Constantine or Valens; it then branched out into two "thighs" (μυρποι divisions), solid, collateral, stumps; very different from the outstretched "arms" of Greece. Its brazen texture denotes its martial spirit: also its fame, going forth as by a trumpet into all the world. Also, being a mixed metal, it denotes the further limitation, and descent in quality, of the supreme authority. Imperial power was no longer con-
trolled by Persian governors and counsellors, nor exercised by a Spartan aristocracy; but was the gift of a community both patrician and plebeian—"Sen. Pop. Qu. Rom;"—if indeed it was not rather the soldiery who gave the diadem. The duration of this "kingdom," so far as relates to the Image, continued to the knee, i.e., up to the age of Charlemagne; presenting a little more than four centuries of "belly," and a little less than five of "thighs:"—this apportionment of the period we shall have a better opportunity of defending in the next vision.

We feel persuaded that what has been thus far said on the "third kingdom" will have been received as satisfactory by the reader, and that no more is necessary for its identification. There is however a prophetic truth suggested by the latter half of this "kingdom"—the "thighs," which it is very important—because of its bearing not only on the kingdom itself, but upon the one that is to follow—that we should rightly apprehend, viz., that a prophetic "kingdom" does not require that the whole of it be brought under a single government. What is required is—that between its several parts there shall be some manifest bond of union. Were a single government a necessary characteristic, then would the Grecian "kingdom," consisting during much of its times, of several free states—whether viewed before or after the days of Alexander—be still unexplained; we have however seen this kingdom—i.e., the royalty and rule of the Grecian people, to have its part in the constitution of the Image. The national unity of the states, however independent of each other, qualifies them to respond collectively to the character of a prophetic "kingdom." We conceive even that did the speculation arise, that the "fourth kingdom"—that of the "legs" below the knee—might perhaps be found in the Anglo-Saxon race, it would be no bar to its validity that the race, which is here the uniting principle, is divided into two grand divisions—the one monarchical in Europe, the other republican in America.

Now in applying this consideration to the "thighs"—the two independent branches, Eastern and Western, of the vast Roman empire, we must ask—what was the uniting
principle which could operate to constitute them one "king-
dom?" Community of race does not solve this question. And yet by the very terms in which the "kingdom" is
described by Daniel ("And another third kingdom of brass"
—v. 39; "his belly and his thighs of brass"—v. 32.) the
"kingdom" is one, even in its second portion. The answer
is this—that both the "thighs" are Roman:—the common
claim to be of Rome is the binding principle. At the division
of the empire in the beginning of the fourth century, and the
transference of the chief seat to Byzantium, this claim was
set up—in an unconscious fulfilment of the prophecy, by
calling it "New Rome." Mr. Faber has some valuable
observations bearing upon this subject, in his "Revival":—
he points out the principle of Roman law "that the territorial
Roman empire, and the gubernactive Roman emperorship were,
each alike, a strict unit. Hence, whatever number of per-
sonal emperors, either in the East or in the West, might
govern the one Roman empire; and however that one empire
might be gubernatively arranged in point of division; still
these personal emperors, and that territorial empire, were,
each alike, deemed one, and in Roman law were never held
to have departed from the principle of unity." The effective
cause of this unity appears to have been, the universal
grant of Roman citizenship, the "jus civitatis," to all born
within the provinces of the empire; so that "with the gradual
extension of the Roman city, the number of Romans con-
tinually increased, until all were Romans both in name and
political reality:"
—thus St. Paul, "though a native of Tarsus
in the Eastern division of the empire, was born a Roman."
Now if this view is important in its reference to the govern-
ment of the "third kingdom," it is not less so as it respects
the construction of the "fourth"—to which we now turn.

The "fourth kingdom"—the sixth and seventh portions of
the Image, "the legs of iron, with the feet part of iron and
part of clay" (ver. 33)—commence with an unusual pre-
cision in A.D. 800 in Charlemagne:—the "legs of iron"
continue a thousand years to the great Napoleon, when the
"kingdom" extends into "the feet part of iron and part of
clay." To the above description is added as an interpretation
(ver. 41) a notice of the "toes"—not included in the original dream. It is highly important to mark well this latter circumstance. The "feet" constitute the seventh consecutive portion of the Image; but we are to remember that in chapp. xiii. and xvii. of the Revelation, the seventh "head" gives rise, in the one to a resuscitated, in the other to an "eighth" head—two analogous symbols:—the mention of the "toes" as distinct from, and yet belonging to, the seventh portion of the Image, will appear to be a parallel mode of symbolizing an eighth era of rule, and has the effect of throwing valuable light upon the "eighth head" of the Revelation, his times, and dynasty. It is clearly seen from this manner of introducing the "toes"—by nature an essential part of the "feet," that they are to be regarded (in conformity with the joint symbols of the Revelation) as part of the "fourth kingdom," yet as constituting an extra part of that kingdom.

It would not be easy to satisfy the mind, with reference to the kingdom of the "legs," under any other view than that of their being continuations of the two "thighs;" and therein as representing the prolonged existence, in territory as well as ascendancy, of the Eastern and Western empires. We do not intend to set at naught this natural expectation; on the other hand we must take note of the territorial sequence of the four "kingdoms." The territorial conformation of the second kingdom differed from that of the first; nor did the seat and other local attributes of the third kingdom agree with those of the second:—it is much to be expected therefore that the territorial basis of the fourth kingdom (of "iron") will be considerably distinguished from that of the third (of "brass"). "Distinctness of the four empires in territory (says Mr. Birks, p. 96) is almost equally plain with their succession in order of time." Notwithstanding this, we should certainly study to preserve as nearly as may be the order of nature; and with this hope we shall endeavour to show, that the fourth empire naturally grows out of the third in history, exhibiting the natural procession of the "legs" from the "thighs;" and that in conformity herewith it embraces in its constitution a respectable portion and sample of each thigh.
Before proceeding, we would wish to bring forcibly before the reader, and to beg his reflection upon the fact, that there is a strong principle of natural unity between the "fifth" and "sixth" portions of the Image—the "thighs" and the "legs," albeit they are of different "kingdoms." They are separated from each other only by that peculiar joint the knee, which operates so as to unite the two limbs at an exact and well-defined point;—differing greatly herein from the uncertain means by which the same condition of distinctness is effected between the "breast" and the "belly"—portions of the preceding "kingdoms." On this account it must be concluded that the portions of imperial rule represented severally by the "thighs" and the "legs," though separate in kingdom, unite at some well-expressed point of time. Now in casting our eye back upon the entire Roman kingdom (the third and fourth "kingdoms" together) and its territorial changes, with a view to ascertain the true commencement and site of the "fourth kingdom," we find that it remained in a state of complete unity during its first four and a half centuries—reaching to the time of Constantine. It was in the age of Constantine the empire was seen in its greatest dimensions; for at its partition by that Emperor, among his sons and nephews, more numerous provinces are named than can be predicated of any other age of Roman rule. (Vide "Univ. Hist." xvi., 133). Eusebius indeed makes Constantine's dominions of prodigious extent,—reaching from the confines of Caledonia to Ethiopia, and from the Atlantic Ocean to the extremest India,—exceeding vastly the dominions of Nebuchadnezzar or Alexander. The faithfulness

* In a note in "Lee on Prophecy," p. lxxii, we read from Eusebius's "History of Constantine":—"In Britanniam quidem, et in eos qui in ipso habitant oceano ad solis occasum longe lateque diffuso, signa intulit. Scythiam vero universam que sub ipso Septentrione posita in plurimas gentes et nomine et moribus discrepantes dividit, suo adjunxit imperio. Jam vero cum ad extremos meridiei fines imperium propagasset, ad ipsos nimirum Blemmyas et Ethiopias, eos quoque qui ad solis ortum incolum . . . ad ultimos usque continentis terminos . . . ad extremos Indos et circumcisitos undique populos, cunctos mortales qui universum terrarum orbem incolum." Dr. Lee makes this an argument for believing that the light of the Gospel has already been carried into all the dark habitations of the heathen!
of the symbolic Image is herein maintained, for it is in the middle of the portion of the human figure assigned for this "kingdom," that the circumference is the greatest. And when the empire was divided into two collateral "thighs," the symbol lost none of its truthfulness; which consisted, not only in the circumstance of the division, but in this—that thighs gradually diminish in bulk as they descend:—thus the Saracen conquests took away important substance from the Eastern "thigh," and the establishment of the Moorish kingdom of Grenada, and the voluntary relinquishment of Britain from the Western.

But while the ages of the two "thighs" thus proceeded uniformly in observance of the rules of nature, there was not maintained an equality of strength between them:—the western thigh languished, and after less than two centuries of decline underwent a sort of decomposition, in A.D. 476, at the deposition of Augustulus. It tends much to the confirmation of our view of this duplex imperial type to observe, that from this time to the rise of Charlemagne—between three and four centuries, the western "thigh," which had now ceased to furnish strength to the imperial power, remained in the utmost state of political and municipal degradation,—the whole territory being rent into shreds of government, and nothing but violence and lawlessness prevailing among the innumerable independent clans into which it was broken up. We may indeed consider the vast western territory to have been in these centuries in a state of fallow, which the winds and the storms were acting upon, with the purpose of preparing it as a basis for the establishment of the "fourth kingdom"—of "iron," when its time should arrive.

It was from the midst of these tumultuous waves of anarchy, bloodshed, and universal confusion, that the great leviathan Charlemagne arose to view in the last days of the eighth century; and in the great event of his Coronation we venture to say is to be beheld the commencement of the "fourth kingdom." In determining this important point it may be of course assumed that the Image is perfect in all its emblematic relations, with the allowance of course of an
easy latitude of application; and it is on this account we have said, that this "kingdom" requires to be dated from a definite point of time. For nothing in nature can be more definite than the termination of the "thigh," or more immediate than the beginning of the "leg"; and consequently we are bound to search in history for some specific and illustrious event that shall correspond with the knee of the Image. We find it in the coronation of Charlemagne, on Christmas-day, A.D. 800, in St. Peter's at Rome. This transaction was the resumption of imperial power in the West (it is so called in history) after its having lain in abeyance between three and four centuries since the times of Odoacer:—it was the reconstitution of the Roman western empire. Like the knee between the "thigh" and the "leg," it joins together two distinct lines of the imperial ascendancy of Rome,—belonging in point of fact, in a singular combination of cause and consequence, (a consideration of great future importance in our investigations) to both of them—to one line as much as the other.

To Charlemagne a gracious Providence had given understanding, which he possessed in a degree as eminent as the more ordinary qualities of ambition and energy. He was viewed by the numerous tribes of people and shreds of nationalities he brought under his rule, as a tower of strength, and a refuge provided by Providence, from the universal oppression that prevailed. The extent of his empire was enormous—a subject we shall have occasion to turn to again. He stands out on the page of history, as much renowned for the wisdom of his legislation, as the unvarying victory that attended his arms. Above all, in a prophetic sense, he is the mark on the scale of time—the joint in the foot-rule—which unites (as the knee the upper and lower portions of the leg) the two great lines of ancient and modern history.

Now, what was the configuration of this new western empire: and how do we make out that it was a fair representation of the typical "legs" of the Image? This follows from the fact that, besides its own natural provinces, there were comprehended within it many of great extent, which aforetime, and long subsequent to the partition under Con-
stantine, had belonged to the *eastern* branch. These provinces had changed their places, some by conquest and some by negotiation. For instance, under Justinian, in the sixth century, the greater part of Italy, including the exarchate of Ravenna, and the islands of Corsica and Sardinia, were portions of the eastern "leg"; but were afterwards enumerated among the possessions of the Frankish conqueror, who bestowed Corsica on the "Holy See." In the treaty of peace that took place between Nicephorus the Eastern emperor, and Charlemagne, James mentions ("History of Charlemagne," p. 460) that the election of the latter to the throne of the West was recognised by Nicephorus, "and his possession of Istria, Croatia, Liburnia, and Dalmatia, was confirmed to him, as well as his title to Sardinia, Corsica, and Italy, as far as the Lower Calabria." The cession of Dalmatia implied that of Pannonia, and all that lay between it and the conquered territories of Hungary and Bohemia. These are immense possessions, and history informs us that Nicephorus, after ceding, made several fruitless attempts to reannex them to his dominions:—they constitute at the present day some of the most valuable portions of the empire of Austria. *

Now assuredly these facts, however briefly stated, claim to be allowed a considerable weight in determining the difficult question of the empire of the "legs." The case is succinctly as follows. Prophecy sets before us a "kingdom" under the symbol (viewing the kingdom *singly*, a most remarkable symbol) of two parallel "legs":—in resolving it, we naturally seek to satisfy its peculiar requirements. These "legs" descend from two "thighs" of the preceding "kingdom," which have been very easily accounted for; and the reasonable inference is, that the kingdom they represent must at least *partake* of the substance of both the "thighs." Territorial identity throughout is not essential, because the "*kingdoms*" are distinct. Notwithstanding which, as the later "*kingdom*" is presented to the imagination in a duplex

* May we not claim from the very name of Austria (Ost Recht—the Eastern Government) some support to our views?
form, it claims (one might say, imperatively) to descend from both the members of the preceding duplex "kingdom;" thus adhering to the order of nature, which is never lightly to be set aside. Now it has been shown that, besides the conquest of Hungary, which belongs geographically to the Eastern rather than the Western empire, extensive provinces—Pannonia for instance, and Dalmatia, and the exarchate of Ravenna (not to insist, if objected to, on the rest of Italy, and on Sicily, Corsica, and Sardinia, which rather fluctuated between the two empires, though they were finally included in the Western)—were ceded specially to Charlemagne, the founder of the "Holy Roman empire":—nay, they remain as evidences and mementoes of the defunct empire of the East, even to the present day. We submit, under these circumstances, that the new empire receives an appropriate designation, in that of the "Kingdom of the Legs."

But what then becomes of the remaining—by far the larger part of the ancient Eastern empire, which this new prophetic empire thus entirely excludes from its confines? The answer to this imposing objection is exceedingly easy; but it must be given in the language of another vision—Dan. vii. 12: "As concerning the rest of the beasts, they had their dominion taken away: yet their lives were prolonged for a season and time." Although the "Beast" (speaking of him as single, as in the Revelation) has travelled westward through several regions, he has left every where traces of his past habitation:—indeed (as Daniel has just said) the Persian beast still maintains an imperial existence, and so the Grecian; this latter being, itself, the same as the one in question—the Eastern "leg." It turns out then, that the long continuance of the Eastern "leg," even for ages after the establishment of Daniel's "fourth kingdom," is rather a fulfilment than the contrary of the prophetic word. Let the reader well consider the verse on which this depends—second in importance to none in the book of Daniel, and the argument it furnishes: it is the only possible way (so far as the writer can discern) of escaping the difficulty contained in the objection. St. John's responsive note to this verse is the fact, that his single "beast" is compounded of all four of
Daniel, thus showing that all four remain in life. This is the first occasion we have met with (but more will follow) of meeting a difficulty occurring in one vision by a solution drawn from another;—a necessity which proclaims, more than any other thing, the excellent unity of the prophecies; and as requiring for their unlocking a key with many wards. It may remind us of the text (2 Pet. i. 20) "no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation" (ιδιας έπιλογεως ου γινεται)—in the sense affixed to it by some expositors, to the effect, that no prophecy is capable of being solved by a consideration of its own unaided text alone. From the rise of Charlemagne, Eastern Rome lost its predominancy of rule, and from that epoch,—though preserving its existence—vanishes from the prophetic view:—the kingdom of the "legs" ascends, and its seat is in the farther West.

But now, having regard to the symbolic fashioning of nature (for we are persuaded the Image may be relied upon in its leading proportions) let us attempt to discover what may be portrayed in history, by the sudden falling off in size of the calves towards the ankles. In this empire, from its very foundation, the dominion exercised has been of a very peculiar sort—one unknown in any previous age of human history, consisting of a spiritual sovereignty conjoined with, but overriding, the temporal. It is essentially requisite for the explication—not only of this but of other visions, that we regard the modern power of Rome (we mean, between Charlemagne and Napoleon) entirely in this point of view,—as wielding her temporal authority through the medium of rights conceded to her spiritual sceptre. It thus happens that the territorial bounds within which her dominion has received credit for superior sanctity, as being the "Holy Roman empire," become the bounds—not only of the imperial power, but of the prophetic "kingdom": that is to say—because of the holy source of the secular sovereignty, the "kingdom" becomes commensurate (but ever within the boundaries of ancient Rome—the "belly" from which it springs) with the Roman Church. The consequence is, that to disclaim the validity of the spiritual rights of Rome is, in
fact, to withdraw allegiance from her imperial rule. Now the island of Britain, after having been released in the beginning of the fifth century from the early Roman allegiance, had been brought again under her rule through the sacro-secular claims of the Papacy, and in fact constituted, at the rise of the "fourth kingdom" in Charlemagne, an integral portion of the Roman empire:—yet we find her, in company with many Continental states, in the beginning of the sixteenth century, "protesting" against, and therein seceding from, the sacro-imperial rule. It will be admitted that of all the events which are chronicled in the long pages of Roman history, during those—commonly called "middle" ages, the most important is the Great Reformation—an event, or series of events, affecting essentially the rule of the imperial "City," and worthy therefore to be noticed in the descriptive visions of Prophecy:—does the Reformation, then, find its expression in the Image? We believe that the secession alluded to—this escape from the "holy" enclosure of Rome—causing an abridgment of her imperial bulk by nearly, perhaps, "one third," is met in the symbolic "legs" by the falling off we have spoken of of the calves towards the ankles, effecting a very similar reduction. The blasphemous appropriation of the title of "holy" for this empire, which we can liken only to a fringe of beautiful lace sewn on to a kitchen duster,—asserting as it most truly does that the spiritual is its most effective arm, and determining as it incontrovertibly does that whatever of territory is not enclosed within its sacro-secular borders is extraneous to it as a prophetic "kingdom"—thus becomes an unconscious and very curious comment, in its results, upon the symbolic configuration of the Image; and helps to verify, as is so often the case with the evil ways of men, the Divine foreshadowings.

Every commentator the writer has consulted speaks of the "fourth kingdom" of Daniel, both of his second and his seventh chapters, as descriptive of the Roman empire from its early origin; deeming these to be parallel visions, and to differ only in this—that the one is addressed to the worldly-minded, dazzled with the "excellent brightness" of the "Image"; the other to the saints of God, who, under the
beauty of external shape, can detect the bestial nature. Mr. Birks even dates the commencement of this empire of "the legs" from the first successes of Rome against Macedon, about two hundred years before Christ. The first portion of the empire—(or what he calls its undivided state, with reference to the text in Daniel, "the kingdom shall be divided"—Dan. ii. 41)—he considers to have been a period of about six hundred years, up to the time of Valens; during which the Roman government was one and single:—the second portion (the iron and clay mixed) he refers to the decline of the empire, and the rise of the ten kings—of whom we shall have more to say presently. Now it will not much recommend this scheme, to notice the total forgetfulness—nay, contempt,—it evinces, of every consideration of proportion in Daniel's Image. Surely as the Image is set before us as a measure of time, it is by the historical admeasurements supplied by time that we ought to be guided to a correct view of the symmetries of its construction. The vision is seen about six hundred years before Christ; and, under guidance of the rule of judgment just suggested, we observe with consternation that, in about four hundred years, the commentators bring us all the way down from the top of the head to the knees!—and to get from the knees to the end of the toes (not yet attained) eighteen centuries and a half have already been consumed! May we not be reminded by these proportions of a well known toy for small babies, which exhibits the human frame with an inch of body and about ten inches of legs? Let little Johnny pull gently the string, and the stride of the figure across the table is really no bad illustration of the manner in which Nebuchadnezzar's Image is made to bespan the plain of time. Really we have thought, on perusing this absurd theory, "that some of nature's journeymen had made men, and not made them well, they imitated humanity so abominably." (Hamlet.) Perhaps we ought to seize, in behalf of the scheme we advocate, the advantage that comparison cannot fail to afford; and to say that we require for the head of the Image just half a century, for the breast and arms about four centuries and a half, for the belly and thighs nine centuries, and for the legs
and feet already one thousand and fifty years.* Let us take a hint from this last measurement—how near we must necessarily be to the end of the bright Image, i. e., to the close of the "times of the Gentiles."

The reign of iron, genuine and unmixed, continued for a thousand years from Charlemagne to Napoleon. But what is to be understood of "Iron"? By the terms of the Prophecy—"as iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all things" (ver. 40)—it is clear that the predominance and the appliances of force is the characteristic chiefly intended. The next clause informs us, that the iron breaketh in pieces "all these"—viz., preceding kingdoms,—destined to root up their political foundations. This is an announcement of the wonderful ascendancy the Western nations should gain over the Eastern in this age, excelling them in all things that "iron" symbolizes, whether in reference to warfare or to government. It has thus a close connexion with the famous prophecy, that Japheth "should dwell in the tents of Shem." (Gen. ix. 27.) But now let us enquire,—to what does "iron" in a secondary sense make allusion, as the source of temporal rule? In the earlier Roman kingdom—that

* Professor Stuart has the following curious remarks on the Cabbalistic doctrine of the Sephiroth, i. e., the Personification of the Divine attributes. "The Sephiroth (he says) were ten:"—the fiction was briefly this.—To the Divine Being—the Infinite one—were ascribed parts or attributes, which were so arranged as to make out the figure of a man. First comes Crown, representing the head: then Wisdom and Intelligence the two eyes. These were the three supreme Sephiroth, after which, seven inferior Sephiroth followed in order. The seven are Greatness and Might, i. e., the shoulders and arms: then Ornament—girdle magnificently adorned: then Splendour and Majesty, i. e., the loins bedecked with glittering weapons: then Foundation, i. e., feet: and Kingdom, which is footstool, i. e., under his feet, or subject to him. In Hindostan, where man was regarded as the image of the great seven-stringed lyre (i. e., the image of universal harmony) his members were reckoned in such a way as to make seven of them (pp. 429 and 782). It is evident from these speculations, coinciding as they do with the philosophy of Daniel, that the ancient systems from which they spring—Cabbalism, Hindoosim, the mythology of Greece and Rome, and perhaps Freemasonry, are all corruptions of one early system of true philosophy:—their aid is certainly not to be despised in the interpretation of Daniel.
of "brass," the source of power was found to be adequately described in the letters S. P. Q. R.—how shall it be described in the "kingdom of iron?" We believe its true designation to be Hereditary Right,—that uncompromising principle, unbending as "iron," which for a thousand years has been continually, until lately, gaining strength in almost every Christian state.* And it is by no means incongruous that iron should carry the double allusion to external force, and hereditary right; for the latter, through a strange misappreciation of its own proper weight, has ever tended to the promotion of war, in the defence of rights springing out of family alliances.

It is a fact no less certain than disgraceful, that the religion of the Gospel has in no wise subdued the warlike propensities of mankind. On the contrary, the civilization that has confessedly attended its progress has even given an impulse to the prosecution of war, by creating on the one hand a keener sense of personal right, and on the other by increasing the facilities for the more general acquisition of military fame. Furthermore, during the ages descending from Charlemagne the external aspect of war has carried peculiarly the appearance of iron,—as, for instance, in the outpouring of Europe in mailed array in the Crusades. A knight on his war-horse, armed cap-a-pie, was an exact impersonation of the age of "iron." The use of artillery further confirms the prophetic statement:—look at the present broadside of a man-of-war:—observe a single order.

* In the "Secret treaty of the three Northern Powers," bearing date 20th May, 1852,—which appeared in the papers while the question of the empire in France was pending—the following observations occur:—

"Considering that the basis of European order is hereditary right, that in that respect there is a joint responsibility and interest (solidarité) between all European states; considering also that, as regards France, the House of Bourbon personifies and represents the hereditary right," . . . . "and that the very origin of the present power of the President is the negation of hereditary right;" &c. "In the case of (so and so) the Powers will address a protest founded on the principles of public law," &c. "The recognition of legitimate and hereditary royalty interests all European states. It is a national and an international principle;" &c. (Signed—Francis Joseph, Frederick William, Nicolas.)
from the French Emperor to an iron-master, to furnish forthwith three millions of cannon balls:—listen to the following statement from Woolwich, "three monster shells have been landed on the Arsenal wharf from the Lowmoor foundries, bearing each the following dimensions—diameter, three feet nine inches; weight, one ton six hundredweight; intended for Sebastopol. An experimental gun has likewise been founded at Liverpool for projecting these enormous missiles, weighing no less than twenty tons":—peruse the following, which has lately appeared in the daily papers, "It is calculated that the Russians fired about 30,000 tons of iron at us (at Sebastopol). It is certain that we gave them about 11,000 tons in return, and possibly the French fired about 20,000 tons; so that between 60,000 and 70,000 tons weight of iron must be lying about on the plateau." And when we call to mind the horrors and barbarities of Christian sieges, "breaking in pieces and bruising" all the most noble products of human skill and industry:—wars of thirty years duration—whereas that savage, Alexander, made but nine campaigns: and the perpetuation of the evil by royal alliances and international engagements, such as seldom took place in earlier times; we may be persuaded, first, that we have been walking the degraded earth for upwards of a thousand years in an age of "iron"; and secondly, that Christianity, with its proud accumulation of physical knowledge, but under the rule of that most unchristian "beast," the powers that be, have added to, rather than diminished, the miseries in this kind of the human race. But we have rather outstepped the age we are in in the last illustration.

Proceeding onwards on the esplanade of time—the Great Image, we arrive at the seventh and last age of imperial rule—the second portion of the "fourth kingdom"—the "feet, part of iron and part of clay." We are now in the age of Napoleon—the heel of the Image, and in the midst of those transactions of which many a man now living can say "quorum pars (ipse) fui." It is of no small importance in the wide unmeasured field of Prophecy to know on what spot we are standing,—an advantage which is assured to the
readers of the present day by the discovery of the Beast's name; and this advantage the writer is persuaded will not be less consequential in its results, when the pen of investigation is taken up by other more able hands. It will have been observed how exceedingly brief are the notices of the preceding "kingdoms"; which extend, nevertheless, in their references, over a no less space of time than twenty-three centuries. The truth is, they are intended only as introductory to the age at which we are now arrived; of which the notices, though still brief, are so far improved in length and quality,—particularly when estimated by the circumstance of the (in all-probability) very limited duration of the period they belong to—as to show, that it is the age for whose benefit especially the prophecy has been designed, and its effective guidance reserved.

This seventh age had its commencement with the assumption of the imperial crown by Napoleon—the heel, and last perpendicular portion, of the Image. This took place in the year 1804. It will be objected, perhaps, that the "Holy Roman empire" had not then come to an end; as the resignation of its crown did not take place until 1806. To this we reply, that the two events, taken in combination, serve only to falsify the very prevalent notion, that the Roman empire did come to an end in 1806. The German emperor in 1806 resigned the title—the shell of the imperial dignity; but the substance had been already transferred to Napoleon. In 1808, the famous decree from Schönbrunn, annexing the Papal states to his dominions, and declaring Rome the second city (Paris being pronounced the first) of the empire;—and in 1809, the conferring the title of "King of Rome," the ancient title of the heirs elect of the Western empire, on his son, were further significative acts, proving that he was indeed Emperor of the West. These events should be viewed together, as constituting one prophetic incident—the fact that Napoleon became the "Head" of the empire, by the transference (mark the word) of the power and the crown to him. The transaction in its details corresponds with the articulation of the ankle-joint, which pronounces the arrest of the kingdom of "the legs" the
"Holy Roman empire," and the commencement of the kingdom of the "feet"—another era of the same Roman imperial rule. In truth, Napoleon may be recognised historically as the true successor to Charlemagne in the throne of the West; for since the days of that great founder of the empire, not one of his successors, until he, had ever held rule over so large a portion, or anything approaching to it, of its original territories. Add to which, that France, the most noble of those territories, ceased to be one of its constituent parts about a century or so after Charlemagne, and was restored to it in the rank of its leading kingdom only by Napoleon. Notwithstanding this, France has always borne the title of the "eldest son" of this empire: and it is mentioned by an able commentator* that "It was common to consider France as successively holding the empire of the West."

It is an essential condition of Daniel's "fourth kingdom," that it should be throughout of an uniform descent,—Eastern and Western in combination; but to affirm this in the present instance, it does not seem necessary to do more than to say, that as the kingdom of the "legs" is a continuation of that of the "thighs," in the sense of containing a portion of each, so by greater reason, as being of the same kingdom, correct symbolism bids us understand that the "feet part of iron and part of clay" proceed directly from the "legs," and are substantially (i. e., territorially) the continuation of them.

On the new element—the clay, in the material of this "kingdom," we must presume, in compliance with the scheme of interpretation hitherto pursued, that this is an element introduced into the springs of government; and that it is descriptive of the plastic, inconstant, and easily impres-sible; or (regarded as porcelain) of the noisy and clattering voice of the people. The attempt to unite "iron and clay" is the absurd attempt to unite unbending legitimacy with clamorous democracy. On the elevation of the first Napoleon the attempt had a transient success, by reason of the clay clinging with desperate tenacity to the iron, when the popularly-elected emperor united himself in marriage with

* Tregelles on Daniel, p. 73.
Austrian legitimacy. On the election of the second Napoleon (such is the progress of things) the clay assumes itself to be the essence of legitimacy, according to the words of Louis Napoleon, "From the day that the dogma of the sovereignty of the people replaced that of right divine, it may be said that no government has been so legitimate as mine." The clay (the principle of popular election) has expressed itself on the two occasions in the votes of four million and eight million of people respectively; and on each occasion has been attended with dazzling prospects: nevertheless, the inability of the clay to attain to the solidity and compactness of the iron—i.e., of universal suffrage to co-exist with legitimacy, will eventually be, as we are surely informed by the declared doom of the Image, the cause of its total ruin.

At this point we bring to a close our remarks on the original Image of king Nebuchadnezzar, as given in verses 32—3, and the explanation immediately appended to it. In the prolongation of the "four kingdoms" into seven periods, the Image has been seen to exhibit the general course and character of imperial rule from the days of Daniel to the present day, in which we find ourselves in the midst of the seventh and last period. How long this period may continue before the "stone" shall smite the Image in its brittle feet (ver. 34),—how long (that is to say) the Napoleonic dynasty of Rome may weigh upon the aspirations of the true Church that is to follow it, nothing has appeared as yet to guide our calculations:—the time may be short, or it may be long, so far as the original dream bears upon the inquiry. This much further, even upon the information already supplied, we might perhaps venture to say—that the duration of the dynasty will depend upon the manner in which the measure of time be taken in the foot; whether in a perpendicular line from the ankle to the ground, or in a circular line to the end of the toes. The first, we believe, for reasons that will appear, to be the measure intended, the horizontal direction of the foot marking only the prolonged detail of events of a single age—an age (that is to say) on the same level of time with the heel.

It happens however that certain important inferences here
arrest the attention, which the inspired interpreter, far-
sighted in the discernment of consequences, is enabled to
draw from the circumstance of the admixture of "clay" with
"iron," in this period of the "kingdom." In ver. 41, 42, 43,
the text is as follows—

(41) "And as thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potter's clay and
part of iron, the kingdom shall be divided: but there shall be in it of the
strength of the iron, forasmuch as thou sawest the iron mixed with miry
clay. (42) And as the toes of the feet were part of iron and part of
clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong and partly broken. (43) And
whereas thou sawest iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle
themselves with the seed of men: but they shall not cleave one to
another, even as iron is not mixed with clay."

These verses bring before us three very difficult subjects:
—a division of the kingdom: the toes of the feet: and the
mingling with the seed of men:—we shall consider them in
the order in which they are presented. Perhaps no other
point in the prophecies has given rise to longer discussions
than each of these has done; on which account the writer,
while repressing his confidence in the opinions he is about to
advance, feels himself perfectly justified in advancing them.
It will be his wisdom, however, to be as brief as the subject
will at all allow of.

In the 41st verse, the incongruity that obtains between
"iron and clay" is given as the cause of a certain effect, viz.,
that "the kingdom shall be divided." How the inference
was drawn by the prophet is beyond our perception: it will
be sufficient if we may discover what is meant by the
expression "divided." The symbol of the kingdom is a
couple of feet: but as these feet are divided already in
nature, and must be understood (if not specified to the con-
trary) as being in the usual separate state, to say that the
"feet" shall be "divided" in this sense,—in that, moreover,
it is no more applicable to them than to the "legs" from
whence they come—must be a mistaken view of the expres-
sion:—not to mention that there would be a manifest
impropriety in drawing out a natural truth from the incon-
gruous substances of which the "feet" happen to be com-
posed. It cannot be, then, that the "division" is of a
longitudinal nature, as when a cane is split from top to
bottom; but it must be of the opposite nature, as when a cane is divided transversely into two parts. * "The kingdom (consisting of "feet" AND "toes") shall be divided"—i. e., the "feet" shall be divided from the "toes." This view of the case, if true, is exceedingly important; as this "division" becomes an equivalent expression for the "deadly wound" of the 13th Rev.; and (as we believe) refers to the same thing—the temporary annihilation of the Napoleonic dynasty.

Now we are to observe that, of the original description of the royal dream (ver. 32, 33), the "toes" do not form a part, being mentioned for the first time in this 41st verse: though they certainly were seen in the vision, as it is said, "thou sawest the feet and toes":—(a hint, by the bye, that when a symbol is given in aid of a prophetic description, it is permissible in the interpretation to avail oneself of all its acknowledged parts and properties). Again, in the 42nd verse, we read of the "toes" alone. Hence it is to be inferred that the division above spoken of—the discontinuance of imperial rule—takes place in the symbol (as already said) by the separation of the "feet" from the "toes." But what are we to understand by the "toes," as distinct from the feet? Conjecture here insists on being our guide; and it is our opinion that the region of the "toes" consists, not only of those members themselves, but of the ball of the foot from whence they spring, and in which their roots (as it were) are found. We conceive that the whole portion of the foot, from the end of the instep on the superior side, or in advance of what is called the hollow below,—i. e., from where the foot meets the ground again after the discontinuance of its pressure in the tread of the heel, and from thence to the end of the toes, to be this region; and thereby to represent the resumed, or complementary kingdom:—thus there is found

* The word used is διαιρεω, to divide—in the sense of "to separate" the constituent parts of a thing (Jones's Lexicon): μετρον (from whence μετρος, the thigh) is also "to divide," but in the sense of "to apportion," "to distribute":—a wonderful exactness of the prophetic language, when it is considered that the thighs are apportionments of the upper bulk of the frame.
an expression in the Image itself for this "division," viz., the hollow. How then do we propose to apportion the parts of this kingdom ("feet" and "toes") in time? It begins with the great Napoleon, who is the heel: the hollow portion—or discontinuance of tread—represents the interregnum of the last forty years: and the ball itself exemplifies the resumption of the tread of empire in Louis Napoleon.

On three occasions we have now found the reign of the two Napoleons described as one or biune, the several signs setting forth with inimitable correspondence and precision the temporary subversion of its throne:—these signs are, the "deadly wound and its healing" (Rev. xiii.)—the "eighth head" who is "of the seven" (Rev. xvii.)—and the present return of the pressure of the foot on the groaning earth. (Dan. ii.)

It may here be observed how great an advantage is gained by taking a combined view of the several prophecies that bear upon a subject. In the "healing of the deadly wound" (Rev. xiii.) there is nothing to forbid the inference that it ensued, either immediately upon its infliction, or at the enormous distance of several centuries—as has been propounded by interpreters. Again, in the "division" mentioned in the chapter before us, there is nothing to correct the idea of its having been brought to pass peaceably in the natural course of things. But the first of these errors is provided against by the very moderate length of the "instep" in Daniel's Image, denoting a "hollow" underneath—i. e., an intervening but short space of time; and the second, by the nature and terms of the parallel figure in St. John. We are inclined to add (if it may not appear too fanciful) that this unity of reign, under a condition of temporary discontinuance, is further symbolized in nature by the heel first, and then the ball, meeting the ground in the walk,—while nevertheless both rest on the same level of time. Let us then be wise in time and learn, that as so many points in the symbolism tend to each other's elucidation, so it is to be expected the impression on the prostrate earth of each portion of the imperial foot, will carry a resemblance to each other, and be equally deep and disastrous.
The attention of the reader is now requested to the configuration of the passage before us (ver. 41-2-3). The words "whereas thou sawest" (ory eides) in verses 41 and 43 denote two occasions, on which the prophet would in succession arrest our attention. We presume the reader is not unacquainted with this contrivance for arresting attention, (it pervades the prophecies)—viz., by means of what authors call "catch-words." In consequence, the verses 41, 42, will constitute the subject of the first occasion. And if we take away from ver. 42 the words that are interpolated—"as," "were," "so,"—(observing that the Greek is without any such aids) it will be apparent enough that verses 41, 42, form a single subject—the latter of these, as well as the former, being under the government of the words "whereas thou sawest" at the beginning. Now this single subject is that of the two Napoleons, whose reigns (we have shown) are viewed as one, but "divided." In ver. 41 the words "feet and toes," express their entire reign; but in ver. 42, the "toes," mentioned alone, point to the latter portion only—Louis Napoleon. And we may here observe, in passing, that this arrangement is seen again in an exact duplicate of this passage in another vision (Dan. xi. 20, 21) relating (remarkable to say) to the same subject, and the same individuals. As ver. 43 presents itself as a separate subject in the construction, and speaks of a time at the present moment altogether future, it would certainly appear that the Napoleonic "kingdom" will not terminate with Louis Napoleon:—nevertheless, as the "stone" is to fall on the feet of the Image, and that "the feet" admits of no change in the level of time, it may be presumed that the times of ver. 43 will follow the present days after no long retardation.

The spirit of prophecy takes no note of battles and bloodshed. As an Eastern hunter, in relating the capture of a lion, would omit to dwell upon his devastations in the neighbourhood—the results of his nature; so Daniel takes no notice of the glorious (!) deeds of the human "beast," treating them as matters of course; but proceeds at once, after noticing the manner of his rising, to the great chronological mark his reign affords—the division of his "kingdom." His
"kingdom" shall be temporarily trodden down (says ver. 41), because of its being based on "iron and clay." The connexion here between the cause and the partial effect is certainly not very apparent; yet does history seem thus far to respond to the prophetic word, that when the military "iron" in 1812 failed of its wonted vigour and victory, there was found in the popular element—even when resting on a picked up staff of legitimacy—no intrinsic strength and stability, no ark of safety—such as legitimacy alone would have afforded, in which to deposit for a while the documents of a fallen monarch's claims:—for instance, the famous "mot" of Talleyrand at the commencement of the retreat from Moscow—"c'est le commencement de la fin," would have been ill applied to the like circumstances of a legitimate monarch. "But there shall be in it of the strength of the iron, forasmuch as (i.e., in like manner as—ου τρωμον) thou sawest the iron mixed with miry clay:"—or (as in the Latin) "Which nevertheless shall spring from a plant of iron," &c.:—or (as in the Greek) "And there shall be in it (subsistence) from the root of iron," &c. As this verse applies to the manner of rising of the Napoleonic dynasty, we are induced to think—combining in a general sense the three versions of it here transcribed—that the description alludes to that most true "plant" and "root" of iron—the great French Revolution, from which the dynasty has sprung: and that the mention of this "plant," in itself a powerful index of time, is intentionally suggestive of the growth it had attained before the dynastic sceptre was fashioned from it.

The 42nd ver. applies entirely to the prophetic "kingdom" of Louis Napoleon. As the region of the "toes" consists (we have said) of the ball, and the toes, it is in the ball, or final tread, that we may contemplate the very days of this individual, but we apprehend it will be—if not in his own days in those of an immediate successor, that the literal "toes" will be developed—the method to be explained hereafter. As used in the text, the word "toes" must be received as including generally (as said above) the times of his prophetic kingdom. The words "partly strong, and partly broken" will, under this view, describe the two states of constitution.
in which, successively, this prophetic kingdom is found,—first, in an united and solid form, as symbolized by the ball of the foot, containing (as it were) the "toes" within itself—a state not yet quite manifested, as Louis Napoleon is not yet become the imperial "Head;" and secondly, in a separated state of its parts, as figured in independent toes. With this agrees what is said of this same power, and these same times, in Rev. xvii. 16, 17; where we read, first, "And the ten horns which thou sawest upon the beast, these shall hate the whore," &c.; where—the horns being in union with the head, the kingdom is "strong;" but afterwards we read that these "horns" give their kingdom (allegiance and power) unto the beast, until (i.e., only until) the words of God shall be fulfilled,"—where the kingdom is "broken." These "horns" (it appears) assume independence,—a fact which is symbolized in the "Image" in the independent shape of the toes. In so far as the words "partly strong and partly broken" relate to the basis of L. Napoleon's headship, they are peculiarly descriptive. In the Latin and Greek the passage is rendered, "Shall be partly solid, and partly crushed"—i.e., pulverized; words which seem to declare a substantial right of inheritance, but to be lifted into the throne in a cloud of dust—the light voice of the people. But looking at the words as descriptive, further, of the general course of this headship, they seem to distinguish between the ever-conquering career of the Antichrist—its founder, and the doom of never-ceasing decline which shall alight on his kingdom on his fall,—coinciding herein with what is elsewhere said in the prophecies:—for while Dan. xi. describes the Antichrist as proceeding with unimpeded success, until he shall have "planted the tabernacles of his palace in the glorious, holy mountain" of God (ver. 45)—where the headship is "strong;" we learn from Dan. vii. 26, that "they (the saints, or saintly nation) shall take away his dominion, to consume and destroy it unto the end:"—"unto the end:"—so that this prophetic kingdom exists, after its founder shall have personally gone into "perdition" (Rev. xvii. 11); and after the "ten horns" shall have withdrawn their allegiance (ib. 17); whereby (as said above) the headship becomes
"broken." The allegiance of the "horns"—it is hence presumable—will be transferred to the saintly nation: of whom, as it is said (ver. 45) that "they shall break in pieces the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold"—this seems to state that they shall bring under subjection all the countries these metals had in the course of ages symbolized.

We are now to investigate the second of the three subjects above-mentioned—the nature and derivation of the "toes." The "toes" are not spoken of as ten in number; but this is unimportant, since "ten," according to the best expositors (Mr. Davison for instance) carries the mark of unbounded fulness, and (as we would further add) increase, rather than of exact number. They are called "kings" (ver. 44), and on this account have been generally regarded as the same kings as the "ten horns" of other visions:—this we are persuaded is a much too hasty conclusion. For "kings" we read "kingdoms,"—first because Grabius gives this reading from the "Codex Alexandrinus;" secondly because in Dan. vii. (17 and 23) the words are used synonymously:—and thus we are relieved from the confusion that would have ensued, if, after pursuing the whole length of the image below the head in the sense of its parts representing "kingdoms," and not personages, we should find it at length to terminate in individual "kings."

As at the present moment history is resting, though as yet only slightly, on the ball of the foot, which contains the hidden springs of the "toes;" the question presents itself—in what manner will the singleness of shape of the present imperial rule be disturbed, and that process of change be effected, from which the prophecy clearly says shall originate a number of independent kingdoms. The mind turns instinctively to ideas of battle and convulsion, to issue in the overthrow of the dominant empire, and the consequent independence of its component parts; but we venture to think, from the analogy of other prophecies, that this grand result may be brought about in another way. Might it not be by the simple overthrow of the Papacy? It has been already pointed out that the tie which in these days binds in one the different members of the Roman empire, is a spiritual tie,—
that the loadstone of their allegiance, the centre of the imperial sacro-secular system, is St. Peter’s chair; and as it will appear in the course of our inquiries that the Papacy is under sentence of no distant doom, it would seem that the springing up of these kingdoms may, not improbably, consist in the loosing of the peculiar fetters of her domination; as if the “toes” of the image, first wrapt together in the place of the tread, were suddenly set free from the cartilages by which their union was secured. This at least seems a more probable view of the future course of things, and to be more in unison with the general expectations of prophecy, than that which would ascribe everything to the vulgar operations of war, to result in an universal readjustment of the present European kingdoms:—though war (we may be sure) will ever be the chief operator of territorial change, so long as the “Beast” reigns. The release from the spiritual tie of union may in some instances be achieved in the fear of God, in the adoption of Protestant principles; in others, in defiance of Him, in lifting up the dirty flag of Infidelity.

It has been shown in several instances that this wondrous image of Gentile civil history, besides serving the purpose of a measure of advancing time, has been fraught with many typical allusions beyond what the simple diversity of its metals would convey. For instance, the “breast” has been viewed as containing the heart, which sends forth the life-blood (true religion) to the whole frame:—and the “belly” as providing the necessary sustenance (laws and organization) for the most distant parts of the body politic. We may fairly ask, then, in what relation do the “legs” stand to the whole figure of man; and in what the “toes?” The legs are the instruments of human progress; and it so happens that an universal expression among men to signify an advance in civilization is—the “progress of mankind.” With the legs we bestride, and (as it were) measure the earth: we walk among the “secret places” of nature, and “subdue” it (Gen. i. 28): and by an universal consent, the “advance of the age” is synonymous with its improved condition and the increase of its useful institutions. Now it is not a little remark-
able that the "legs" of this great image—these instruments of human progress, commence in history with the *imperial establishment* of the Christian religion, *i.e.*, in the middle of the third, or brazen, kingdom, under the imperial *headship*, (as will be presently shown), of Constantine. The movement of the "thighs" in the human gait is not great; but in descending to the lower parts of the leg the same movement becomes rapid, and gradually increases to the very end:—such has been the nature of human progress, in obedience to the impulsions received from Christianity—that indwelling, energizing, and vitalizing principle, without which human progress (it has been abundantly proved) is incapable of being sustained. Is this advance in civilization *ostensibly and visibly* symbolized in the image, in any other way than what we have here described? We answer emphatically—No. There is however an evidence of this advancement which, though not made *symbolically* manifest, meets the eye of our *experience*; it is when we behold "ten," or many, kingdoms—those powerful States of which the present commonwealth of Europe is composed, springing up *within*, and forming the mighty parts of the present Roman empire. The breaking up of the unwieldy empire of ancient Rome into these divers independencies is, of all the signs, and proofs, and means, of expanding civilization the world has ever seen, the most unquestionable. The absolute inability of a single and distant government to meet the craving for social improvement which is natural to man, not less in the provinces than near at home, creates the necessity of local rule. This necessity will first be manifested in local struggles against the ancient tyranny, and in the increasing influence of neighbouring chieftains by whom these struggles have, perhaps, been fomented and protected. Beyond this it is but a short step, if the times are favourable, from the subject state to the tributary, and again from the tributary state to the independent. It is in this manner (*speaking generally*), and from small beginnings of strength such as these, that have sprung the present mighty states of Europe, each rejoicing in a condition of internal prosperity, such as no empire of antiquity ever attained. The rising up of many "kings"
within the imperial boundaries was an object to the
prophet's eye, not unlike the appearance of many children
around the family-table:—happy is Europe when she has
her quiver full of them. It is then in the Christian "legs"
of the image that the progress of mankind is rightfully
symbolized; and it is by the "toes" fixing themselves
independently in the ground, in this progress, that its stability
is secured.

Now, commentators having observed that the "toes" of
the image are called "kings:" and having fixed it as a
certain truth that the last "kingdom" of Daniel,—(to which
indeed they certainly belong, and in which as certainly the
powerful states on which we have been dilating are found)—
is the Roman empire from its earliest days, have conceived
themselves warranted to apply the symbol of the "toes,"
universally, to the kings of this "kingdom:"—that is to
say, the toes are made to apply, as types to antitypes, first
of all to the ancient Gothic settlements which were formed
within the Roman territories, and secondly to the great
European kingdoms which have been formed, and still
remain, within the same borders. We are not wishing to
call attention now to the erroneous limits in time, hereby
assumed, of Daniel's "fourth kingdom:" for when the true
limits are given (its commencement being in Charlemagne)
an objection we are about to advance will remain the same;
—this is, to the very absurd employment of the symbol "toes,"
to the purposes here stated. The whole image of Nebu-
chadnezzar is a consecutive as well as material illustration of all
the then future ages of history,—the "head" being the first
age, the "toes" the last. Were we to speak of the Image as
a printed volume, the "toes" would occupy the last page:—
how exceedingly absurd then is it to make this last page
contain the history of times (those of Charlemagne, for
instance) which would naturally be found at least a hundred
pages earlier! To apply the "toes" thus is precisely the
same outrage upon nature as that which signalizes the
ancient symbol of the Ephesian Diana—a woman covered,
from top to toe, with pendent breasts. Here, instead,
pendent toes would decorate from the middle downwards the great Image of Daniel.

Now we do not consider these "kings"—the early Gothic kingdoms, and the modern European kingdoms—to be altogether unexpressed in the Image,—though certainly not expressed to the eye. "Progress," of which they are the evidence, is proof of some cause internally working, and that cause we call the spirit of Christian freedom. The sinews and hidden powers of the "legs" are put in motion, at the bidding of this unseen impulse;—and we hold that these sinews or hidden powers—these muscular developments, are these Gospel-bearing kingdoms. But is there any reason why the symbolism should represent these "powers" as unseen? We believe there is;—even the same that was just now adverted to—that there has always been in these ages an exterior shell, or surrounding coating, of Government—the sacro-temporal domination of Rome, the bond and badge of the imperial unity. The "toes" in their future independent state will be (as just now said) the evidence of the disruption of this bond, and of the being set free from Rome's withering embrace:—and as independence acquired in any particular generation must always be viewed as springing from a spirit that has been long e'er then at work; so the future independence of the "toes" may be regarded as the ultimate fruit of those internal strivings in the "legs"—those unseen energizing principles of our holy religion, which have been productive already of separate action among their populations, to the extent of asserting an entire freedom in things purely temporal, and of repudiating every connexion among themselves, excepting the single one of the Papal unity. Thus will Christian energy, invisibly working through many generations, result eventually in a complete emancipation, spiritual as well as temporal, in the times of the "toes." This imbedded action may remind us of the decree of Cyrus—the unseen pulsation of the "heart," which has sent down its benefits through all succeeding generations, in the preservation of the favoured nation, and with them of the knowledge of the true God.
It will not perhaps occur to the reader why we should bring forward this—in every sense recondite argument. The reason is essentially bound up with the fundamental principle of prophecy—that all its parts, however diverse the figures used, must be found not only in unison with, but also to corroborate and illustrate, each other. The "toes" of the Image, taken by themselves, being the last of the several consecutive portions of the Image, can do no more than represent the kingly states of a single age; yet may these states have descended from earlier ones by many ages—though not till then existing in a separated condition, but involved within the integuments of Roman rule. This is very conceivable: and if a man, standing upright and moving his toes, will but observe how much the motion results from those unseen springs which run upwards to the top of his thigh, he will not fail to understand the position we take up, that the "toes" (kingdoms) to be exhibited in a now near-approaching future, will owe their origin to a concealed action in the preceding "kingdom" of the "thighs" and "legs." In a future vision—that of the "Beast with seven heads and ten horns" we shall find that the "ten horns" are the very kingdoms from which the "toes" are here asserted to spring; representing them (by their own attachment to a head) in their earlier involved state, when within the bondage of Roman rule.

As we have recognized the formation of independent sovereignties within the predominant empire as the chief means and steps of Christian civilization,—though, being thus enfolded, they can only be regarded in symbolism as hidden promoters and inwardly-working agents of that civilization; it may not be amiss here (though it would be more in place, perhaps, when treating of the "ten horns" of a future vision) to mention how fully the symbolism of "ten kings" (kingdoms) has been vindicated by history. It is not pretended that the number "ten" is exact: but then we are to remember that the sign is not so much in the ten, as in the kings. It was in the days of Constantine—i.e., in the commencement of the Christian "legs" that the barbarians of the North began to descend "in hungry troops" upon the enervated empire. There are two points to be
borne in mind, so far as prophecy is concerned, in respect of these successful invaders, viz., that they all speedily became Christian; and that their chiefs, so far from trampling upon the Roman name, were proud to consider themselves as holding a portion of the imperial authority: *—so that they acknowledged themselves (as we have above described) to be enveloped within the integuments of the "legs;" and there, consequently, to work in the cause of Christian improvement with only an internal energy. The earliest batch of these "kings" is given by Machiavel (we copy from Bishop Newton i. 460) as follows—1. the Ostrogoths in Mœsia, 2. the Visigoths in Panonia, 3. Sueves and Alans in Gascoigne and Spain, 4. the Vandals in Africa, 5. the Franks in France, 6. the Burgundians in Burgundy, 7. the Heruli and Turingi in Italy, 8. the Saxons andAngles in Britain, 9. the Huns in Hungary, 10. the Lombards upon the Danube, afterwards in Italy. In pursuance of a notion—we are persuaded a correct one, that these "ten kings" are ever changing from age to age, Mr. Birks has constructed a valuable table of their different series, as they succeeded each other at intervals of about half a century. Inexact in number, but exact enough, they range continually between nine and thirteen. The following are specimens:—

"About A.D. 568. Four kings in France—of Austrasia, Neustria, Soissons, and Burgundy: to which add the Visigoths, Sueves, Greeks, Lombards, Gepidae, Anglo-Saxons." (Birks i. 150.)

Attention is requested to the following remark—a very curious one indeed when it is considered that Charlemagne is the knee of our Image:—

"Under Pepin and Charlemagne the division became obscured from two causes, the scourge of Saracen invasion,

* "The Roman provincials acknowledged their new rulers (the barbarian chieftains) as holders of Roman imperium, and regarded them as possessed of that absolute power which the Roman emperors had claimed and exercised. The new rulers willingly accepted the acknowledgment of the provincials; and thus, without exchanging their kingly titles for the imperial name, they governed as holding an associated authority within the empire." (Tregelles, 68.)
and the temporary reunion which was necessary for the nominal (quy.) restoration of the Western Empire.” (Ib.)


“A.D. 1600. Austria, Venice, France, England?—Scotland?—Hungary, Spain, Naples, Portugal, Switzerland?—Savoy, Tuscany, Holland?—Total 7 to 11.”

“A.D. 1700. Austria, Venice, France, Britain?—Spain and Naples, Portugal, Hungary, Switzerland?—Hungary?—Holland?—Total, 7 to 12.”

In these lists it will be observed that the author affixes a mark of doubt to some of the kingdoms, especially those affected by the Reformation:—he does rightly, for to be beyond the reach of Rome is to be no longer of the “beast.” Omitting these, the remaining “kings” (states)—tied to the stake of Roman servitude, could not possibly be regarded as independent “toes.” After them come the ephemeral kings of Buonaparte’s making, which adhere in a remarkable manner to the predicted number,—but of these more in a future vision. The “kings” of what we have called the “interregnum,” and which still continue, are to be thus enumerated:—

“A.D. 1816. Austria, Bavaria, Wirtemberg?—Naples, Tuscany, Sardinia, Lombardy?—France, Belgium, Spain, Portugal, Britain?—Switzerland?—Total 9 to 13.”

These kingdoms, excepting always the “reformed,” constitute Rome’s present land of enchantment:—but it is during either the career or the dynasty of Louis Napoleon,
that they will effect their freedom, and be seen in undivided sovereignty.

Of the continual strivings of the "toes" for an independent existence, the late years of peace have been prolific of examples:—they have occurred in Spain, Portugal, Rome, Naples, Lombardy, Hungary, several parts of Germany, Belgium, France,—more than half the countries of Europe; but the time was not come. These strivings (it will be said) have been in the pursuit of secular, not spiritual, freedom:—true!—but the high-pressure valve upon their aspirations has always been (is it too much to say, always?—we think not) the sacro-secular tyranny which, commencing with the imperial establishment of Christianity, and gathering strength in all after-ages, still distinguishes the rule of "holy" Rome.

Such then we believe to be the right explanation of that famous symbol—the "toes" of the Image:—they are kingly states which will hereafter, independently, follow in the footsteps of the Roman Antichrist, "until" the day of his perdition:—they will constitute his "strength," and as "toes" sustain his steps, though, perhaps, not subjected to him. In aid of which last idea it may be mentioned, that the right reading of Rev. xvii. 16 appears to be "And the ten horns which thou sawest, and the beast" (not "upon" the beast—as in our version)—ascribing independence to the "horns," even whilst under the "beast's" banners. A writer on Prophecy, if he would avoid the charge of rashness, will wish to distinguish between what may be called his positive, and what his speculative, opinions. The positive opinion of the writer on the subject before us is, that the "toes" specifically noticed in the Image, are not yet come: his speculative opinion—that he has nevertheless traced the circumstances of their natural growth, and ultimate manifestation. However, he should scarcely have indulged in this speculation, were he not prepared to transfer it in due time, as evidence accumulates, to the positive side.

We are now to encounter the third and last difficulty presented in these verses—the "mingling with the seed
of men:” it is found in the verse which, also, we have found to be wholly future. It is not here said “the seed of Ephraim”—a favoured tribe; nor “the seed of Israel”—a favoured nation; nor “the seed of the righteous;” but “the seed of men”—the children of the degenerate, unsanctified family of man. This is the simple explication of the passage which, after much reflection, the writer rests in. He has been alive to the commendable researches, and entertaining illustrations supplied from history, in support of the view ordinarily taken of these words; which imagines them to allude to “royal marriages,” and the international ties thence arising. (Vid. Birks i. 116.) There is certainly no other feature so remarkable in the history of modern Europe, as the territorial and political results that have attended these marriages. In all states of the Roman world, and in every age of modern times, these alliances have been the traditionary means with statesmen, whether for extending their confines or improving their internal security; and not a single country can be named of Christendom the boundaries of which have not been much modified by this nuptial device of the political science. Through its operation the reigning houses of Europe have come to be regarded as a separate portion of the human race, created to be the perennial springs of Government; and mankind have judged well in this—that if to rule is Elysian bliss, they only who have been born in Elysium can be safely trusted with the enjoyment. We are convinced that this theory will not stand examination. Indeed these “royal marriages” are involved in the explanation we have ventured to give of the symbolic “iron,” as referring in a secondary sense to the principle of “legitimacy”—a principle ever foolishly and unnecessarily seeking strength in the international marriage. There are three stages mentioned of governmental decline in the “kingdom of iron:”—the first is the change to “iron” from another metal, alluding to a fixed acknowledgment of the claim of legitimacy in rulers: the second is the mixture of “clay” with the “iron,” which (as the clay is spoken of as superior potter’s clay) seems to allude to the increasing influence of the educated middle-classes, giving rise to con-
stitutional Governments: the third is the descent to "the seed of men"—the power of the rabble. We may be persuaded that this last expression refers to those the farthest removed from princes and princesses in the social scale—the profane multitude, who, regarded as the ultimate depositaries of supreme power, are thus named in scorn.

The forty-third verse concludes the description of the great Image; and it is presumable that, if the general tenor of that description has been to mark a certain progress of deterioration in the successive dominant "kingdoms," whether in the form and principles of their Government (as we have supposed) or in any other attribute or quality of the social state (and of this there can be no doubt)—it is presumable (we say) that some general contrast would be discernible between the beginning and end of the description,—a climax of the evil in progress—a particular point of deterioration to contrast the most forcibly with the "head of gold." "Thou art this head of gold" is the starting point of the prophet's elucidation; and from thence the change proceeds, ever for the worse, until we arrive at—what?—Royal marriages?—Absurd! We should look for something more suitable as a contrast to the individuality and autocracy of Nebuchadnezzar—the Head; it is the many toes of the Image, who—in relation to the prevailing source of government in their times—are called multitudinously the "seed of men;" an expression synonymous in meaning with "Vox populi."

It is not to be overlooked that in this 43rd verse, the mixture of "iron and clay" is spoken of as an abstract fact—"whereas thou sawest iron mixed with miry clay." And the consequence—"they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men"—seems to say, that the two anterior principles or parties—the legitimists and the constitutionists—shall, in the progress of change and competition for ascendancy, alike resort to this third party or principle—the universal suffrage of the people; and that this will be the miserable path conducting to absolute democracy—the most degraded and hateful of all forms of human governments. Hither (the prophecy seems to say) things shall gradually tend, and
ultimately arrive. The blind and heedless multitude—\textit{the mere "spawn of men"}—shall be appealed to as the \textit{true source} of power; although the Most High has said that \textit{He "ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will."} The "voice of the people" shall be invoked as the "voice of God," as well by the "iron" as the "clay"—as well by the well-drilled military in defence of legitimacy, as by the cultivated, constitution-seeking classes. But the restlessness of the social state shall not abate; the struggle shall grow fiercer and fiercer between decrepit tyranny and youthful insolence; the horrible notion shall gain ground that human legislation—aye, even that incipient legislation the education of our youth—has no rightful connexion with spiritual concerns; the Cerberian cry of Infidels, Freethinkers, and Laodiceans (Rev. iii. 15) shall join in trilingual discord with the noisy shreds of mankind; until, in the end of days, the much-vaunted science of legislation—science without religion, and legislation without heed to the order of things established by the Great Supreme—shall be brought to a point of depression, which lands it (like the \textit{sole of the foot} which joins the \textit{dust}) not in the \textit{clay} but the "mire" of our race.

A fulfilment—perhaps the most complete for some time to be expected of this predicted condition, has already been seen in the leading kingdom of the "beast," in the re-erection of the idol of universal suffrage—the restored \textit{self} of Napoleon. The "voice of the people" has been declared with all imaginable pomp, and before the sun, to be the "voice of God." (Mem. 10. May, 1852.) The idol erected—measuring (as we shall see by and bye) "sixty by six," as on the plain of Dura (Dan. iii. 1)—stands on the suffrages of \textit{six millions} of people; these multitudinous suffrages having served as stones to raise the cairn of extinguished liberty, and this cairn serving as a pedestal for the image of despotic power they have set up. This image is destined to attract (if we are not much mistaken)—like its prototype on the plain of Dura, the "worship of all nations;" that is (as we understand the words) the admiration and the \textit{service} of all the nations subjected, as well of old as now, to imperial Rome. As to the continuance of this present "kingdom" of the "feet and
toes"—even yet incomplete in its constitution, we may be sure that the Image will not deceive us; and if it has been truly shown that the first portion of the entire "kingdom"—the "legs of iron," is the measure of a thousand years, it would be a complete desertion of the principle we have evoked of proportion to imagine, that the "feet and toes"—measuring in height from the ankle to the ground (the measure of the whole Image being obviously the perpendicular height from the head to the heel)—shall endure yet many years; or that any great length of time will intervene before the "stone"—the power that is destined to crush them, will begin to give evidence of its wondrous calling.

The great imperial Image, which we have now examined downwards to its base of clay—declaring as it professes to do the predestined course of human history, seems yet more intended as a standing protest against the pride of men, by exhibiting the effect of his fall upon the most noble of his endowments—the one in which he most resembles his Creator—the faculty of rule, requiring above all others the aids of intelligence, wisdom, and charity. To rule over the new earth, to turn its laws and properties to his own use, and bring all living things under subjection, was the original purpose of man's creation: an important addition to which high prerogative, resulting from his fall—the most transcendent portion of the gift, though such its origin—is this, that he is called to hold rule over his fellow man. It was for these ends generally that his excellent faculties intellectual and moral were imparted, and for the latter end specially were the different orders and degrees of men instituted. There are but few of human kind so low as not to participate in some degree in the privilege of rule—even be it of no higher sort than the regulation of their cottages and families; and thus all are able to form a judgment upon the value of those primary principles and affections which are at the foundation of all good government, whether it be of a kingdom or a humble cabin. It is on this account, we presume, and with a view to an appeal to all who exercise their thoughts on the moral destinies of our race, that the prophet resorts (ver. 38) to a notice of the original position of man.
upon the earth, as "ruler over the beasts of the field, and the fowls of the heaven." He would impress upon all an ever-mindful consideration of first principles, as exemplified in that sense of solicitude for the welfare of the creatures which dominion over them inspires, which we all experience, and which has ever maintained itself in remarkable vigour among the sons of men. And he seems further to state, that as the rule of man over the creatures, and his advantage from them, are much abridged by the obscuration of his own faculties by the fall, so the rule awarded him over his fellow-man shall, through neglect of the fundamental maxims suggested by nature, be brought into contempt; and that which was intended for his greater good in his present state of being become, through an inevitable necessity impressed on transgression, the means of his greater fall. Certainly the symbolism of the vision is not intended to pronounce on the comparative merits of forms of government; excepting (it may be) as regards their tendencies, severally, to keep alive among the ruling classes the sense we have alluded to. And hence the inference seems to follow, that in proportion as any single country shall be distinguished by the.unselfish and paternal views of these classes, so shall it rise to ascendency among the nations; and that herein, under Providence, is the origin of the "stone."

It cannot be doubted that the absolute monarch, whose position is above the reach of constitutional changes, and who is conscious of being born to reign, offers the best promise of an abiding adherence to nature's moral laws:—there are no fears of rivalry to cloud the serenity of his judgment, no harassing prospect of the day of retirement to raise his cupidity; and thus, at the least, his moral and intellectual aspirations are in "golden" harmony. It is this purity of position, rather than of personal character, which seems to be commended in king Nebuchadnezzar. The "silver" reign that followed beheld, in the flashing eye and quivering lips of aristocracy, the evidences of gallling ambition and factious hate—bringing into view as a dominant motive the lust of personal and family aggrandizement. The reign of "brass" took for its maxim that the good of man-
kind at large was involved in the glory of one centrical and
ever-enlarging power; which invited the conquered every-
where into the fellowship of citizens, bestowing upon them
even princely privileges. The reign of “iron” has been
recognised, firstly, in the long wars of neighbouring nations,
all advancing rapidly and equally in civilization, and seeking
to secure each its own ascendency by the establishment of
that of its reigning house; and secondly, when mixed with
clay, in the intestine strife of classes, all demanding a share
in the administration of public affairs. It is a trite saying
that a corporation is always dishonest:—the individual will
condescend to act as one of a body, where the blame spread-
ing over a large surface becomes light to bear, which as
a private person he would not venture upon:—and such in
its working is the spirit of shameless democracy. Thus in
every successive stage of descent, in unison with the enlarge-
ment of the basis of power, the prophecy seems to contem-
plate an increase of self-seeking and of personal corruption;
so that the predicted decline in purity of human govern-
ment may be measured by the number of those concerned in
its administration.

We have now traced to its predicted issue the gift of
imperial rule committed to the Gentile world. Like as the
blood circulating from the heart loses ever more and more its
arterial brightness, and assumes the vitiated venous hue; so
the stream of Gentile rule, extending from the fountain of
its original purity as appointed by God—the seat of the
“Chaldean excellency,” has been found to make its way
under a continual process of deterioration through all suc-
ceeding ages. And thus too has the decree of fourfold
empire, pronounced first at Babylon, and conveyed on the
harp of Prophecy in the notes of seven harmonious strings,
been carried out in seven responsive notes of human history;
and in an “eighth,” the appropriate octave-note of the first,
of despotism. King Nebuchadnezzar, falling from the first
principles of holy fear and speaking as God, calls the nations
to the worship of an Image “sixty cubits high”; in
note responsive the tyrannical “six million,”—assuming to
speak as God in the appointment of sovereignty (“Vox
populi vox Dei'')—call to the worship of the similar idol they have set up. (2 Thess. ii. 4.)

On the kingdom of the "Stone," and of the "Mountain" into which it grows (ver. 44 et seq.), the student of Prophecy will know that it is no new thing to imagine an emblem of this sort invested with a double signification; and while directing our view mystically to the true Church of Christ, to signify also the country chosen to be her exponent—the country which most embodies in its public acts her principles, and to whom the defence of her truth seems to be committed. It is observable that this "kingdom" does not spring up subsequently to, but during, the times of the "kingdoms" of the Image; for it is written, "In the days of these kings (kingdoms) shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom."* What then is the original "mountain" (politico-ecclesiastical power) out of which the providence of God (acting "without hands" of man) cuts the "stone;" which the stone displaces; and the base of which it more than occupies? In that the "Stone" alludes primarily to the Lord Christ and His true Church, it is extremely significant that the Stone was really in the mountain. We doubt not that the first manifestation of this rising "kingdom" was in the Great Reformation,—its corner stone "Christ our righteousness" being taken from out the "ruinous heaps" of Rome's fraudulent empire; and that from that glorious era the future historian will date alike the ever-increasing ascendency of its spiritual principles, and its secular rule; each putting forth its energies in mutual help of each other, and making progress according to the measure of the Divine will. There is something remarkable in the choice of this symbol—the "Stone," to designate this rising power:—may it not remind us of the famous declaration of our Lord, "Thou art Peter (i.e., the Stone—what other than the stone of this prophecy?) and upon this rock I will build my church." Of the Church thus spoken of, we may be quite sure it was the same as the one spoken of by Daniel; for Daniel says of his—that "it

* If the expression "these kings" alludes to the "ten toes" (and so it seems to read)—it must certainly be in their involved—their not yet manifested state.
shall break in pieces and consume" its predecessors, and "shall stand for ever"; and our Lord of His—that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it;" which is equivalent to saying that it shall never be broken, and shall **stand for ever**. There must ever be in this material world a visible exponent—a definite exemplar, of any spiritual system that rises within it;—it is in this light we regard our favoured nation at the present time; believing—although the Reformation belongs far from exclusively to her—that the Lord has yet elected her especially to be its Image and evidence, and to be also the "right hand of His power." But let us not be high-minded on this account. The following note on 1 Cor. vi. 1, as found in "Mant's Bible"—to the effect that there is a positive and a comparative sanctity of a people, describes the point of view in which it would be wise to regard our country. "The heathen are called 'unjust,' or 'unrighteous,' in the same sense that Christians are called 'saints,' or 'holy.' For as the latter were called 'saints' on account, not of the real sanctity of their manners, but of their **professed faith**; so the former were called 'unrighteous,' on account of their **idolatry and unbelief** (ver. 6), although many of them were remarkable for their regard to justice, and to all the duties of morality." It is in this sense that England may be supposed just now to be placed in contrast with the rest of professing Christendom; and that on her—notwithstanding her manifold national derelictions—may be pronounced, and in the like sense, the words once used on a solemn occasion of old, "He hath not beheld iniquity in Jacob, neither hath He seen perverseness in Israel."

---

**DANIEL CAP. VII.**

In the seventh chapter of Daniel, as well as in the second, are presented the outlines of four "kingdoms;" and for the reason that the design is from the same pencil, and that the same future ages of the world are apparently portrayed in
each, it has been taken for granted that the same series of kingdoms is alluded to in both visions: but this the writer ventures to believe is a great mistake. Each vision, though closely connected with the other, has dimensions peculiar to itself, and requires to be examined on its own ground. It is his belief, that no two visions in prophecy are designed more nearly to coincide with each other, than do a series of prints intended to illustrate the several stages of one historical subject; which usually, and of necessity, interchange material one with another, giving and taking in turn. The account of the vision is as follows:—

(Ver. 2.) "I saw in my vision by night, and, behold, the four winds of the heaven strove upon the great sea. (3.) And four great beasts came up from the sea, diverse one from another. (4.) The first was like a lion, and had eagle's wings: I beheld till the wings thereof were plucked, and it was lifted up from the earth, and made stand upon the feet as a man, and a man's heart was given to it. (5.) And behold another beast, a second, like to a bear, and it raised itself on one side, and it had three ribs in the mouth of it between the teeth of it: and they said thus unto it, Arise, devour much flesh. (6.) After this I beheld, and lo, another, like a leopard, which had upon the back of it four wings of a fowl; the beast had also four heads; and dominion was given to it. (7.) After this I saw in the night visions, and behold a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth: it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it: and it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it; and it had ten horns. (8.) I considered the horns, and, behold, there came up among them another little horn," &c. &c.

It is to be observed of this vision, that it consists of "four beasts," (i. e., "kingdoms") having seven heads among them; and we shall consequently pursue the same path of investigation as hitherto, by examining the "seven" rather than the "four." And we would ask, why—even putting aside the ground of analogy, and confining the view to this single vision—why should we not do so, if found convenient? Commentators have been able, it is true, with a glance of thought, to number four chief historical kingdoms; and content herewith, have not deemed it worth while to notice—what is equally placed before them—a much more convenient, because a larger number, viz., seven heads of kingdoms, as a means of measuring the vast expanse of ages to which the
kingdoms and the heads alike appertain. This omission has served to veil a future which was not intended to be thus unknown. But further, in St. John's Revelation (chap. xiii.) mention is made of a beast with "seven heads;" and it is beyond a doubt, from internal evidence, that this one beast with seven heads is a corresponding vision to Daniel's four beasts with seven heads:—in other words, Daniel's four kingdoms have become one in the later prophecy, while in each the "heads" remain seven. And how can this be?—It is that the first number, whether it be "four" or "one," is but a platform of action: but the "seven" are the active agencies employed, and claim to be considered separately;—proof that the "seven" is the more important number in the framing, and therefore in the investigation, of these mysteries.

Let us proceed. As Daniel lay upon his bed, he beheld "the four winds of the heaven strive upon the great sea: And four great beasts came up from the sea, diverse one from another." The "four" and the "four," in these sentences may fairly be assumed to have a relation to each other: and as it is but a phrase to speak of "four winds," as if there were not many more; so the "four beasts" (or "kingdoms") must be taken to represent the numerous kingdoms that should arise in the world. Furthermore, as these "winds" and "kingdoms" stand to each other in the relation of cause and effect—an universal cause producing an universal effect, we may learn from the passage that an innumerable host of spirits—agents of the "prince of the power of the air," are ever "striving" and contending for the direction of human affairs; and that in proportion as they are permitted to act on the "great sea"—the turbulent masses of the nations, certain centres of human dominion—to be symbolized only as "beasts" who have no knowledge of God, and are intent only on present good—are the results of their malevolent agency. These "beasts" are four in number; and although in this respect they have an universal reference (for "four" signifies universality) they are not the less really "four"—i.e., as "great" beasts. It is the peculiar attribute of divine symbolism to be at once repre-
sentative and real,—to be allegorical in its views, and yet to be life and fact. The flood of Noah, if it typified the death that had supervened on the soul of man, and its regeneration in baptism, did so by that which was a real destruction, and a real restoration of the earth's fecundity. The spiritual meaning involved in the fall of the walls of Jericho, was conveyed by no pretended and dramatic fall. In like manner these "four kingdoms," challenging attention by their particular number, and gathering within their typical enclosure as well the empires of Mexico and Japan as any other, do, nevertheless, in an especial manner refer to four particular "great" and dominant kingdoms, representative of all others that should in the same ages rise and fall:—these we believe to be the Medo-Persian, the Grecian, the Roman, and the Holy-Roman empires.

The vision of this chapter was not seen until the year 555 B.C.,—not less than fifty years after the dream of the Image, and in a different reign; and less than twenty years before the Chaldean power was overthrown. There can be no hesitation therefore in pronouncing that the first monarchy alluded to is not the Babylonian, as generally supposed, but the one that followed it—the Medo-Persian. It is not to be imagined that the Babylonian monarchy, so soon to fall, could be included in that which professes to be a prophetic statement:—but the notion is rendered altogether untenable by the declaration of Daniel himself (ver. 3), that he "beheld" the four beasts "come up from the sea." How was he to behold this sight in its commencement, when, under the supposition of the Babylonian empire being intended, that commencement had taken place some fifty or sixty years before! An expression also of the Divine interpreter (ver. 17) further upsets this opinion;—he says that these are four kings "which shall arise": and it seems to the writer that the reason suggested for this future tense by some commentators—that it is the manner of prophecy, can only be viewed as a slippery stepping-stone to a convenient conclusion. Furthermore, the symbol of a wild-beast precludes the possibility of Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom being had in view among the four, as the term marks degradation among
animals; whereas, in the "Image," he was "the head of gold"—a metal pre-eminent for purity. In fine, these four "beasts" ("kingdoms") must range alongside the "inferior" kingdoms of the Image—those of silver, brass, and iron, four against three.

And let us observe that the number four in this place, though consisting of three only of the former series, is—equally with the four of that series—convertible into seven. This is a very important consideration, as it shows that, in the investigation of Prophecy, the constructive number seven must ever be consulted, independently of any opposite suggestion of history. Indeed we are persuaded that had Moses, nearly a thousand years before Daniel, seen the great Image of the ages, in his day future, the Image would equally have consisted of seven in its parts, requiring only a different particularization. It is from having commenced wrongly the series of kingdoms, that interpretations the most forced and absurd have been put forth by (begging pardon) even the most esteemed of our interpreters:—see (for instance) Bishop Newton on this subject. Moreover, no scheme can be valid which is not able to offer a minute explanation of every point.

The first of these powers (says the prophet—ver. 4), "was like a lion, and had eagle's wings: I beheld till the wings thereof were plucked, and it was lifted up from the earth, and made stand upon the feet as a man, and a man's heart was given to it." Observe, that Daniel "beheld till" a certain change took place; indicating that the change had not been fully effected until some time after the first appearance of the vision; and then in a sort of dissolving view. This (as we shall see) helps marvellously in the explanation.

Now, however true it is that the "Babylonian lion" is a well-recognised emblem, it is equally so that the "Lion" has always been, and to this day is, the symbol of Persia: the "Lion and Sun," the present device of that kingdom, would not be an inapt illustration of the emblem of Daniel, "a lion with eagle's wings." Not that the eagle is synonymous with the Sun in this imagery: we conceive it rather alludes to the mountainous country of Media; the symbol so
signifying the comparatively *sandy* region of Persia, with the pleasing annexation to it of the *refreshing hills* of the Median kingdom. Daniel beheld, "till the wings thereof were plucked." The first sovereign of the rising Medo-Persian dynasty was Darius the Mede, who occupied the throne only two years; and as it was his nephew Cyrus, the Persian, who had overthrown the kingdom of Babylon—acting under and for his uncle, it was by virtue of Persian prowess that the Mede held the kingdom; who thus—sitting on a throne Persian by right, became the veritable "lion with eagle's wings." During the two years of Darius, the father of Cyrus died; and this chieftain, thus succeeding to his uncle's throne, became the real founder of the Persian as distinguished from the Medo-Persian dynasty—the latter being absorbed into the former. Thus were the eagle's wings of Media pluckt from off the lion of Persia:—that is to say, Persia no longer *made pretence* in her heraldic bearings of her acquisition of the inferior province, and the eagle's wings were discontinued on the national symbol. As an illustration of this, we might imagine, on the annexation of Wales by her stronger neighbour, that a leek—as an emblem of the principality, would be for a time exhibited between the lion's ears of England; but would be afterwards discontinued, as being the memorial of too insignificant a power. This figure has a sort of counterpart in Daniel's vision of "the Ram and He goat" (chap. viii.), where by the Ram is intended the Persian monarch,—it is said, "one horn was higher than the other, and the higher came up last."

This Persian beast "was lifted up from the earth, and made stand upon the feet as a man, and a man's heart was given to it." We believe these mystical words to relate to the call of God to Cyrus (Is. xliv. 28) to restore the liberty of His chosen people; and the explanation to be as follows. In the established order of creation, man, by being made ruler over the inferior animals—beasts, and creeping things, and feathered fowls—became the *mediatorial link* between God and them. Inferior creatures render no *service* to God, as they are incapable of that will, on the exercise of which service depends: but service was to be the natural fruit
of man's intellectual and mediatorial position. Now man, by his fall, was reduced to the level of the beasts, the subjects of his own government: nothing remained to elevate him, morally, above the lower animals, or to claim for him from his Maker a superior regard. Equally with them, he thenceforward stood in need of the offices of some mediatorial Being, to bring him under the notice of the Great Supreme, who, in this regard, makes no distinction between those who are by nature low, and those who have fallen to a low estate: for (to speak in accordance with the figure under review) man had ceased to be of God's intelligent creation, and was numbered among the brutes. In what manner the infinite distance and alienation of man from God has been filled up and provided for, we, the inheritors of Christ's redemption, know:—we know that in Christ, and in Him alone—the second Adam, man is restored to his original position in the scale of creation,—that is, he rises again above the "beasts that perish;" and above all, is established in the power of doing God service—the distinguishing faculty he had forfeited. This view of the doctrine of a necessary gradation is aptly set forth in the institution of a Priesthood, both before and after the day of Christ. Emotionally, mankind at large are accounted still as of the lower races; and the Priesthood as occupying the true mediatorial place of "Man" in the creation—the true position of service. Personating the second Adam—the only real Mediator, this intermediate class serves in His absence to keep alive the recollection, that a mediatorial link is necessary between fallen man and his Maker; and that, without such link, he is as the lower creatures, incapable of good. As then the priesthood outwardly and emblematically sets forth the restored mediatorial position of "man," and his special appointment to God's service on earth; so most truly, and without any mystery, it may be affirmed that every one is called to the priestly state—to a state above that which he had inherited from nature, who is called in any way to the special service of God:—he rises from the level of the "beasts," where his brethren in the aggregate are still viewed as being, to the original higher level of the family of "man."
Thus then we may understand that Cyrus, when called to
the special service of the Most High, rose (speaking in
unison with the vision) to a higher state of being; was no
longer a "beast," incapable of will and service; became a
link between the bestial state he left and the Deity; became
"a man." By being called to re-establish the worship of the
true God at Jerusalem, he "was lifted up from the earth" of
his fallen condition; he "was made stand on his feet as
a man," carrying his countenance high towards heaven in the
attitude of service and of praise. Furthermore, by acknow-
ledging that the God of Israel had given him his kingdom—
instead of, as Nebuchadnezzar, pretending that his own
might had gained it him, he gave evidence that "a man's
heart was given him." There seems to be a peculiar force in
the expression "it (the Beast) was lifted up from the earth,
and made stand"; as if, before being so "lifted," he
had been grovelling in the lowest depths of the bestial
condition,—as, for instance, when king Darius cast the
righteous prophet into the den of lions: from which low
condition he was, in Cyrus, "lifted" on his "feet"—the
proper attitude of a willing service.

The second of the "Beasts" (Dan. vii. 5) "was like to a
bear, and it raised up itself on one side, and it had three ribs
in the mouth of it between the teeth of it: and they said
thus unto it, Arise, devour much flesh." This is the Mac-
donian empire. It "raised up itself on one side," inasmuch
as the career of its founder was altogether in an Eastern
direction—"on one side" of Macedon, where the beast first
"raised itself" from the ground.* It is in conformity with
the commission to "devour much flesh," that this beast is
represented with "three ribs in the mouth of it, between
the teeth of it." They who regard this curious description
as of the Medo-Persian beast, attempt to decipher it by
supposing that it points to the three countries, Babylonia,

* In an ornamental temple in the grounds of Stourhead there is a bust
of Alexander—a beautiful copy from an antique:—it has the head lying
in a marked manner over the right shoulder—a very curious comment on
the expression before us; as the face must be "raised up on one side"
to produce this singularity of attitude.
Media, and Persia, of which it became possessed. This truly suicidal feat of seizing its own ribs with its teeth (for Media and Persia belonged to its natural constitution) the love of flesh will scarcely account for. Ribs constitute the store house of an animal; and apply fitly to the great commercial entrepots of the age: and when we call to mind Alexander's famous sieges of Damascus, Tyre, and Gaza,—not to speak of his subjugation of Egypt; and all this before proceeding Eastward with the ribs in his mouth as commissariat stores, we cannot but be satisfied of the suitableness of the imagery to the career of that atrocious conqueror; who further gave all due evidence of his intense love of flesh, by crucifying along the sea shore, two thousand Tyrian prisoners in one day. The bear, his prototype, overcomes his victims by disembowelling them; that is—in respect of these emporiums of wealth—by clearing out the place of their intestinal habitations, in search of the solid wealth which might assist in his future march of conquest. As regards the likeness of Alexander to the "bear"—an important distinction of which among beasts of prey is his roughness, it should not be overlooked that, in the eighth chapter of Daniel, where the Macedonian figures in the first recital of the vision as a "he-goat," he is in verse 21 called the "rough goat."

After this, Daniel sees (ver. 6) "another beast, like a leopard; which had upon the back of it four wings of a fowl; the beast had also four heads; and dominion was given to it." The Leopard is the Roman empire—an elegant likeness, describing by its numerous spots of every shade the numerous countries of every degree of civilization it brought within its borders. "Upon the back of it,"—i. e., upon its highest part—its supreme estate, it had "four wings of a fowl." The wings of a fowl are serviceable to the bird only to take him from the ground to his perch, and from one perch to another: accordingly, the seat of government, during the many centuries of this beast's continuance, is found in divers localities. But first let us give attention to the fact, that "the beast had four heads." The first and second Heads of the whole series of seven have been recognised as Cyrus and Alexander; who then are the third,
fourth, fifth, and sixth—the heads of the leopard? We conceive them to be (subject to revision) Augustus, Constantine, Justinian, and Charlemagne—all founders of empire. The period thus comprised in the "leopard" is just eight hundred years: and we would ask—is it possible to imagine a more elegant method of describing by symbol the continual conflict of interests, and the ever-recurring seizure of the diadem, which resulted from the elective sovereignty of that martial people,—the sovereignty being often divided among several "heads," and they recommended only by their successes in distant wars—than by referring, first, to the numerous originators of imperial rule ("four heads"), and secondly, to the distinct seats of their sovereignty ("four" perches). It is indeed an inevitable result of the constant changes of dynasty in such an empire, that they should lead to corresponding changes of the chief seat of government; and we find it accordingly—at one time at Rome, at another at Constantinople, at another at Ravenna, and lastly at Aix-la-Chapelle.

The number "four" is clearly in this "kingdom" employed figuratively, and denotes a fulness of the changes referred to:—though (as said before) the prophetic imagery is never left to wither in mystic barrenness; but has, here as elsewhere, its counterpart in fact. Other founders of empire—Dioclesian, for instance, and particularly Theodoric—might have been cited, but "four" were sufficient: other capitals also—such as Nicomedia, Milan, &c., but they would only have encumbered the imagery. To make any comment upon the emphatic distinction, "dominion was given to it," ascribed to this beast above all others,—and whereby it is seen to correspond with the brassen kingdom of the former vision, which was to "bear rule over all the earth" (chap. ii. 39) were surely superfluous:—the same were to be the boundaries "orbis et urbis,"—such was to be the rule of that city "toti qui præsidet orbi."

After this, Daniel "saw in the night visions, and behold a fourth beast, dreadful, and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth: it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it: and it was
diverse from all the beasts that were before it; and it had ten horns." (Dan. vii. 7.) It may not be amiss to observe, in passing, upon the word "visions," as showing that these "beasts" were not all seen at once:—the reason seems to be, that existing in the future, they did not present that unbroken aspect which is the characteristic, in the mind's eye, of past history. This beast with "iron teeth" brings us again into the age of "iron," and modern times. The measure of this age is to be taken from Charlemagne in A.D. 800 and continues to, and beyond, the present time:—its head, or representative, is the great Napoleon. As Charlemagne in this vision is a head of the "leopard," he has of course, in that capacity, no "kingdom" in time descending from him; and as all the ages after him belong indubitably to the "iron" kingdom, it is necessary that this kingdom (excepting so far as the Frankish conqueror presided at its initiation) should find its representative or Head at a later date:—it can be none other (we repeat) than Napoleon. Let this scheme, which is somewhat startling, be received for the present with indulgence. We are now in a very difficult passage of the book of prophecy, and must draw largely upon that faculty to which all prophecy is addressed—the reader's imagination.

The "Image" of Nebuchadnezzar is the standard of measure and reference of all the prophecies which speak of the civil history of the Gentile world. Now it is an essential element of interpretation that the several visions of Daniel be regarded as reflecting light one upon another; so that a point left in obscurity in one vision may even become a salient object in another scene. It will even happen—so interlaced is the information they severally present—that the ideas raised by one set of symbols are oftentimes to be expressed only in the language of another set; for instance, although we have nothing more to do at present with kingdoms of silver, brass, and iron—as such, it must not be a matter of surprise to find the prophetic spirit borrowing expressions from them for the purposes of illustration:—it is in this view we propose to consider a short but very remarkable expression in the chapter before us, which runs thus—
"whose teeth were of iron, and his nails of brass" (ver. 19). An extensive retrospect upon the great "Image" will be necessary for the full understanding of this expression.

In the "Image," the seven stages of time were apportioned as follows:—the first was the "head"—the Babylonish king; the second and third were the Persian and Grecian empires, in the Eastern but somewhat more Westward parts of the world; the fourth and fifth were the Roman empire, diverging in its second era into two great branches, occupying the centre of the prophetic earth; the sixth and seventh were the "Holy Roman empire" in two distinct divisions, established in the farthest West. Now, in taking a general survey of the Image, although it is apparent—both from its general appearance and the terms of the prophecy—that special points of time are not alluded to, but rather, in a general manner, the progress and changes of imperial rule; yet that there is one exception in the case of the knee; which, presenting itself in the front aspect of the human figure as a place of division—a sort of barrier moving on a hinge, seems to indicate, that its antitype in time must be some well-defined point—some corresponding joint in human history. This joint we imagine to be the career, and this point of time the celebrated coronation, of Charlemagne. It has already been mentioned how exceedingly important a spot in the domain of history this emperor occupies. By the common statement of historians, he stands at the entrance of modern times; and consequently (we may add) as a closing door upon the ancient world. Let it be borne in mind, that it is of the nature of such a door, or barrier, to partake on either side of the character of things adjacent to it:—a drawing-room door, e. g., will be on one side white and gold, corresponding with the furniture within; and on the other side of a darker colour, corresponding with that of the hall. In conformity herewith, Charlemagne will partake in character of both the ages he serves to divide. Now, in the structure of the knee, three parts are observable;—first, that which appertains to the thigh-bone; secondly, the cap of the knee; thirdly, the top of the shin-bone; and these represent, severally, in the life of Charlemagne—first, that portion of
his career which belongs to the "thigh" or "kingdom of brass," comprising all his active years, and all his conquests; secondly, his coronation; thirdly, the short portion of his life which succeeded that event, initiating "the kingdom of iron." It is seen then, that Charlemagne, the restorer of the Western empire, which had been in abeyance for more than three centuries—ever since the deposition of Augustulus by Odoacer, belongs equally, as represented by the knee of the Image, to the old and the new Roman empires:—that is, to the "kingdom of brass," and the "kingdom of iron." His conquests had been achieved wholly under the former kingdom, which had witnessed to upwards of a quarter of a century of unfailing victory; while, yet, he stood forth as the founder of the kingdom of iron—having lived for that end just half-a-dozen years of undisturbed tranquillity after his coronation. His life then belonged even more to ancient than to modern times; and his age may with the utmost correctness be referred, as occasion may require, to either of these great divisions of History. Hence arises the expression we have quoted, "his teeth of iron, and his nails of brass." The "nails" (or claws) of a wildbeast are the implements of first assault in seizing the prey. The expression is a direct evidence that this fourth kingdom of chap. vii. is opened by a Head who is found in the brassen kingdom of the "Image."

Let us now make a short review of the vision of the "four beasts," so far as it has yet been examined. This vision, though of similar construction with that of the Image in respect of its presenting "four kingdoms," is not distributed like it under seven periods of empire, but under seven "Heads" of empire—originators of new dynasties, who are seen to lift themselves up, at points long-distant from each other, from out the wild waves of human history. The distinctive historical marks by which these "Heads" are to be recognised are too plain to admit of a mistake; but as the object was not to mete out the vast field of time, over which they claim in a manner to preside, into equal portions, they are not found, as milestones—at equal distances along the way, but rather as marked objects along the horizon—such as
windmills or towers, which have the effect of leading the eye rapidly onwards from one height to another, without regard to proportion of distances between them. And further, the characteristics that are given of each succeeding portion of this field (mark this especially), are not such as appertain generally to the whole portion, but only, or principally, to that much of it which the "head"—its rightful sign, occupies. In fact, the particulars given constitute for the most part a summary of each Head's individual career; the times of the Head thus appearing as the distant Oasis, surrounded with tall trees, on the desert plain of History. Thus of the Persian "kingdom" (even of the whole kingdom) the only marks recorded are those which belong particularly to the life of Cyrus himself: of the Grecian, those only which point to the career of Alexander: of the four "heads" of ancient Rome (the "leopard"), that emblematic number alone is in the description deemed sufficient—marking an ever recurring change of dynasty (admitting therefore of no specification) from the earliest age to the last of their dominion. Augustus is the alpha, and Charlemagne the omega, of the long series:—the two intermediate "heads" it is of less consequence to determine with certainty; but we doubt if those above designated can be improved upon. Augustus will be readily accepted as the first head of the Roman "leopard"; but the right conception of the vision, and the stability of the whole scheme of interpretation here offered depends, upon our having rightly discerned the last in Charlemagne. The detailed history of the brilliant age and coronation of this conqueror, situate at the junction of the two kingdoms of the "leopard" and the "beast with teeth of iron," is given in Prophecy quite as markedly as the ages of Cyrus and Alexander, but not in this vision:—it is found in Revelation xiii., which chapter is obviously founded on this verse of the seventh of Daniel. Here the hero figures only as a link (a kneepan) between the earlier and later Roman kingdoms. In accordance with this view of the plan of the prophecy, it will be found presently that the "kingdom of iron" the representative Head of which is Napoleon, has for its descriptive sign the age and career of this chieftain.
The symbolism by which, in the bright Image, the Head Charlemagne is described—standing as he does on the common confines of the ancient and the modern worlds, is the most beautiful (as we think) anywhere to be found:—the kneecap joins together, while also it conceals, the division between the thigh and shin bones—the two continuous lines of Roman history—the ancient and modern portions of the one empire:—and this kneecap is Charlemagne's coronation, which history expressly calls the resumption of the imperial dignity. But at the present point of the investigation, this figure recommends itself mostly by its exact correspondence in sense with the words of the later vision—"his teeth were of iron, and his nails of brass," denoting, like them, a property in both kingdoms;—by its correspondence likewise with the fact, that the spotted "leopard," when vanishing from the view, did not give place to a new sort of Beast, but that itself put forth (as it were) "iron teeth," &c. This peculiar endowment of Charlemagne, of being able to carry his regards, in headship, in either direction, bespeaks a peculiar purpose, and it will be found of the utmost utility on more than one occasion; for on the two "kingdoms" which he thus overlooks he confers a sort of unity, both in interests and in prophetic action, in unison with what history testifies of them. Though belonging to both empires, he belongs most in this vision to that of "brass" (the "leopard") by virtue of the period of his conquests:—and as a similitude is often the best means whereby to apprehend a thing, we consider the reign of the "four-headed leopard" (the thigh bone) to be as a truncheon, or commander's staff, in the hand of the brazen god of war, having a knob of equal size at each end. Then comes the shin-bone, or age of "iron." The upper knob is equally Charlemagne (for he is the whole knee); and with the knob at the ankle commences the era of Napoleon—it is another truncheon: or, with the addition of the foot, it is not unlike a flail, to flog the nations. The vision of the "beasts" commences upwards of fifty years after that of the "image," and stands exactly a head lower than its fellow:—but as they stand on the same ground, i.e., end together, there must be a process of adjustment; and we should expect
to find it gradual;—we believe it to be completed in Charlemagne. It is the most important conclusion we have yet arrived at—the hinge of our whole plan of interpretation—that in both visions alike Charlemagne claims to be the sixth unit of the number seven.

Now, as to the seventh "head," upon what ground do we fix the character upon Napoleon? Why is it he, more than any other of the emperors—many of them illustrious in character and deeds—who sat in the imperial throne during the thousand years? To give the reasons (not to mention the chief one of all—the discovery of the "name of the beast") is to repeat what has been said on the question in our examination of the "Image." Reference was there made to the imperfect territorial state of this empire during the long interval. In that France only remained a few reigns among its component parts, the empire became defective; and never afterwards presented the imposing aspect it did at its foundation, and as it was intended it should do again in the next great epoch of its ascendancy. On this account Napoleon, who was the first to reassemble in one its dismembered portions, may indisputably (as we think) be considered the successor of Charlemagne in the throne of the West.

As a reigning monarch is ever to be considered the exemplar of his times,—a dogma which, if generally true, will appear in greatest relief in an age of social storm and the general wreck of government, such as when Napoleon arose; and as, moreover, we are restricted by the analogy of the former kingdoms in this vision, from seeking the explanation of the signs of the "fourth kingdom," elsewhere than in the personal career, or the immediate age, of its representative; we consider that the terrible characteristics given of this "kingdom" are to be sought entirely in the French Revolution—the age whose cruel travail ended in the production of so portentous a chief. To this end it seems unnecessary to do more than call mentally to mind the part in the bloody drama of those days which was assigned to Napoleon, both before and after his assuming the imperial crown. The slightest glance of memory at events so recent empowers us to pronounce him the very image and impersonation of that
political hurricane; and that he responds more emphatically than any other chief since the foundation of the empire, to the description of the "beast" so "dreadful and strong exceedingly." Its "great iron teeth"—teeth being the instruments of a beast to crush the prey—is a feature which refers (we presume) to the enormous amount of artillery he brought into the field. The beast "devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it." To understand this propensity to "devour," we must attend him to at least one morning's meal:—behold him then on a snowy morning, in the month of February, 1808, at Eylau, when 50,000 men and upwards—not only human beings, but Christian brethren—fell! Aye, 50,000 and upwards in a single morning's meal! And behold the carnivorous "beast with iron teeth," riding complacently the next morning over the ensanguined field, as in the process of digestion, glutting his eyes and whetting his appetite for the next repast, "as was his custom." (Alison's Epit., 264.) The "breaking in pieces," and the "stamping the residue* with the feet of it," are points abundantly fulfilled in the overthrow of thrones, the contemptuous treatment of royal houses, the destruction of national landmarks, and the insults offered to national rights and customs.

The last feature of this "Beast" given in the text is—that "it was diverse from all the Beasts that were before it; and it had ten horns." It is not necessary to understand that the "diversity" here spoken of consists, in this Beast alone having "ten horns," but only that it possesses them in a distinctive and peculiar manner. In greater probability however, this diversity refers to other matter than the "horns:" and on looking round, the points of difference between the age that begat Napoleon the sign, and every age preceding him, are so numerous and striking,—whether we look at the constitution of the imperial rule—the mixture of "iron and clay," or the scientific calculations and noisy character of war, that it would be a useless loss of time to enter upon them.

* The word "residue" cannot be more explained under the first Napoleon; but we are not to forget that he is only half of a whole.
There is no subject of Prophecy on which more has been written than that of the "ten horns"—a proof of the difficulty that attends it, and leading to the presumption of its not being yet fully explored. These "horns," like the "toes" of the Image, are either kings or kingdoms, according as the sense of the passage may seem to require. The opinion the writer rests in, after the best consideration he can give, is, that the symbol of "horns" is applicable to the Beast, equally in every "kingdom" of his being:—it is an opinion which he derives from a consideration of the construction of the beast's name, or numerical cypher, to be examined hereafter. More than one commentator has remarked upon the disconnected appearance of this feature of the prophecy—"and he had ten horns"; as if the observation were beyond the proper requirements of the beast's description. Thus Mr. Tregelles says (p. 39), "The description of the beast is given in verse 7: 'After this I saw in the night visions. . . (ending with) . . . it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it':—this is the general description, and then there is added 'and it had ten horns,' and then another horn is spoken of as springing up among the former ten." The "Theological Critic" (III. 391) writes, "even in Daniel the ten horns stand in so slight and merely external a connexion with the fourth beast to which they belong, that they can hardly be considered a characteristic mark of that beast." The view the writer takes is this,—that it is as though the prophet had said (an addition to his particular description)—"and this beast had the enormous number of ten horns"—laying emphasis on the "ten";—asserting in fact, that the beasts preceding him had horns, but not so many. Every great empire would naturally have "horns,"—territorial acquisitions, or illustrious commanders (as when Alexander is called "a great horn"—Dan. viii. 8): but it was reasonably to be expected that the prophetic spirit, so observant of good taste, would abstain—excepting under absolute necessity—from speaking in direct terms of horns, as appertaining to a lion, a bear, or a leopard.

From the instance before us of the use of the symbol, considered singly, it could not be viewed with certainty as
applying even to the whole of the "fourth kingdom"; for if the speculation be a correct one that the marks given—all of them—of the kingdoms in succession, are those which appertain peculiarly to their "heads," or representatives; we are clearly invited (putting aside for the moment the question regarding the longer range of time) to consider it as appertaining in a special sense to Napoleon's own day; and as signalizing his particular career and history—he being unquestionably, as seventh "head," the Head of the "fourth kingdom";—let us endeavour so to apply it. Now "horns" may be presumed, in their truest sense, to be auxiliary powers,—detached seats of imperial strength,—instruments for effecting the purposes of the imperial will. In this point of view we venture to assert that no horns in history have ever so fully responded to their designation as those of Napoleon, and by their base servility so fully justified the application of the symbol. The number "ten," though not necessarily exact,—if it be made to include the sovereigns permitted, as well as those instituted to reign, is easily counted. Besides the kings of Westphalia, Holland, Spain, and Naples, there are those of Wirtemberg, Bavaria, and Saxony, as well as the Grand Duke of Cleves, and the minor sovereign princes of the Confederation of the Rhine. Respecting the rank of these last-mentioned princes, the following apposite passage occurs in Cardinal Pacca's work (V. 1. p. 23.): he speaks of "the princes of the Confederation of the Rhine, who, like Deiotarus, Ariobazanes, and Agrippa, in the time of the Roman Senate, and the first of the Cæsars, had the title of kings." Of all these powers the main duty was, to aid the great chief with contingents of troops, money, and munitions of war; and to be generally the active agents of his despotism. To illustrate the state of abject vassalage in which these kings were held, it will suffice to call to mind a single historical fact—that the king of Holland, not choosing to adopt the tyrannical continental system levelled at the prosperity of England, and afraid to refuse the imperial invitation of his brother to that effect, thought it most prudent to resign his crown.*

* Lord Holland tells the following anecdotes, illustrative of the super-
We are able then satisfactorily to recognise "ten kingly horns" coming out of this "kingdom," in the high auxiliaries of its Head—true satellites of that scorching sun: as likewise we have recognised the "ten kingly toes" (not yet come) of the "Image," in the future spiritually-freed divisions of the same Napoleonic "kingdom." And further, (to touch for a moment on the wider hypothesis that the "ten horns" should be considered as foreshown in the whole "kingdom of iron,")) it will be granted that this view has the advantages of the text strongly suggesting it, and of its being in accord with history:—they will be those mentioned in Mr. Birks's lists, and which we have ventured to describe—as respects their place in the Image—as the indwelling, muscular agencies of the "legs." The Napoleonic horns, when taken in conjunction with these earlier ones, afford a peculiar instance of the Divine skill in so arranging events, that this splendid Sign, whether read in the times of the "kingdom" at large, or of its "head" only, equally verify the prophetic conception. In a future page a defence will be offered of the proposition, that the "ten horns" belong to every "kingdom" of the Beast from the beginning.

The position of Napoleon as the seventh "head," towards the end of the "fourth kingdom," indicates that there is no necessary dependence upon each other of the numbers seven and four, whereby their fulfilments are regulated;—as indeed may have been earlier inferred from the circumstance of "four heads" being pressed into the service of a single "kingdom." Napoleon was the issue of a thousand years' ciliious treatment the "horns" met with from him in whom, as "king," they lived, and moved, and had their being:—"He (Napoleon) on one occasion dined with his hat on, when three kings and several sovereign princes sat uncovered at table. Returning from the chase with the kings of Saxony, Wirtemberg, and Bavaria in the carriage, he stopped at Malmaison to pay a private visit to his divorced wife Josephine, and kept the monarchs waiting at least an hour at the door. The King of Bavaria, who recounted the story to my informant, was more diverted than affronted at the incident, and said, 'Puiqu'on nous traite comme des lacquais, il faut nous divertir comme tels,' and asking for bread, cheese, fruit, and wine, regaled himself with that homely cheer in the carriage, or in the hall, with admirable good humour and excellent appetite."
gestation of the "iron kingdom":—like the apex of a burning mountain, he was the last portion to receive its shape and character, the whole being brought into its proper fashion by the ebullitions of a thousand years. But if he be regarded as placed, not at the end, but in the midst of his "kingdom"—as a focal point between the "iron" and the "iron and clay," the consummator of the one and the abiding strength of the other ("there shall be in it of the strength of the iron"—ii. 41)—it results that he is placed, if not exactly in the centre, at least as the source of power, and centre of attraction, of a system. He becomes as the Sun of the system he symbolically governs (a figure by which he is known in the "fourth vial"—Rev. xvi. 8)—in like manner as Charlemagne is the central orb, and essential mediator, between the "third" and "fourth"—the two Roman "kingdoms." But this (it will be said) is but an illustration of the fact before us: it would seem that the reason of it must be sought in a deeper mystery—either in some hidden relation of the units of the heptadomade, or (more likely) in the necessary regard to be had to the proportions of the great Image.

THE LITTLE HORN.

We approach now a subject, of all contained in this vision the most important—that of the "little horn." The prophet says (ver. 8) "I considered the horns, and, behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots: and, behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of man, and a mouth speaking great things." This is only the eighth verse of a chapter containing twenty-eight, the last twenty being occupied almost entirely with this "little horn," and the consequences of his rising.

Almost all Protestant expositors have considered this to be a symbol of the Papacy,—an opinion so well sustained, however its propounders may be observed to differ in their explanation of details, as to render unnecessary that we should do more in this place than declare our concurrence in it, but proceed at once to our particular purpose—that of
examining how far this opinion agrees with what we have previously written. It will be shown in the vision of the "beast from the sea" (Rev. xiii.)—synonymous with that of the "kingdom of iron," that the special mark given of its government is the double rule, Papal and Imperial, which pervaded its whole course; indeed that, in a total subversion of the natural order of things, the High-Priest became lord-paramount, even in the temporal throne of the empire. In prosecuting the idea (which we believe to be, even minutely, a reliable one) that the great Image of Daniel is a measure of the "beast" in all his "kingdoms," we observe in it an illustration of this double line of rulers, so exceedingly to the point, that—however calculated the mention of it may be to raise a smile, we cannot withhold it. In the human "leg" are to be observed two bones extending in a parallel course the whole length of the way from the knee to the ankle—the Tibia and the Fibula, equally engaged in supporting the weight of the body—symbolically of the "imperial beast";—they afford an exact representation of the two collateral lines of rulers from Charlemagne to Napoleon.

Now the imperial line in this "kingdom" we have found to lead to a culminating "head" in Napoleon:—the question is, are there grounds for entertaining the idea that the priestly line does the same? May we believe—regarding the Papal line as the exponent of Antichrist from age to age—that it likewise terminates in a character which gathers into itself the full force of its own peculiar marks, and which, as head and issue of that line, becomes the Antichrist—the subject of this dissertation, and who would in consequence be the individual "little horn"? It is remarkable that the illustration of the tibia and the fibula even here does not fail us; for if we regard the tibia (or shin-bone) as the imperial power, it ends in an axis—the point of bone that forms the inner ankle, and which may be imagined to represent the discontinuance of the pure "iron" of the "kingdom," by the election of Napoleon to the throne of Charlemagne. The fibula in its termination begets a corresponding point of bone—the outer ankle, which may be imagined to set forth the
sudden termination of the Papal temporal power, just after
the imperial election of Napoleon. The two lines (be it ob-
served) are thus seen to co-operate in the establishment of
the imperial dynasty of Napoleon—the "feet part of iron
and part of clay" of the Image. The height from the ankle
to the heel we have presumed to symbolize the duration of
this dynasty, the symbol being lengthened out to the end of
the "toes" on one general level of time. It is during the
short space of these times that the whole weight of the bestial
power is collected, in the tread of the foot which precedes
the "toes;" and which tread is otherwise described in the
vision before us, in the prowess of the "little horn."

Now there is a difference between a "head" of empire,
and a "horn" of empire, in symbolism:—a head com-
prehends the whole territorial extent of an empire, and the
whole of its times; a horn, as to territory, is a portion only
of an empire,* but in respect of duration, there is no
natural reason why it should not rival the head from which it
springs. And this agrees with the Protestant view of the
"little horn;"—it is but a minute portion, territorially, of
the headship, but it is presumed to continue throughout its
existence. But as to the question whether the "little
horn" may be imagined, in unison with its head, to put forth
a late-coming exponent of its line, there is a difficulty in it
which analogy alone will scarcely enable us to solve. There
is a further question—viz., why the "little horn" should be
supposed to require such an exponent any more than all, or
any one, of the "ten horns" out of which it springs,—which
with the light of history is more easily surmounted. The
"ten horns," viewed territorially, are the full constituent
parts of the Roman empire, viewed personally are the sub-
ordinate officers of the imperial ruler; and are consequently,
under either view, represented in Government, and have their
one general head, in him; but the "little horn," naturally a
fellow-subject of the "ten horns," exalting himself against
the "head" that bears him, affects a higher authority

* It is a symbolic fact of considerable consequence, that Alexander is
presented in Dan. vii. 5, as a head of empire, in Dan. viii. 21, as a "horn."
than he in his own "kingdom." Growing quickly "more stout than his fellows" (ver. 20)—i.e., assuming to be endowed with a more excellent greatness from above,—to be, in fact, among the rest, as God ("tanquam Deus"), he declares himself to be "amenable to no law," and to be invested with a control over all sublunar authority. Had it been propounded to an ancient philosopher, from a glance into futurity, that such a ruler was likely to arise in the world, and in an age that would call itself more enlightened than his own, it would have seemed passing strange; but history has to us verified the foreboding, and records that to the "little horn" was granted, from the earliest years of the "fourth kingdom," the supreme seat of the empire even in secular dominion. This "little horn" then, speaking "great things," and pronouncing his high decrees with superhuman authority, is to be regarded as the chief depository of imperial rule in the kingdom of "iron." To such an extent did it inflate itself and enlarge its shadow, that the "ten horns" with their imperial chief were utterly eclipsed by its superior glory. And hence it seems to follow as, at least, a likely consequence, that if the legitimate imperial line requires a culminating Head (a conclusion derived from imperious analogy), of greater force does the Papal line—holding the supreme sceptre of rule through so many ages, seem to forecast in the prophetic arrangements a similar final consummation. If—so far as we have proceeded in this vision, no individual has been brought into notice except as the representative of a system—for instance Cyrus, as heading the system denominated a "lion"; so likewise have we nowhere seen a system, without an individual exponent and referee of its character—as when the Roman kingdom is read in its "four heads," even the very number four upholding the principle; and as when, in Napoleon, are assembled the full features of the imperial line of "iron." In each system the Head is its Image. And finding the path of headships thus far successful, we cannot but think it a reasonable expectation that this parasitical stem (so to call it) of imperial power,—this "little horn," so quickly outgrowing and domineering over all the rest, may issue at the end of its
times in an individual—the climax, and all-gathering head, of the system.

Yet will this theory much depend for its reception on the view we may take of the nature of the Papacy—whether as being a spiritual or secular institution; premising that to the term "spiritual," on this occasion, we should attach the idea of Divine appointment. Is it with a spiritual, or a secular signification, that we should speak of the "little horn" as holding an associated imperial rule? Now there can be no doubt that the prophecy regards the Papacy as in its foundation secular, for it calls it a "horn"—a lifeless excrescence from the head of a "beast"; which latter is declared in this vision to be a Gentile kingdom. But this "little horn" has "eyes like the eyes of man"—man, the mediatorial being who stands between the Creator and the lower world. It is then a brainless thing with intelligence,—a power that rises from the earth, holding unnaturally among its elements that which is in origin Divine. This we recognise at once as a correct description of the Papacy—a power altogether unknown in the constitution of the Christian Church; which is superadded to that Church, and therefore of earthly origin; which people heedlessly call the spiritual as distinguished from the temporal power of the Roman empire; but which, in fact, exercising therein no legitimate spiritual rule at all, presumptuously makes use of the bright gem of Christian episcopacy, intended to enlighten a see of moderate dimensions, as a foundation for a claim of universal—spiritual and temporal—dominion. Even when exercising its purely spiritual gift in countries distant from the Roman See, a moment's reflection informs us that this also is an usurpation within the Church; that it is of human origin, and therefore in nature earthly; and it is a fact that the more firmly any one accepts the doctrine of an Apostolic gift in the Church transmitted through her successive generations (and nothing but density of intellect can stand in the way of such acceptance) the more stoutly is he bound, in consistency, to repudiate and denounce this Papal pretension. Well therefore, on every account, may this Power be denominated a "horn"—a symbol in the use of which the prophecy conveys a bitter
taunt against an institution claiming to have its foundation in the Word of God, and entitled—if so, to be treated in symbolism as of the family of “man. (Dan. vii. 4.) It calls it the horn of an unintelligent animal (i.e., of an earthly sovereignty) having in it the “eyes of man”—eyes imparted for the promotion of Divine interests, but made to serve the ends of a “beast,” in its natural lust of earthly greatness and distinction.

It ceases then to be strange—if it should be in the scheme of Prophecy to produce a representative “head” of this line of secular, or sacro-secular, rulers—that this head should be such an one as L. Napoleon, unknown in the hierarchy of the Christian Church:—indeed it would be incompatible with the view here taken of the Papacy, were the presumed “head” of the sacred order. Yet is it possible to imagine that in some other way he might be found fitly to represent the Papal character, and to carry the double countenance appertaining to it. There is an intimation in a passage of Rev. xiii.—“he (the horned beast) exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him”—of some strange union speedily to take place of the Papal and Bestial powers. In what way, and to what extent, this union may be carried out in the person or the headship of L. Napoleon, it would be futile to conjecture:—and wherein the writer has heretofore put forward the idea of this personage assuming to himself, as the Antichrist, a spiritual in conjunction with a temporal supremacy, he repeats that this must be only understood as an illustrative conjecture, supplied by a consideration of the circumstances, standing on no warrant of Scripture, but offered in aid of the imagination of the reader.

We are to observe that the “little horn” is made to spring out of Daniel’s “fourth kingdom,” which commences with Charlemagne in A.D., 800. It is not necessary, as will be shown, to believe that it first became visible to the prophet within the boundaries, or times, of that kingdom; but if we would acquire a right apprehension of its importance in the constitution of that kingdom, and in the framework of the prophecy, it is essential to understand
that at the rise of that kingdom, the "horn" assumed a peculiar development, and sudden increase—nay maturity—of its growth, among the already growing "horns." Let us examine the historical grounds of this essential conclusion.

This fourth kingdom, or Western empire, had its origin entirely in the will of the "little horn"—the Pope of Rome. It is a well-known fact in History that Charlemagne was ignorant of the intention of Pope Leo III., to make him Emperor of the West, and was entirely unprepared to receive the imperial crown, at the moment it was taken from off the altar of St. Peter's and placed on his brow. For many ages the pontiff had been acquiring influence in the temporal affairs of Christian princes; and under the pretence of holding in his hand the sceptre of the Lord Christ, and of the duty of establishing His kingdom, was ever pushing forward with increasing boldness a claim to determine on their sovereign rights. It is of the nature of such pretensions to proceed in a path of progress; and that path will naturally lead, if unobstructed, to a predetermined issue—a final goal. What in the Papal advances was the goal had in view? The answer is written just above:—it is impossible to imagine a point in the scale of earthly ambition, beyond that which was attained and secured at the establishment of the new "Western empire;" which was nothing less than to constitute the Pope of Rome, as Vicar of the Lord Christ (of the lowly Saviour whose kingdom "is not of this world"), the fountain of all earthly power and dignity—even to the extent of instituting and ordaining an imperial crown and title. The history of the Papacy presents many enormities of later date; but so far as concerns the assertion and exercise of temporal power, it is on this occasion, and in this transaction, that we behold the highest claim it could by possibility put forth—the longest reach of the sacro-secular rights it was its purpose to establish among the nations of Christendom—the climax of its pretensions. Dr. O'Sullivan gives the following brief account of this exercise of the right, "of bestowing titles and crowns" (p. 512):—
"The Pope (writes Mainbourg) who had secretly made the necessary preparations for so august a ceremony, anointed Charlemagne with the holy oil, which had not been used on any emperor before him, and invested him with a long robe and an imperial mantle. After this he adored him, in the manner observed towards the ancient emperors, who, all knew, had been sovereign masters of Rome; and Charlemagne swore, that to the utmost of his power, he would ever defend and protect the holy Roman Church." "Leo the pontiff, with his own hands, set a crown on his head, and declared him Emperor of the Romans; and then the whole multitude arising, proclaimed three times with one voice, 'To the most pious Charles Augustus, crowned by God, great, peace-giving, emperor of the Romans, life and victory.'" "Thus (continues O'Sullivan) was that 'lawless one' revealed. The frauds, and the force, and the marvels which promoted image-worship—the unrighteous deceits which exalted the Pope above his brother bishops—bore witness to the act in which he renounced all subjection to human law, and, casting away the last semblance of duty to a power whose sway he had once acknowledged (he alludes to the Roman emperor of Constantinople), raised up a new power, against which he was presently to be arrayed in extreme and lasting opposition."

Now we ask—By what authority did the Pope thus act? Certainly not by that of Christ—though in the false assumption of His name. It was by an authority purely of earth—no more of a spiritual kind than was that of the sentry at the door.

At this epoch then, there were introduced two elements into the constitution of government of the new—the "Holy Roman empire," the Papal and the Imperial; elements which may on every account be recognised as of coeval date; for the Pope having made Charlemagne "Emperor of the West," the grateful monarch hastened to bestow immense temporal privileges on his "Holiness," together with those territorial possessions which have remained ever since with the Roman See. It would be easy to show that, of these elements of imperial power, the Papal, for many ages, as a general rule, maintained the ascendancy—admitting of no assessor on equal terms:—and in vindication of at least the natural propriety of this arrangement, the scriptural maxim may be cited, that "without contradiction the less is blessed of the better," and to the better must do obeisance. It became an admitted principle that "the tribunals of kings are subject to the sacerdotal power" (Birks, i. 208); that "Emperor's
should be the subjects, not the sovereigns of Pontiffs" (O'Sullivan, 500); and that it was a Christian obligation to provide "that the splendour of the ecclesiastical shall exceed that of the regal state" (ib.): above all it became an ordinance thenceforward, that the imperial election required for its validity the Papal sanction. (Ib. 497; and Bishop Newton.) To what greater height could the Papal element of this duplex power ascend?

Now if Leo and the Papal line descending from him became paramount in authority in this new empire, availing themselves of Charlemagne and his line as their servile instruments of rule, how (let us ask) will this help to elucidate the prophecy of the "little horn?" It is in the answer to be given to the question we have raised, whether, if the legitimate Imperial line issued at the end of a thousand years in the appearance of Napoleon—its consummating "head," the more pretending and co-ordinate Papal line does not require a similar issue,—some conspicuous head accumulating in himself, as its exponent, all its blasphemous characteristics; and—as the predicted Antichrist, a "horn with human eyes"—concentrating in himself the entire sum of the usurpation and pretension of the two-faced Papacy? The Antichrist is placed before us in Scripture, in a great diversity of ways, as the ambitious imitator and counterfeit of our Lord; so that both the figures and the language applied to the One are seen continually distorted into a base illustration of the other; and it is not a little in favour of the speculation here started, that we can recognise in it a resemblance to the coming of the Messiah, who may be said to have concentrated in Himself all the types and ordinances of the older dispensation—growing as it were out of them:—as likewise He will again show Himself, at his future coming, the consummating Head of that faithful line of ministers, to whom it has been appointed to "occupy till He come." This expectation can, of course, be entertained, on the ground only of inference:—all that can be asserted is, that the idea is in harmony with the rest of the prophecy; which has in all its "kingsdoms" brought forward individual "heads" to mark their succession and preside over their
times,—such head, in each, being one of a line, in whose day the system reaches its climax of power and celebrity. We have shown that there is no impediment arising from the pseudo-spiritual character of the Papacy. For the rest we must avow that, on no other hypothesis, can we pretend to regard the "little horn" as an isolated individual.

That the "little horn" is, in the first place, the Papal power, is seen at once from a comparison of ver 11 of this chapter with Rev. xix. 20. In Daniel the beast is "slain and given to the burning flames," the victim obviously comprising the "horn," which is a part of itself, and which, in the fascination of its "great words," is the cause of the general doom: in the Revelation the beast is "cast alive into a lake of fire," and "with him the false prophet," who (Rev. xiii.) "had exercised all the power of the beast"—just as Daniel's "little horn"; and whom it will be easy to identify hereafter as the Pope of Rome. On the other hand it admits of scarcely a doubt that the "little horn" is identical with St. Paul's "man of sin" (2 Thess. ii.); for the two descriptions—not to speak of the features common to them of pride and persecution—have this also in common, that both appear to continue within the prophetic vision until the "coming of Christ"—whatever this last expression may be held to mean: The "little horn" (as we read the passage) continues until the Son of man "comes with the clouds of heaven" (Dan vii. 13), and the "man of sin" until destroyed by the Lord "with the brightness of His coming" (2 Thess. ii. 8)—i.e., with the manifestation of His presence (τῇ ἐπιφάνειᾳ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ). (O'Sullivan, 69.) It has been well propounded on the subject of the individuality of the latter—in that the revelation of our Lord, and the "revelation" of the man of sin, are both described by the same term ("αποκάλυψις") within a few verses of each other (conf. 2 Thess. i. 7, and ii. 8), that if the former means, as generally received, a personal appearing, so also must the latter; and under the force of this argument, a "personal appearing" will attach likewise to the "little horn."

Now the "little horn," in single person, will of course be
the consummating "head" of the sacro-secular Papacy; and he must appear during the Napoleonic dynasty, Napoleon having been shown to occupy the headship of the "fourth" —*i. e.*, the last "kingdom." But the *completer* of the headship of Napoleon, who concentrates in himself the full force of his empire, is the character described as *Napoleon revived* (Rev. xiii. 3)—the *eighth* and last of the series wherein he stands,—the *eighth in number*, but still the *seventh head*:* this follows, if from other considerations, irrefragably from the discovery of the name*. In that he is the eighth, he is identical with the "eighth king" of Rev. xvii., of whom it is likewise said that he has the full powers of the beast at his disposal (ver. 13). The "little horn" also collects into himself, manifestly, the entire powers of the beast, and "exceeds in wickedness all that had gone before him" (Dan. vii. 24, Lxx.)—meaning (we presume) not moral, but bestial, wickedness—the thirst of martial glory and enterprise:*—and although he is not so obviously as the preceding the eighth in a series, yet does he—the *eleventh horn*, become the *eighth horn*, by swallowing up three (ver. 8); and moreover, he occupies palpably the *eighth place* in a vision counted by *heads*—though himself a "horn,"—that is, he is the only *Power* mentioned after the *seventh Head*—as may be seen. It is presumable then, that as, in addition, he is called a "king" (ver. 24), and is therefore qualified by station; he is the same as the "eighth king" of Rev. xvii. All these *eighths* seem to stand on the same level of time as the "toes" of the great Image—themselves constituting the eighth of their series.

Let us say a few words on the rule of construction here referred to—that of *seven parts and an eighth*, and which we consider to be one essential ward in the key of Prophecy. In the great "Image" there were counted seven parts, of which the seventh was found to be "divided," so as to present an eighth portion—the "toes." In Rev. xiii. it was the seventh "head" who received a "deadly wound," and the wound was "healed," so as to give rise to an eighth unit of heads—though still the seventh headship. In Rev. xvii. it will be seen that, after the seventh head, comes an
"eighth," being "of the seven." In like manner, in chap. viii. of Daniel, there are paraded seven "horns," and then it is said (ver. 9), "And out of one of them came forth a 'little horn'"—making an eighth. Not disdaining the aid of ancient philosophy in this matter, it may be mentioned that seven inferior divinities, representing the seven original powers, were supposed by the Egyptians to be united by Pan (himself a personification of the universe)—who was reckoned an eighth (Stuart, 762). Herodotus mentions (we take it on credit) that the tower of Babel consisted of eight towers rising one above the other, gradually diminishing in size:—but Mr. Vigne, in his travels into Thibet Tartary, mentions that he observed a sacred edifice exactly of the configuration of the "Birs Nimrood," excepting that it was composed of seven instead of eight platforms (Vigne, II. 343). We consider the explanation of this difference to be, that—as a foundation to the tower of Babel, there was a large square platform on which the others were raised, the series thus consisting of the seven supported by an eighth; from which in a manner they may be said to have sprung as from a source provided. As this plan of construction claims so great antiquity, we should look for an early origin; and perhaps we may discern it in the "eight souls" that were saved in the ark—the foundation of the ancient Arkite worship. The seven of these proceeded from, and were saved in Noah the eighth—i.e., the first; unquestionably so—if in the ark of his faith spiritually, so of his person physically; for his sons' wives were one with themselves, and themselves one with their father. The precise bearing of this rule it does not seem possible uniformly to explain: we have assumed in a previous page, perhaps too hastily, that there is a correspondence always between the eighth and the first, of which latter the eighth is the return; but the rule seems capable of a diversity of application, and the eighth to be sometimes only an eighth in order. In music (a specimen the more valuable as being founded in nature) the eighth certainly is the return—in the sense of the lower note of the octave absorbing, or, like Pan, "uniting" all that precedes. The days of the week, springing from the eternal Sabbath in
which the contemplative power of the Infinite resides, and ending _eighthly_ in a day of rest—the image of eternity, but "of the seven," is not a bad specimen. Sometimes the seven appear to proceed from an original deposit in which they had been contained, as in the case of the children of Noah above cited; or as in the case of the seven Churches of the Gentiles, which spring from the original stock of Abraham’s faith, as embodied in Mosaic _unity_.

It has been shown, that the Vision we are engaged with of Daniel’s "four beasts" has a close relation—that of identity of its component parts, to the vision of Rev. xiii.; and analogy seems imperatively to demand, in consequence, that the seventh head in Daniel—being the same as the one wounded to death in the Revelation—should be found in a _second manifestation_, or the "kingdom" be in some way "divided": and as the great Napoleon is the seventh head in Daniel (ver. 7) the character presented in ver. 8—the "little horn," will necessarily be some one who can respond to the description of _himself restored_ (who but Louis Napoleon?—) and who can figure in the "eighth" place. If there be really any requirement of this sort arising out of the analogy, it seems impossible to put aside the claim of the "little horn" to satisfy it; and if the "little horn" thus becomes the required "eighth" head, it is equally impossible not to acknowledge L. Napoleon—being the resuscitated _seventh_ head—to be he. That is to say—not so much (it may be) that L. Napoleon is the impersonation of the "little horn," as that _in his day, or dynasty_, will be fulfilled the _signs_ of the "little horn."

Now if L. Napoleon be indeed, representatively, the personal "little horn," it can only be so by his assuming a new and very unexpected guise. He is to be traced in a direct manner only to the headship of the _Beast_:—by what

---

* If we should imagine the shaft of the bronze pillar in the Place Vendôme to be divided into six parts, and surmounted by a "seventh" in the figure of Napoleon; and again, these seven to stand upon the solid base from whence there they spring; we should have before us a perfect _image_ of this rule of eight parts, together with the apparent relations intended to subsist between the first and the last.
metamorphosis can we imagine him to appear likewise as head of the Papacy,—as at once the secular, and sacro-secular, head of Rome? Even imagination fails as a guide, except it be rudely to suggest that, not content with the subordinate spiritual government held by all sovereign princes, he may declare himself the spiritual head of the Church—the High-Priest as well as King of the state; so making good the pretensions to holiness ascribed to the "little horn," which has "eyes like the eyes of a man;" and to the "man of sin," who "sitteth in the temple of God (the Christian Church) showing himself that he is God"—i.e., sitting as Christ, supreme in all authority—("ut in templo Dei sederit, ostendens se tanquam ipse sit Christus, et Filius Dei"—Jerome:—vid. O'Sullivan, 46). It is in L. Napoleon at any rate, and in some such manner, that we think it highly probable will be manifested the final phase of the "little horn," as at once the lord and son of the Papacy, as Christ of the house of David,—and so the Antichrist.*

Now if the "little horn" be the Papacy; and if the "little horn" be in a concentrated sense L. Napoleon; it might fairly be expected, from the artistic propriety observable in every part of Prophecy, that this personage should carry about him personally some evidence of the claim—showing (for instance) his peculiar title to the appellation itself. Now he is a "horn" of empire, by virtue of being son of Louis king of Holland, than whom it would be impossible to imagine a more veritable "horn" or subordinate power, as shown by the circumstance just now alluded to, of his having abdicated his crown rather than obey the injurious behests of his imperial "Head." Like begets like. Had L. Napoleon been the son of Napoleon, it would have been impossible that he should pass, personally, for a "horn." He is also a "little horn" because springing up (as it were) accidentally,

* There have already been some suspicious prognostics of what may come to pass; for instance, in the Pope's decreeing that L. Napoleon shall be addressed as "His sacred imperial Majesty"; and in the miserable superstition which assigns to the chieftaincy of the "holy places" a rank and dignity scarcely behind that of imperial sovereignty.
as a "lusus naturæ," without any natural right of position. The power committed to him rests entirely on his connexion with the great Head departed;—with which accords his own avowal, that his "mission" is to carry out the will of that Head. But, as if the more fully to establish his identity, and place it beyond all cavil by a double testimony, St. John (be it again mentioned) designates him a Head:—he appears as the "eighth head" of empire, in the great vision of the fall of Babylon (Rev. xvii. 11). Thus he is at once in symbolism a Head, and a Horn springing out of a head. In conformity with which double sign, he carries the double cognomen of Louis—the "horn," and Napoleon—the "head,"—the "horn" that still is, the "head" that is to be.

Let us now proceed to the Signs that are given of the "little horn." The theory of the little horn being at once plural and singular suggests the idea, that the signs may have a double fulfilment; in accordance with a system of exposition which the reader will recognise as much in repute in the present day—that many prophecies require a precursive accomplishment, to issue at the end of its times in a transcendent final consummation. The writer—though not disdainful of this theory, confesses to viewing it with so much suspicion, that he is not disposed to undertake its application in the present instance. Indeed a slight reflection tells us, that to imagine events to come in fulfilment of signs given, with reference to an individual such as L. Napoleon, is of all things the most easy and the most unsatisfactory,—to say nothing of its evincing a bold confidence in our own measure of the Divine expressions. That which, on the other hand, is essential, is, to find historical and appropriate illustrations of these signs, in reference to the "little horn" viewed as the Papal succession. In saying however that this future fulfilment—the duplicate of a past one—is at all times easy to imagine, perhaps an exception should be made with regard to one of the Signs— the "time, times, and dividing of time" (ver. 25)—the duration of a season of persecution; and this sign, consequently, we shall endeavour to apply in both the senses supposed: the rest we shall view as apper-
taining entirely to what the "little horn" unquestionably depicts—the Papacy.

The Signs in the only verse yet cited (ver. 8) are three in number, and to these the principal part of what is afterwards written in this chapter may be referred:—these are, that "the little horn came up among the ten horns" of the Roman beast; that before him "three of the first horns were plucked up by the roots"; and that he had the "eyes of a man, with a mouth speaking great things." There is a progress perceptible in these signs: the prophet first sees the horn in a nascent state—his earlier days: he next sees him advancing in strength, and his way made plain before him by the annihilation of certain Powers which, had they remained, would have impeded his progress: lastly he sees him in the full development of his pretensions and character. It has been shown that the last of these stages was attained in the year 800, at the institution of the "Holy Roman empire." The reader, it is true, may be able to call to mind other and greater enormities than the one on which the celebrity of this date is founded,—developments of character of subsequent ages; as (for instance) when Hildebrand kept the emperor Henry IV. a couple of nights a suppliant at his Palace gates; as when Alexander III. trod upon the neck of Frederic I.; as when the Papal fief dissolved at once the marriage knot of the whole Christian priesthood: as when from age to age, even to the present, he makes the Table of the Lord his footstool; but these are only the natural results of opportunity; there must have been a point of time when the "mouth speaking great things" put forth its highest pretensions, and was permitted to act upon them, and this we conceive to have been in the coronation of Charlemagne.

Now as this view of the case necessitates that the two preceding signs shall be of anterior date to Charlemagne; and yet that it is with him the "fourth kingdom" commences which is the special subject of this vision; it becomes necessary to inquire how these points can be made to accord one with the other. We conceive then, that as the divisions of time in this Vision depend as well upon headships as upon "kingdoms"—the two measurements acting simultaneously,
the versatile character of Charlemagne's \textit{headship} may here be called to our aid. Charlemagne belongs equally to two "kingdoms"—that of "brass," and that of "iron," exercising headship equally within both; and this we perceive to be a warrant for our looking back to an earlier age than his own, for the means of applying the terms of this prophecy. We are to remember that this peculiarity of Charlemagne is a \textit{token}; viz., of the \textit{sameness of nature} of the third and fourth kingdoms—both of them being Roman; and that consequently, when the prophecy speaks of "the ten horns out of this kingdom" (ver. 24), it by no means intends to say, either that the "ten horns" \textit{had their origin} in an age subsequent to Charlemagne, nor that the expression "this kingdom" is to be restricted to the age commencing with him. In a previous page the error has been pointed out of supposing the "ten horns" (or at least "horns") to belong exclusively to the "fourth kingdom"; and in like manner the term "this kingdom" seems to embrace in its allusion, in the present instance, the whole Roman kingdom. Indeed a reference to the Greek (ver. 24) will show, that the text does not there state so precisely "ten horns out of this kingdom"; on the contrary it speaks of "his (i. e., the beast's) ten horns"—a point of considerable weight; for we know that the \textit{beast} is the same as that of the "third kingdom," viz., the Leopard—only with increased fierceness of character. It appears then that Charlemagne, standing with one leg in each of these "kingdoms," is enabled by his position to stretch back his bestial paw tipt with "nails of brass" (ver. 19), as a sceptre of rule, from the entrance day of the "fourth" into the "third kingdom." And let it be asked—how far was he able thus to carry back his retrospective headship? The answer is—Brass is a symbol taken from the great Image, and the particular portion of brass nearest to Charlemagne was "the thighs"—these commence with Constantine; and to his day consequently he may be considered, as a "beast," to extend his paw; as a "head" his retrospective influence and rule.

It is quite clear that the simple account in the English version of the origin of the "little horn," as springing from
among the "ten horns" of the fourth kingdom, will not comport with the necessity we have pointed out of looking for the two first signs given of him, in an earlier age than that of Charlemagne. In consequence, either the hypothesis must be abandoned of the rise of the fourth kingdom being in Charlemagne (which is quite out of the question), or we must inquire whether the term "kingdom," or the figures—the "ten horns," and the "beast," will not admit of being accepted under a slight variation of meaning. This we have endeavoured to show may be the case. The expression "the kingdom," in these ages of History, may be viewed, we say, (in the more general sense required by the early-rising of the "little horn") as comprising the third and fourth "beasts"; or the "beast" may be viewed as expressing the third and fourth "kingdoms"—remembering the guarantee we have for this device in the common term Roman. The very "ten horns" which have constituted the European kingdoms since Charlemagne, came later than his day into existence (vid. "Birks' Tables," suprà); but then, it has been shown that before Charlemagne, as well as after him, the "beast" had horns. And further, the figure of a little horn rising obscurely and stealthily at any time after Charlemagne can find no sort of support in History. In proposing then to consider the "little horn" as rising among the horns anterior to the opening of the "fourth kingdom," we do not feel that we are asking from the prophetic statement, with whatever of jealousy it would guard its claim to precision, any greater degree of accommodation, than what it was intended by the Prophet it should lend the inquirer.

The first sign is to the effect, that the little horn came up "among" the ten horns of the beast (ver. 8): also, that he came up "after" them (ver. 24). These expressions sound somewhat contradictory, but it is not so. On the first, which explains itself, enough has been already said: on the second Bishop Newton observes, that "He (the horn) was to rise after the others, that is behind them, as the Greek translates it (ἐντοιχίων άυτον); so that the ten kings were not aware of the growing up of the 'little horn' till it overtopped them; the word in the original signifying as well behind in place, as after in
time." Not disallowing the beauty of this suggestion, we yet think that one may be offered more in unison with the spirit of Prophecy. The first question, in the endeavour to penetrate a prophetic vision, ought ever to be—Where stands the seer? The position of the seer—if it be made a question of at all—must necessarily be of the utmost importance in determining the meaning of words expressive of place and time. In the various scenes of the present vision, are we to suppose that Daniel—"beholding in the visions of the night"—is to be accounted ever as sleeping on his usual pillow in Babylon? We believe not. We shall find it necessary shortly, on a much more important occasion than the present, to defend the very opposite opinion we hold:—at present suffice it to say, that we hold it in common with more eminent persons. The Rev. W. Dodsworth (for instance) in discoursing in his "Advent Lectures" (p. 81) on the famous text "Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away till all be fulfilled," observes—"If it should appear that there is something forced in interpreting the phrase, this generation, not of the generation in which our Lord lived, but of that of which he spake, it may be replied, that nothing is more common in the prophetic style than for the speaker to translate himself, as it were, to the period of which he is speaking. The prophetic books furnish innumerable examples of it, as anyone acquainted with them will remember." Now viewing the expression "after," or "behind," them, under this light, we ask, Where may Daniel be supposed to have stood when enunciating his prophecy regarding the "fourth kingdom"? Surely the natural place is in the day of the Head of the "kingdom"—Napoleon. And consequently, in saying that he saw the little horn come up "behind" the ten (i. e., as he looked back upon the opening of the kingdom in Charlemagne), he virtually bears testimony to what we have confidently set forth, that the little horn commenced his existence in an age anterior to Charlemagne,—behind that monarch in position, before him in time.

The next sign is, that "three of the first horns were plucked up by the roots before him." It is not unknown to the reader how very various are the schemes of commentators
to identify these three horns; the general object with them being to show, that three kingdoms from among the ten into which the Roman empire was in an early age divided, were seized upon for the endowment of the "little horn"—constituting what has been since called the patrimony of St. Peter:—on which account it is said the Roman pontiff wears the triple crown. Bishop Newton mentions several of these schemes (each of them therefore bearing testimony against the rest), and he rejects them all for the very solid reason, that the "three" kingdoms are not in any of them numbered among the "ten,"—for not only were three horns to be plucked up, but three of the first horns. He then exhibits a catalogue of his own of the "ten kingdoms," so as to comprise the three which, after Sir I. Newton, he most approves; and these three are, the Exarchate of Ravenna, the kingdom of the Lombards, and the duchy of Rome (i. 479). Let us not be too hastily satisfied. We much doubt whether these states, under a strict examination, would sustain the character of "horns"—a symbol denoting a Power whose strength is distinctively its own. The Lombards is certainly a good specimen; barring the unfortunate circumstance, as connected with the above theory, that Lombardy, with Pavia its capital, never came into possession of the Papal See. The Exarchate, when seized upon for St. Peter's use, was in possession of the Lombards, and had never antecedently boasted of a higher state of independence, than that of a detached province of the Greek empire. Rome, at the time of its seizure, was scarcely more entitled to the distinction of a separate state.

We mention these views, not for the vain purpose of expressing a want of confidence in them, but in order to obtain their support to a principle which we deem to be a just one,—this is, that although "ten horns" may be enumerated with more exactness, perhaps, in one age than another of the Roman kingdom, it is not necessary that the "three horns" should be taken from any such single age, but from ages far apart from each other. Mr. Birks, to whom we owe the tables of the "ten kings" as they appeared in successive ages, adopts this view; for the "three kings,"
according to him, are the Heruli established in the rule of Italy by Odoacer, on the fall of Augustulus—the last of the Western emperors, in A.D. 476; the Gothic kingdom estab-
lished within a very few years by Theodoric on the ruins of the former kingdom, which contrived to last a couple of generations; and the Lombards whose dynasty continued a couple of centuries, and whose ruin was finally effected by Charlemagne in the end of the eighth century. These
he mentions as having successively obstructed the way of the “little horn” in his destined rise to temporal dominion.
“They are uprooted (he observes) to make way for the growth of the little horn as it germinates on the head of the beast.” “It is not three provinces which are incorporat-
ed; but three ruling powers which are prostrated and over-
thrown” (174-5). This we believe to be the true view.
The remarkable feature of these several events of History, in their connexion with the prophecy, is, that “The over-
throw in each case was effected by the direct aid and stren-
uous efforts of the Bishop of Rome, and ended in securing his dominion. It was the Bishop of Rome who shut the gates of the imperial city against the defeated Odoacer, rejoiced in his fall, and welcomed the Goths as deliverers. It was the same Bishop who invited and encouraged Belisarius to subvert the Gothic kingdom. And finally, it was the Bishop of Rome who used all the arts of subtle policy, and brought forth all the devices of profane invention, to effect the down-
fall of the Lombards, the last impediment here announced in the way of his own greatness” (ib. 193).

The “profane invention” here alluded to is that of the famous letter written by the Pope to Pepin, father of Charlemagne, wherein—

“he boldly introduces St. Peter in his own person (not as supplicating—but) as claiming his (Pepin’s) aid; and prostitutes all the most solemn motives of religion, its threatenings, and rewards, to the one purpose of securing his own temporal sovereignty, and the destruction of the Lombard kingdom.”

This letter the author truly calls—

“the basis on which the dominion of the pontiffs has been established, the fit and natural foundation for a kingdom of fraud and violence.”
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It ends as follows,—

"See, most beloved sons (viz., Pepin, Charles, and Carolman), I have taught and admonished you. If you shall obey quickly, it shall turn to you for a great reward, to be helped by my succour. In the present life, overcoming all your enemies, and coming to old age, ye shall eat the good things of the earth; and ye shall without doubt enjoy everlasting life. But if, which we do not believe, ye shall interpose any delay; know that by the authority of the holy Trinity, and through the grace of the apostleship committed to me, by transgressing our exhortation ye are shut out from the kingdom of God, and life eternal" (ib. 190). "Such (continues the author) was the impious language of this 'mouth speaking great things,' by which the temporal dominion of the Papacy was at length attained."

That the Pope judged rightly of the spirit with which he had to deal—which indeed he had engendered, appears from the following extract of the author's from Gibbon:—

"To the importunities of the Greeks (i.e., in depreciation of the imperial donation of territory to the Pope) Pepin piously replied, that no human consideration should tempt him to resume the gift which he had conferred on the Roman pontiff for the remission of his sins, and the salvation of his soul. The splendid donation was granted in supreme and absolute dominion; and the world beheld for the first time a Christian bishop invested with the prerogatives of a temporal prince."

Without pretending to improve upon the specification above given of the "three horns plucked up," we would submit, notwithstanding, whether the entire destruction of the imperial rule under Augustulus ought not to be counted among them. It is certain that, in the symbolism of this vision, Augustulus could not be entitled to a higher appellation than that of a horn,—the reigning head of the "leopard" (the headship being that of Constantine) being established in Constantinople. Had we to do with the great Image, where there are two lines of imperial rulers in the two "thighs," the case would be otherwise:—here we are concerned with the "leopard" and his "four heads"; and every offset of power from either head is a horn. Besides, when it is remembered how torn and disgraced had been the imperial mantle of Western Rome long before the day of Augustulus, as (for instance) in the sack of the city by Alaric in the beginning of the same century, it is scarcely possible to imagine that, in this vision, the government subsisting in
"eternal" Rome would be deemed other than a "horn," if it should have been the purpose of Prophecy to describe it. The question is unimportant—regarded only on its own account; but in the connexion of this prophecy with that of the "man of sin" of St. Paul, and with reference to the plan of the symbolism, we think it worthy of consideration.

In the account given in 2 Thess. ii. of the rise of the "man of sin," it is stated to the effect that he could not be manifested until "he that letteth" should be taken out of the way. St. John declares that in his day there were "many Antichrists"—i.e., that the spirit was showing itself in divers forms of error or wickedness; but that, as to the visible manifestation of him—the impersonation of the spirit, it was requisite that he who stood as a hindrance in the way should be removed. It was generally received in the days of the Apostles, that this hindering power was the Heathen Roman emperor; and consequently, as a greater evil was in prospect after him, it was with an increase of earnestness the duty of praying for "all in authority" and for the "peace of the empire" was observed by the early Christians:—"Oremus (says Tertullian) pro rerum quiete, pro mora finis." Now the first occasion of the removal of this hindrance was in the transference of the seat of empire to Constantinople. This we consider Dr. O'Sullivan (Apostacy p. 488, et seq.) to have put beyond question; and further, that a part of the very design in this removal of "him that letteth," consisted in the imperial elevation of Christianity in Constantine. During the third century, whatever may have been the aspirations of the head of the Christian hierarchy, as the Christian body increased and with it his influence in their secular affairs, it is clear that, living under the all-powerful and most jealous government of heathen Rome, he could have pushed them forward to no open exhibition, in the display of an unwonted state and dignity. The Roman government was peculiarly tolerant of religious creed and profession, allowing its wrath to be excited by no sort of extravagance of superstition: indeed the well-known observation of Gallio expressed the habitual feeling of Roman governors on this head—"If it be a question of words and names, and of your law,
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"O ye Jews, look ye to it; for I will be no judge in such matters." But if it should transpire that any new system, or functionary, was affecting to be established in an authority however circumscribed, which seemed to trench upon the majesty or the unity of the imperial rule, the treatment would be very different; and the only thing that casts the suspicion of ambitious views on the Christian hierarchy of the early ages is, that undoubtedly the Church did come under persecution. If this was because of the nature of their religious belief, it contradicted the whole tenour of Roman legislative principle:—but perhaps the cause might be traced to their very innocency of life; and the unwonted spectacle they presented of so large a body of men submitting voluntarily their differences to the adjustment of their own self-constituted tribunals, as if in contempt of Roman equity. It is however no matter of question, that the Popes of Rome, just before the age of Constantine, were increasing mightily in secular influence; that their wealth, arising from the votive offerings of the Church, was beyond all measure; and that—if restrained, themselves, from a display of power by the presence of the Emperor, so also were they objects—almost as much of dread as of hatred, to the imperial government.

Now

"it is a curious as well as a remarkable truth (says Dr. O'Sullivan) that the Roman emperor held the Christian congregations in check as long as Rome continued to be the seat of empire. The first emperor who granted full toleration of Christian worship removed his throne to the East. 'He that letteth will let until he be taken (or more properly, become) out of the way' (ἐκ μέσου γενηται). It is surely very remarkable that the first emperor who made effectual provision that Christian worship should be free, removed the seat of empire to a place far distant from that in which, it is argued, the 'man of sin' has been revealed. The enterprise of establishing a court and throne at Constantinople was in itself highly memorable; but that he who planned and accomplished it was the first emperor who delivered the Christians from persecution, is a truth which cannot be thought of without causing the fulfilment of the prophecy to seem more signally manifest. The peace of the Church was signalized by the removal (the taking out of the way) of the emperor—of him 'that letteth.'" (p. 481.)

Now with reference to the change effected by this removal
in the condition of the Bishop of Rome, the same author says,—

"Had this revolution been effected by a heathen emperor, who desired that the laws against Christians should still be enforced, he could have entrusted the execution of them to ministers, who would have been, perhaps, only the more intolerant and cruel because there was no superior near them, to rebuke their abuse of authority. The malignity of servile instruments entrusted with irresponsible power is more terrible than the wrath of their masters. . . . . The removal, therefore, of an emperor unfavourable to the Christians, might not have been serviceable to their temporal condition. But on the other hand, had Constantine not removed, the residence of the emperor at Rome, while it ensured protection to the body of the Christians, would have kept within the limits of moderation the authority and the external splendour of their bishop. Without any law on such a subject, the sovereign's presence would have been felt as a restraint—a subject would not have dared to vie in pomp or power with the master of the world."

To the same effect the author adduces the testimony of Milman,—

"The absence of a secular competition allowed the Papal authority to grow up and to develop its secret strength. By the side of the imperial power, perpetually contrasted with the pomp and majesty of the throne, . . . . the Pope would hardly have gained more political importance than the patriarch of Constantinople."

Also from the Abbé du Pradt as follows,—

"The removal of the emperor to Constantinople gave rise to the greatness of the Popes. In the vicinity of the masters of the world they would have remained subjects—simple bishops of Rome, without the illusion of sovereignty: there would have been no triple crown, nor that intoxication produced by it; a grievous calamity to religion and to man" (Apos. 483, &c.).

Relieved from the restraint of the imperial presence—he that "hindered" being thus "taken out of the way," the advance of the Pope of Rome in wealth, dignity, and power, was (as is well-known, and which we need not stay to illustrate) of the most rapid kind. The "lawless" one—ο ανωμος (so named with the usual propriety of Scripture designations—for Constantine had already proclaimed that the Papal position was too elevated to be within the reach of human law) began to be "revealed"; and the splendour of the Papal court, before the end of the fourth century, became the envy and admiration of the recreant world.
Now it is the opinion of the writer, contrary to what is propounded by the author whose materials he has freely borrowed, that in the historical event above cited is to be viewed the complete removal "out of the way" of that which hindered the rise of the "man of sin":—this seems to flow from the phraseology of the prophecy—"he who now letteth will let until he be taken out of the way"—taken (that is to say) both locally, and in respect of spiritual hostility, "out of the way." And further, a single event seems to be described. At any rate, the word "now" precludes the idea of any obstacle subsequently arising being included in the description, and thereby that of the Northern invaders of the empire who, all of them in turn, raised the supposed obstacle of sovereign domination; whereas the author before us does not imagine the "letting" object to have been fully removed, even until the days of Charlemagne (Apos. 499). Besides, it is the testimony of History that the "revelation" of the man of sin, which was immediately to ensue (ver. 8)—the increase of the Pope of Rome in secular display, pretension, and authority—was at once apparent; and in its progress was not materially stayed by the repressing presence of any authority then existing. Yet was the process of revelation of course gradual:—as when the Sun, loosed at break of day from the bondage of the night, and become revealed—and not the less actually revealed because of morning clouds—still requires several hours to attain the fulness of its splendour. Now the fulness of the Papal splendour we have shown to have been attained in the day of Charlemagne—exactly five centuries after the removal of what "hindered," and the commencement of the "revelation." These five centuries, then, are the times of the Papal development; in which it may be expected that History will have recorded all the most striking incidents and evidences of its portentous growth:—and so we find it does, every thing material as an ingredient of the Papal character being traceable to these ages, and awaiting only the consummating act of A.D. 800, in proof of its full maturity.*

* These five centuries must be considered the times, likewise, of the "falling away" predicted by St. Paul (2 Thess. ii. 3) as to precede the
It were needless to enter here, in detail, upon the evidences alluded to during these ages, whether of secular pretension or of spiritual tyranny:—for instance, to do more than mention the abrogation throughout Christendom of the vernacular tongue in public prayer: the refusal of the Cup to the laity: the systematic establishment of Image-worship, and of reverence for "holy relics": the invocation of the Saints in heaven, and the urging of their merits before the throne of grace: purgatory, and the insight it pretends into the judgment to come: the assumption of the title of "Universal bishop," denounced by Gregory the Great—himself no lax assessor of Papal authority—as a sure sign of the coming of Antichrist; together with the decree which followed (which indeed was its object) that the election of bishops, to take effect, required the confirmation of the Roman pontiff; as likewise the practice of referring all differences to the arbitration of the "holy chair":—to the many methods resorted to of shaking off the imperial authority—as, for instance, in ignoring the imperial approval of the Papal election; and the audacious habit which sprung up about the same time of using the date of the Pontifical instead of the Imperial reign. These are well-known indications of character. But there is a further one mentioned by Dr. O'Sullivan (p. 494) which, however small in its consequences, seems, more than any else we have heard of, to illustrate the Papal spirit of these ages,—it is this, that in the early part of the seventh century Theodore I., "having received the new title of Sovereign Pontiff, was the last occupant of the Roman see whom Bishops dared to name brother."

"Henceforth (observes this author) it may be said the Papacy became essentially separate from the Episcopacy as an apostolic institution. 'Be not ye called Rabbi,' said the Lord, 'for one is your master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren.' It is almost impossible to compare with this complete revelation of the "man of sin"—viewing the "man of sin" as the Papacy: but it is evident that if the "man of sin" is to be regarded in the light of an individual, the "falling away" becomes the long career, with all its deformities, of the Papal ascendancy; which some (no doubt) will think a better account of the remarkable expression."
precept the observation of the historian—‘le dernier que les évêques aient appelé frère,’ and not to feel that a great and antichristian change had been effected in the order to which it is applicable.” . . . . . .

“This Theodore was the pope who is said to have mingled sacramental wine with the ink he used in writing the condemnation of a heretic.”

Long before this date “the bishops of Rome had assumed the style and title of secular princes, and exercised power little less than supreme. The state of Italy and of the East constrained them to be politicians.”

“Devastated by barbarians, abandoned by its sovereigns, Italy knew no longer to whom she belonged, and her people were reduced to despair. In the midst of these great calamities, the popes were the only refuge for the afflicted. Without desiring it, and by the pure force of circumstances, they were substituted for the emperors, and all eyes were turned towards them” (ib. 496).

It was under this condition of circumstances that the Roman pontiff, having secured by the help of Charlemagne the downfall of the Lombard kingdom, bethought him of transferring the tottering rule of Rome from the East to the West. The following is the account given of the transaction, as quoted by Bishop Newton from Machiavel,—

“He (Charlemagne) went in person to visit the Pope, where he adjudged and determined that his holiness, being God’s vicar, could not be subject to the judgment of man; for which, the Pope and people together declared him emperor, and Rome began again to have an emperor of the West; and whereas formerly the popes were confirmed by the emperors, the emperor now in his election was to be beholden to the pope; by which means the power and dignity of the empire declined, and the Church began to advance, and by these steps to usurp upon the authority of temporal princes.”

Again,—

“In the same proportion as the power of the empire decreased, the authority of the Church increased, the latter at the expense of the former; till at length the pope grew up above all, and a apoplof—the ‘wicked one’ was fully manifested and ‘revealed’; or the ‘lawless one,’ as he may be called; for the pope is declared again and again not to be bound by any law of God and man”—“non legibus ullis obstrictus” (Apos. 499).

Now if the “revelation of the man of sin” spoken of by the apostolic prophet be thus found to consist, as might have been expected, in the putting forward of these lofty personal
pretensions, it is equally agreeable to a natural expectation that the prophet of the elder dispensation, treating under his more secular light of Gentile kingdoms to arise, should be found to occupy the same ground of time—these five centuries, with a description of the physical obstacles that should impede the path of the “little horn”—this same “man of sin.” These five centuries (be it observed) are the exact length of the arm of the “leopard,” as standing at the exit of his “kingdom,” he stretches back his brazen paw to the days of Constantine; i.e. (speaking in the language of the Image), they constitute the length of the brazen thigh:—they are the measure of the retrospective vision of the doubled-faced Charlemagne, reaching to the day of the imperial establishment of Christianity. It is in these centuries, then, that the “three horns” are “plucked up by the roots,” to make way for the growth of the “little horn.” It came under our demonstration that, the “little horn” having given evidence of his perfect maturity in Charlemagne’s day, the three horns must have been annihilated before his day; and it has since been shown that the “man of sin” did not begin to be revealed before Constantine:—it follows that it is during these five centuries we must look for the destruction of the “three horns.”

Now on this subject we have thrown out the question—whether it would not be more safe to say, that the first horn was plucked up in the deposition of Augustulus. It is true that he was Emperor of the West in title; but in truth—the acknowledged head of the empire being at Constantinople—the Western government could only be regarded in this vision as a horn of empire:—it is this alone that will agree with, and by it we would affirm, the theory, that the removal out of the way of “him that letteth” was entirely in Constantine. The kingdoms set up by the two northern conquerors Odoacer and Theodoric respectively—the former (dating from A.D. 476) having lasted only twenty, and the latter only forty years, when Belisarius succeeded in re-establishing the Roman power,—we consider to present, in an united view, a fair representation of the barbarian impediments of the second horn. The plucking up of the first horn left the Pope
supreme in the ancient seat of empire—however under subjugation. On occasion of the annihilation of the second horn there was committed to him by Justinian the government of the whole of Italy. Then came, after a time, the more formidable third horn—the Lombard kingdom; the removal of which (as we have seen) was to advance the Papal Pretender to the plenitude of his glory.

Now according to this way of counting the "three horns," making them to be rooted up in succession during the space of five centuries, we are in all consistency led to say, that the other seven of the series come after Charlemagne. It may be very true that the many generations of the Roman "beast" are all endowed, successively, with parallel series of "ten horns"; but if (as in conformity with other writers we have done) we commence a transverse or intersecting series, it is an evident requirement of such a plan of symbolism that the series be continued transversely to the end. Thus the "Holy Roman empire," commencing in Charlemagne, is divided, by the continuation of this series, into seven parts, or "horns" of empire. Furthermore, inasmuch as the "little horn," during the process of acquiring his strength, has seen "three horns" of this series arise and come to maturity before him, it is clear that—coming then to maturity himself—he is the fourth in the series:—and in justification of this statement, and that the remaining seven (and they only of this series) come after Charlemagne, we may adduce the Greek version of the expression "three of the first horns" (ver 8). In English it would seem as if allusion was herein made to the whole body of "horns" spoken of in the clause of the preceding verse—"and it had ten horns": or as if it meant "three of the first-mentioned horns"—whereby the "little horn" becomes inevitably the eleventh in order, and the last:—whereas it should be rendered "three of those horns that came before him"—(τρια κερατα των εμπροσθεν αυτου)—meaning that whereas there were some batches of horns which came after him in time, so also there were some which came before him. In fact allusion is here made to the ages preceding the maturity of the "little horn"—before he was able to take his place in the series. The little horn by this
method, equally as by the one generally received, comes up "among" the ten horns: he is the fourth in order.

Now the reader who has paid attention to prophetic numberings (it is a subject to which the last chapter of this volume is devoted) will scarcely fail to see the importance of placing the "little horn" the fourth in the series. In the first place, as "three" are subdued (ver. 24) under him, and that consequently the directing power becomes concentrated in him—the fourth in order, and having the semblance of a man; we observe that the combination is that of the quadruple Cherubim, which, in its allegorical import, is ever descriptive of the universal comprehension of the class of objects the figure is applied to:—so that when it is said to the effect, that "three horns are involved in the power of a fourth, who carries about him the tokens of a human nature," it is really meant that all the horns of empire within the sphere of time referred to (and History tells how numerous they really were) are thus involved,—a sense which does not forbid in the meanwhile to look for three chief horns (for there is always reality as well as figure in sacred numberings) as representative of all the rest.* In the next place we may observe (as if Prophecy would wish to suit her expressions to the progress of History) that the three antecedent horns are said to be plucked up (annihilated) "before the face of the little horn"; whereby the little horn—the fourth among the ten, becomes the first of a new series. After him come the seven, of which consequently the last is the eighth in the series; and (as was said of the "eighth head") he is "of the seven." We here observe that Daniel's "fourth kingdom" is distributed under seven horns or dynastic portions, with an eighth; in like manner as his "four kingdoms" are distributed under seven heads with

* This speculation arises out of a conviction, that Scriptural numberings, when historical, are always something more than it:—though faithful to History, that in every case is framed from her materials a numerical emblem. It is not solely a fact of History that the horns plucked up are "three";—any more than it is solely a fact, that the "Fourth" in the midst of the fiery furnace came to the rescue of the "three" holy children. Figuratively, do we not behold our Lord in the midst of His faithful people of all ages?
an eighth; or as the one great "beast" of the Revelation (their equivalent) is likewise so. This speculation no more interferes with the announcement "and it had ten horns"—referring to the horns of each successive generation, than does the meridian line of a place interfere on the globe with the lines of latitude it intersects. The division, or expansion, into seven is in truth the universal stamp of the Holy Spirit, in His arrangements both of Prophecy and History.

Such is the view we take of the "little horn," and the signs given of it, in the reference of that symbol to the Papacy; and if the speculation has a morsel of truth in its foundation (but it is, we confess, a very hazardous one) which identifies the "little horn" with the present rising "head" of the Roman empire, leading to the expectation that in L. Napoleon will be concentrated the features of its duplex rule, there is a show of reason for imagining that the signs we have examined may be repeated in a more emphatic sense in him—the personal exponent of the Power; but on this subject (as before said) we intend to be silent; excepting in respect of the numeric sign of ver. 25, to which, in its certain reference to the plural state of the "little horn," and its possible reference to the individual state, we now turn.

It is said in this important notice, that the saints are "given into his hand, until a time, and times, and the dividing of time." The first example here meets us of the Sacred Numbers; and we shall deem this a favourable opportunity—even if not more deeply entering into the subject, to describe the view in which we regard them in the fabric of the prophecies. Under the supposition that some of the periods of "twelve hundred and sixty years," given under the different terms of days, months, and times, have been fulfilled (and of this there can be no doubt), it is evident that no single prophetic "kingdom" with which we have had to do, has been of sufficient length to contain one of them; and this is at once a proof that it is not intended to say, of any one particular period which may be given among the signs of a "kingdom," that both its commencement and end are to
be found in that kingdom. It may be, according to circum-
stances, either the one or the other, but not both. In
the present instance we shall show it is the end of the period
that is given; and that the words are spoken in the like
sense, as though some historian should have said—"the great
rebellion raged in the reign of Charles II.,"—not intending
to state whether it commenced or not in that reign. We
regard these periods, in their double relation to two
"kingdoms," as clamps which bind together the cope-
stones of a parapet; and as in a clamp the ends are formed
with a reference to each other, so it is here; for
example, if persecution begins at one end there is deliv-
erance at the other. We may liken them also to comets,
whose office appears to be to bind together different systems,
or the too detached parts of each system. It is remarkable
that these periods are all included in the times of Christian
ascendancy, commencing with Constantine—times which
are represented by the "legs" of the great Image,
and which have their commencement in the middle of the
"third kingdom":—and as these periods overstep each other's
lengths, one of them beginning perhaps some half dozen
centuries later than the one preceding, they may be further
likened to the strides which the human "legs" make in their
advance, when, by overreaching in the step, they confirm
each other's progress. And thus (as Cruden says) "legs
denote the stability (he might have added, the progress)
of Christ's kingdom."

If it be insisted that the period before us must, in con-
formity with the terms of the prophecy, have had its com-
mencement in the "fourth kingdom," this can only be made
out by taking a convenient view of the limits of the fourth
kingdom,—that is to say, of the headship by which it is united
to the third; for the "seven heads" are the landmarks of time
in this vision. Not long since we pointed out that the sixth
"head" (Charlemagne) though standing at the entrance of a
kingdom, has, notwithstanding, a retrospective view; in that
in History, he looks back in legitimate headship upon the same
Roman kingdom, that he otherwise with equal right looks
forward upon. The retrospective privilege may justly be considered as reaching so far back as to the preceding "head"—Justinian, for the purpose before us:—indeed, on the recent occasion referred to, when under guidance of the great Image in respect of measurement, we felt justified in considering it to extend even to the opening of Christian rule under Constantine. It is not now, but in a future page when on the subject of sacred numbers, that we shall endeavour—in applying the present period ("time, times, and the dividing of time") to the "little horn" in its plural character—to show the points that must determine its fulfilment; and that the end of the period is given, to enable us, by a simple computation, to determine aright the dark feature foreshewn of the "little horn" in the earlier age. In the application of the period to the individual "little horn," it is only the following difficult speculation that we can offer as a solution.

The prophetic periods are regarded by some modern expositors in a literal sense—as expressing literal days and years; and the one before us, consequently, as signifying three and a half natural years:—this will apologise for our not at once discarding the idea. Now in all the works of nature there is observable, in the midst of an infinite variety of external aspect, a fastidious adherence to the same constructive laws, and to an exact uniformity of constitution. We ask then, may it not be, that as there is the same relation between the day and the year—a relation which makes the day in its opening, progress, and close, an epitome of the revolving year; as between an individual and the social body of which he is a unit,—whereby (for instance) the single saint becomes an epitome of the Church at large; may it not be (we say) that there is intended an alternation, and interchange of reference, among the terms descriptive of these parallel relations; and that the term day should be esteemed in prophecy in the same manner referable to an individual, as the term year to a nation? In common speech we speak of the "morning and evening" of life, with reference to an individual; and of the "rise and fall" (annual terms) of national existence. Is it then too fanciful to say, that these
sacred measuring rods of time should be taken in their literal or restricted sense when applied to a single agent of Providence, and in an enlarged sense when applied to the community of Christian nations? The idea commends itself strongly in this investigation (the more so to any one who entertains the theory of double fulfilment) in this respect—that it is strictly in unison with the peculiar feature of this prophecy, which (as we have found) exhibits the several “kingdoms” in succession in their representative “heads.” The fires of Rome, after raging for twelve hundred and sixty years, have been subdued; but as a dying ember will flare up into momentary brightness, so it may happen that the flame of persecution will break forth anew for a short season (1260 days) under the expiring efforts of Satan in the person of the “man of sin.” There is undoubtedly more of conjecture than is desirable in this speculation,—not more however than must needs attach to an enigma the solution of which is hidden in events to come; but to which, notwithstanding—(be it remembered) the attention of the Church is invited.

We may mention here a remarkable effect, and valuable inference, proceeding from the rule of seven parts and an eighth: it refers to the error of commentators in supposing, that identity subsists between the “ten horns” of this vision, and the “toes” of the great Image. Now we should observe that the “ten horns” are mentioned in the first recital of the vision—i.e., before the prophet “considered” (vii. 8) what was before him, and was thereby led to prolong his recital; whereas the “toes” are not mentioned at all in the first recital of the parts of the Image. This is of supreme importance for the following reason. The first recital, in each case, has in view the seven constituent portions only, or seven seasons (so to call them) of the vision, omitting the eighth; and inasmuch as, in the observance of this rule, the “ten horns” are found within the boundaries of the seven portions, and the “toes” are not,—while both visions, in the concluding scene of each, have respect to the same age; it is evident that the “horns” are (as we have otherwise shown) of anterior date to the “toes.” Both symbols belong to the kingdom of “iron,” and they are
respectively "kings" of that kingdom; but the "horns" belong to its earlier, the "toes" to its later history. The "ten horns" pervade the whole constitution of the beast, and as a line of kings comprehend the "toes"; the "toes" have their special place, as have all the parts of the Image, in a course of continuous history; and are consequently the last of their royal race, before the whole system is crushed beneath the "stone." And hence it is clear we have rightly assumed (consecutiveness being obviously the rule) that it is the "little horn" of the vision of the beasts—of which it is said that it comes "after" the other horns, that has its place in time on the same level with the "toes" of the Image; and that it and the "toes" are each the eighth portion of the system to which they respectively belong. The times of these two symbols are then identical:—and this elucidates a passage in the Revelation (xvii. 17) which states, that the "ten kings" (those of the "eighth" and last headship) "agree to give" (a proof that they have the independence of action which is the property of the toes, and is not of the earlier horns) "to give their kingdom unto the beast, until the words of God shall be fulfilled."

We now plunge wholly into the future of this vision—a consideration which counsels the utmost brevity.

At the end of the vision of the great Image it was added, "Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands which smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them in pieces" (Dan. ii. 34). It cannot be doubted that of parallel import with this is the passage in the present chapter, "And the kingdom, and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High" (Dan. vii. 27)—and that the "stone," consequently, is the "people" of God's saints. Hence it clearly follows that these corresponding notices furnish the single basis of time upon which the two visions are constructed. But there are some important foreshadowings before arriving at this final consummation.

After the recital of the four "kingdoms," ending with the eighth verse, there is introduced a highly wrought and magni-
ficent description of the Court of Heaven, when "the thrones were cast down" (i.e. when "the judgment-seats were set"—ετεθησαυ) "and the Ancient of days did sit," in august presidency over the saints, whom from every successive generation of mankind He had called to witness, and to assist in carrying out his righteous judgments. This solemn scene gives a vast dignity to the whole prophecy; while also the announcement of judgment has the effect of subduing the harshness of that predestination, which would otherwise seem to rest without mitigation on the great events of human history. This august scene the prophet first "beholds"; and "then" (ver. 11) he resumes his contemplation of the "little horn" in his blasphemous government of the fourth empire; and continues it until he sees the wrath of God poured out in his, and its, united destruction (ib.). Now having been led in this peculiar manner to this point of time in the prophecy, we are induced to believe there is a more apprehensible meaning in the heavenly scene of the ninth and tenth verses than as yet we have adjudged to it,—even an historical meaning. We know from History, and Protestant commentaries abound with illustrations, that "judgment" has been, during these many later ages, in the course of infliction on the Roman adulteress. It has been shown that she attained the highest flight of her spiritual pride and temporal usurpation in A.D. 800; after which, for many ages, she continued to prosper undisturbed, saying in the spirit of a blasphemous confidence that she was "a queen and could know no sorrow"; that the treasures of heaven and earth were thrown into her alone lap of enjoyment; and that eternity was her lot. It may be said that in this manner, for at least half a dozen centuries after taking her place at the right hand of power in Charlemagne, she continued to "lift up her horn on high." But at that epoch,—in that still early day, History begins to tell of her long draughts on the patience of God, and of symptoms manifesting themselves in her constitution of a retributive state of surfeit of enjoyment and helplessness of understanding. In her imbecility the fables of infancy had grown into realities, and in her waywardness she had learnt to treat with cruelty those who,
though remonstrating, would yet have had her live; and would have wished by a timely depletion to redeem her from the state she had fallen into of plethoric degradation. But the "judgment was set, and the books were opened." It was the will of heaven that she should be brought into the dust; and it is the opinion of the writer that in these verses (9 and 10) we may read the prophetic anticipation of the disgrace that visited her in the *Great Reformation*.

In the next verse (ver. 11)—in unison with History, the "little horn" continues its "great words"; which, in ver. 25, are expanded into "words against the Most High," and the "wearying out of the saints of the Most High," &c.:—and so it has remained, and will remain to the extent of opportunity, until (as the seer testifies) "the beast (the dominant Western empire) is slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the devouring flame." But this eleventh verse seems to be copied into Rev. xix. 20 (we have already cited it from thence)—wherein it is said that the "beast and false prophet" (i.e., the Papacy) are cast together "into a lake of fire burning with brimstone"; this occurring at the time when the "little horn" (as above) as part of the "beast" (whether regarded as Head of the Papacy, or not) is overwhelmed. Now, if the "little horn" be the same as the "man of sin" (and no commentator doubts it that we have seen) we may behold in the act of his destruction, by implication, the advent of our Lord: for the "man of sin" is to be overwhelmed "by the manifestation of his presence." And we know, moreover, from many sources, that the Lord, in coming, comes to set up His kingdom:—take one assertion to this effect as a specimen of many more, "When the Lord shall build up Zion, He shall appear in his glory." (Ps. cii. 16.) But now observe the remarkable fact, that this "coming of the Lord" is spoken of expressly in ver. 13,—two verses after it may be considered as declared in ver. 11. Hence we deduce that the *times* of these two verses are the same; and the same of course, in consequence, the time of the intervening 12th verse. Of these verses the 11th finds its complement in the 26th verse, with which it must be read: and the 13th has the same relation to the 27th. 

Embedded in the midst of these is the 12th verse; and this is not a little remarkable, when we consider how dissimilar to them it is in subject, and how important at all times is construction in these prophetic fabrications of the Spirit. In it we read to the effect, that "The rest of the beasts"—the Persian, the Grecian, and that of Eastern Rome—though their dominion be taken away, yet have their lives prolonged for "a season and time." Whether the expression "season and time" is indefinite, as in the English it would seem to be, or definite, as in the Greek version—viz., "two times," is a point of great interest, to be determined by some more competent person. Under either view we cannot but conclude that this prolongation of life is for some special end. These "beasts" still maintain their position in the world as civilized nations, though their dominion is obscured by the dense fog of the Mahometan falsehood; and the contrast between the lot foretold of them, and the terrible doom of the Western beast, seems to declare, that when the Lord returns to this earth (as, by the help of the inference drawn from the "man of sin," we have shewn will be in the midst of the overthrow of the Papal nations) He will find the Eastern nations in their original life and organization—the "fog" now brooding over them in all probability passing away. Let us not forget this conclusion:—in a future vision it will mingle its light with other light congenial to it.

From these premises it seems to result, that it is in the East the ensign of the Lord will be lifted up for final victory. It is in these ancient regions (as regards Place) that He will set up His visible kingdom; and that this the chief and glorious anticipation of all prophecy, and of Christian hope, will be accomplished. Descending in the "clouds of heaven" (ver. 13)—"in like manner as He went into heaven"—He will appear "among His ancients gloriously."
THE REVELATION.

We have now been listening for some time, not (it is hoped) without advantage, to two noble stanzas of the Song of Prophecy, as chanted by the favoured Daniel—a captive by the waters of Babylon, and have become acquainted, we fancy, with the metre and the strain:—it is time to move forwards to where the captive of Patmos takes up the song on the same seven-stringed lyre.

The book of the "Revelation" is divided by some authors (vide Bishop Newton, III. 201) into two parts, the second commencing with chap. xii. This is so far of importance to our investigation, as that with chapter xii. commences the direct reference by St. John, to the imagery in Daniel’s vision of the "four beasts"; and that, consequently, the second part of the Revelation may be considered the true continuation of our subject—the "Beast"; for, We sing the Beast! It has been seen that among the four "beasts" of Daniel there are seven "heads," and "ten horns"; these St. John amasses upon a single creature; and whether this creature be "dragon" or "beast," it is but a variation of the imagery. There are three chapters in the Revelation wherein is found this beast, or this creature—Chapters xii., xiii., and xvii.

It must be mentioned however that in the earlier portion of the book, allusion is made to the "beast from the bottomless pit" (chap. xi. 7) who kills the "witnesses"; but a reference to the text will show that this Beast is mentioned, in respect of his own constitution, quite incidentally—as one whose natural history is to be learnt elsewhere. And this consideration is of the highest importance, as fixing the period of the slaughter of the "Witnesses":—it must have been at the time when the Beast really ascended from the bottomless pit; and this may be determined with assurance from chap. xvii. But the subject of the "Witnesses" is beyond our present range.

Now, in turning to St. John's "beast with seven heads and ten horns," it is something to know that, as he speaks prophetically, his reference to Daniel’s visions must be confined to those prophetic "kingdoms" which belong to
Christian times: such are the kingdoms of the "leopard," and of the "beast with iron teeth"; and it will be our purpose to show that the scenes of chapters xii. and xiii. are evangelical descriptions of these two "kingdoms." And first, as to the twelfth chapter, and the "leopard" kingdom.

CHAPTER XII.

If this chapter (which the reader will be so good as to read) be carefully examined, it will appear that there is a double representation of the same scene, such as one might obtain by walking from the eastern to the western angle of a turreted edifice, whereby certain projections at first prominent are either lost to the sight, or diminished in saliency, while others are brought into view. The first representation is from ver. 1 to ver. 6, the second from ver. 7 to ver. 14. By transferring and combining the materials of which these are composed, a general view of the whole may be obtained; and it will be seen that this view presents to the imagination the rise of Christianity, its fortunes until it became the religion of the State under Constantine, and the consequent and immediate flight of the "woman"—the true Church as compared with the professing—into the wilderness. These combined portions of the chapter advance us in time no further than to the middle of the "leopard" kingdom of Dan. vii. (circ. A.D. 350), and to the commencement of the Christian "thighs" of the great Image. (Dan. ii.) A precedent for this duplex plan of the vision is not wanting in prophecy: Joseph, on hearing the double dream of Pharaoh, said, "The dream is one, and it is doubled unto Pharaoh because the thing is established by God." (Gen. li. 32.) The two representations are subscribed with numbers relating to the term of the sojourn in the wilderness, identical with each other in meaning, though diversely expressed;—under which diversity they may be taken as illustrative of the identity, under change of external aspect, of the two narratives that contain them. The last three verses are a prolongation of the Church's history, after the flight of the "woman"; describing in broad colouring the violent but abortive attempts of Satan against her, during her long retirement.
REV. CAP. XII.

It will be a convenient method of placing the double scene in one view before the eye, to read the verses of the chapter in the following order:—first, the first five verses; then, the seventh, eighth, and ninth; then the thirteenth; then the sixth and fourteenth in combination. The exultations of the tenth, eleventh and twelfth verses, which interrupt the narration, it will be better to reflect on by themselves. Thus arranged, the prophecy will present the following shape:—

“And there appeared a great wonder in heaven; a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars: And she being with child cried, travailing in birth, and pained to be delivered. And there appeared another wonder in heaven; and behold a great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns upon his heads. And his tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven, and did cast them to the earth: and the dragon stood before the woman which was ready to be delivered, for to devour her child as soon as it was born. And she brought forth a man-child who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron: and her child was caught up unto God, and to his throne” (vers. 1 to 5). “And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels, and prevailed not; neither was their place found any more in heaven. And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him” (vers. 7, 8, 9). “And when the dragon saw that he was cast unto the earth, he persecuted the woman which brought forth the man-child” (ver. 13). “And the woman fled into the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God” (being provided for the purpose with) “two wings of a great eagle”; (and there) “she is nourished for a time, and times, and half a time, from the face of the serpent” (i. e. for) “1,260 days.” (vers. 6 and 14.)

This was altogether a spiritual contest. The violence of Satan is described under the figure of his waiting intently for the birth of the “man-child”—the sons born to Christ in the painful throes of the early persecutions; whom the devil desired to scare from their devoted purpose, and so to destroy them:—but “they loved not their lives unto death” (ver. 11). The wiliness of Satan is described by his struggling:—acting in the persons of the learned and powerful of the heathen world—with “Michael and his angels,” the divinely-ordained ministry of the Church, arrayed under their tutelary immortal Head:—but he was overcome by “the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of
their testimony" (ver. 11). The blood of the martyrs commingling with the blood of Christ,—the Word of God carried forth by unflinching tongues,—constituted that two-edged sword with which these conquerors in death overcame the adversary.

In this imagery, the "woman clothed with the sun" is the early Church of the Apostles, as seen fresh from her espousals with Christ, adorned with the marriage garment of His righteousness, and partaking, like a bride, of the good things of her Lord's establishment—of His glory, and splendour, and majesty. She stands upon the moon—i.e., has her foundations in the early Church of Israel; which had the same relation to the Church of the Gospel, that the moon has to the unrisen sun,—ordained to shine with but reflected light in the night of prechristian times. This woman is crowned with a diadem of twelve stars—the earnest of her unbounded heritage; three multiplied into four—the ancient promise in Eden in the material expansion it was destined to assume; confided to twelve unerring tongues—themselves setting forth the fulness of her children, her "crown of rejoicing." (1 Thess. ii. 19.) To be encircled with stars, to stand upon the moon, and to be invested with the sun, is—in architectural phrase, "to be built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone." The "heaven" in which this woman appeared is by some interpreted as the "home of the Deity,"—of course it is the fitting place for sun, moon, and stars to appear. But if we conceive of these luminaries as in Joseph's dream, and as in the above exposition, as signifying the Head of a family in the present world, with his wife and noble offspring—heads of future tribes and nations; the "heaven" mentioned must be the appropriate abode of such persons, and therefore the higher spheres of life. The Gospel addressed itself of old, and ever will do so, not to the uninstructed but to the educated intellect of man:—without learning—whether individually acquired, or that of his superiors which the poor man takes on trust—it is not to be understood; and hence the vision, instead of being encountered in the lower walks of earth where such instruction so often fails, or even in the distant future of Daniel's
"visions of the night," is represented as seen in the very day of the Prophet, in the clear light of the resplendent sky—the intellectual light which could appreciate its glory.

Now from the very first, the Church was ever bringing forth male children, both among the higher classes—giants in learning and in zeal, and among the more humble and trustful:—and this consideration tells us that the vision mounts in its reference to the earliest years of Christianity. For three centuries she brought forth her offspring—multitudes "who were added to the Church daily," in grievous pain and tribulation, ever in presence of the devouring dragon; and if it were necessary to suppose the "man-child" of the vision to be an individual as representative of the class (which it is not), it would be either the first martyr Stephen, or the last martyr in the reign of Diocletian (whoever he might have been), when already Constantine was raising the shield of his power in defence of the Christian faith. To imagine with Bishop Newton (III. 208) Constantine himself to be this "man-child" is a very revolting speculation,—Constantine, whose Christianity led him to call the Pope by the name of "God"—a fact from which was deduced the argument in after times, that the Roman pontiff was not amenable to the secular power, for that "God cannot be judged by man" (Apostacy, 465); who also was a terrific persecutor, except of the "orthodox"; and who, having deferred his baptism till he was within the grasp of death, believed that in it he put on a robe of immortality. Let us not dare to pronounce that it was not so to him; but as to his share in the present vision, instead of being the "man-child," it might, we think, with much more probability be conceived, that he and his court constituted the "heaven," where finally and triumphantly the child was born,—perhaps in the council of Nice.

It is then to the struggles and persecutions that attended the birth of the Christian faith that this vision refers. Remembering that St. John was nearly a hundred years old when he was favoured with it, we conceive that it cannot be fully understood except by assigning to it a short retrospective reference. The "woman in travail" may first, then, be
regarded as the ancient and true Jewish Church of Elizabeth, Anna, and Simeon—the "painfully" expectant guardians in a faithless generation of the primeval promise committed to their keeping: or she was the Virgin Mary, as representative and exponent of this church; whose holy son the devil attempted to destroy at a blow, first at Bethlehem, secondly, on the cross. But this Son of man, at once parent and offspring of the promise, was caught up to His Father's throne; and Satan thence learning that his time was short, prepared terribly for revenge. Secondly, the "woman in travail" was the early Christian Church (as said before) bringing forth sons to glory—fellow-heirs with Him who was first "caught up," the first-born among many brethren. These the "seven-headed dragon," in the persons of the reigning heathen emperors successively, sought to destroy in a direct and sudden manner by cruel deaths, by the sword, by flames, and by crucifixion:—but through death their spirits were translated immediately ("caught up") into heaven. And thus we read in another page (Rev. vi. 9) that "under the altar" (which is "before the throne," Rev. viii. 3) may be seen "the souls of them that were slain for the Word of God, and for the testimony which they held." There is a mysterious and glorious doctrine in the words "caught up to God and His throne":—those who in suffering confess Christ, and defend His honour, are taken without delay—even "to-day," as the thief upon the cross, into the regions of the blessed, mounting as Manoah's angel in the fiery flame of their sacrifice. Such are they who "loved not their lives unto the death" (ver. 11); and to such will Christ "give power over the nations," to "rule them with a rod of iron" (Rev. ii. 26)—(thus showing that such are the "man-child"); and will grant to them beforehand to "sit with Him in His throne"—the throne (that is) of the "Lamb as it had been slain" (Rev. v. 6), expecting the day of his power,—not yet the triumphant King. Here we may imagine that, seated in contemplative happiness and light ineffable, they learn "by (through) the Church the manifold wisdom of God" (Eph. iii. 10) in the methods of His election, and diversities of His operation in grace, as
affecting all the kindreds of mankind; and thus become qualified to sit as assessors with their Lord in the judgment-day.

It is only by the retrospective reference which adjudges the "woman," in the first instance, to be the early Church of Israel, that we can obtain any clue to the meaning of the passage (ver. 4) "and his tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven, and did cast them to the earth,"—(in other words) "seduced the constituted ministers of religion into false doctrine." These are the first words wherein allusion is made to the attempts or achievements of the "dragon"; and these attempts must consequently be presumed to have the first place in the order of time, and to precede his placing himself in position to seize upon the "man-child." The writer can imagine no other instance of the early failure of spiritual leaders—"the stars of heaven"—to preserve their estate, than that of the Jewish priests and rulers to receive Christ and His gospel; which was equivalent, in their position, to a defection from the truth. The charge conveyed in the figure may be supposed especially directed against "the chief priests and elders of the people (who) took counsel against Jesus Christ to put Him to death" (Matt. xxvii. 1): these being a "third part," or large number (Wordsworth, 204)—those of Jerusalem, of the whole priestly order of the nation. This drawing with the tail becomes, by this interpretation, the first measure of Satan (and it accords with sacred history) to prevent the birth of the Christian faith:—"Christ came to his own, and his own received him not." These rulers (says the figure) were encircled by the tail of the dragon, and cast to the earth of the uninstructed multitude, to wander in the darkness of their own choosing; and from this choice, at that time made, has followed the "blindness" and rejection of the whole nation. This figure of the tail of the dragon drawing the stars, may be explained by a singular anecdote in the narrative of a late traveller up the Nile—(if we recollect) Mr. Curzon. It appears that the crocodile—that amphibious monster which belongs of right to the bottomless pit, but is so constituted as to be able equally to walk the earth, best
image in nature of the great adversary—resorts, in order to secure his victim, to the peculiar method of inclosing it within a circle formed by his tail, and then draws it hurriedly into the deep. This had just happened to an old woman, as the traveller passed:—she had been loitering a few paces from the water, and was suddenly enclosed within the fatal ring. The beast was at the time devouring her on a sand bank in the midst of the stream. Thus we may imagine the "chief priests and rulers"—the constituted watchmen of the people—to walk unconcernedly on the narrow shore of truth, and to be drawn suddenly into the region of blindness and death.

But in like manner as the "man-child" was continually being born, notwithstanding the watchfulness of Satan, during the three first centuries of the Faith; so we should imagine this predicted success of the latter—earlier (we have said) than the Faith in the date of its commencement—to have been continually and simultaneously proceeding; and that he was ever inveigling his prey into the labyrinths of error and falsehood. Thus history tells us that, during these centuries, false doctrines of every kind—the Gnostic, the Arian, the Manichean heresies, together with the "error of the Nicolaitans," whatever that might have been—like angry waves were ever dashing and foaming against the impregnable rock of Christian truth; and that not a heresy since widely known in the world, but was planted by the father of lies in those early days. Many of the "stars of heaven"—the Bishops and ministers of the new Church, were drawn into this gulf of perdition. To this early success of Satan may be attributed the fact (a further illustration of the prophecy) of many nations who had once received the light of the Gospel relapsing into idolatry:—"their sound (i.e., of the apostles) had gone out into all the earth, and their words unto the end of the world"; but in the mouths of many of their immediate successors, this "sound" became a summons to apostacy, and a return to spiritual death.

Concurrently with the persecutions noted in the first division of the prophecy, we read in the second division (and it is only a change of the figure—the matter remaining the
same) that "there was war in heaven." The weapons of this warfare were, on the part of the saints, "the blood of the Lamb, and the word of their testimony" (ver. 11). The contest being in "heaven" shows that, under the heathen emperors, there were incessant disputes and bitter contentions among the learned and the noble of the world, in defence and in deprecation of the truths of the Gospel. Indeed, the persecutions themselves are attestations of these inward strivings, and mental oscillations between pride and conscience, and of the fearful relapses from a half-converted state into idolatry; for the powerful never persecute those whom they believe to be fools. History speaks of crowds of Christians among the higher orders; of the imperial palace even being filled with them; and of their numbering in their body oftentimes the relatives themselves of the persecuting emperor. In the second century Pliny describes, as being brought before his tribunal, "cives Romani, omnis aetatis, omnis ordinis, utriusque sexus." Tertullian, in the next century, assures the African Proconsul, that if he persists in his cruel intentions, he must decimate Carthage, and that he will find among the guilty many persons of his own rank, senators and matrons of noblest extraction, and the relations of his most intimate friends (Gibbon, chap. xv.). Valerian in one of his rescripts forty years later supposes, that "Senators, Roman knights, and ladies of quality, were engaged in the Christian sect" (ib.); and in the reign of Diocletian "the palaces, the courts of justice, and even the army, concealed a multitude of Christians" (ib.). In the "heaven" whether of established power, or of high rank, so soon as it was brought under the influence of Christian education and learning, the Devil could not keep his standing:—unable to bear the splendour of truth as it emanated from the archangel, he fell headlong to the "earth" (ver. 9); which, as contrasted with the "heaven" means the lower orders of men. Blinded by the flood of Gospel light, he was necessitated, after the accession of Constantine, to seek a refuge among the ignorant, and the inaccessible to truth, skulking in retired villages where (as is well known) the
spirit of heathenism long maintained its ground,—as indeed the word "pagan" attests, for it signifies the religion of the
villagers, as opposed to that of the inhabitants of the towns, who had become Christian.

Now, in every age subsequent to the introduction of the Gospel into the imperial throne, a broad distinction has existed between the hearty followers of the Lamb, and that vast multitude who, impelled by various motives, have sought admission into His church. It may well be accepted that during the first three centuries, when the Gospel offered to its votaries nothing but persecution and martyrdom, profession alone gave evidence of sincerity. It could be none other than a genuine love of the truth which, like the stormy petrel, could skim with joy, and be at ease upon, the surface of those tempestuous times. So soon, however, as the chief government of the world received the truth, the false church began to raise its horn; and the distinction asserted became as palpable, as to the true Church—the humble residence of the Spirit, it was odious to have it supposed that no such distinction existed. Then began embroidered garments, and pomp, and gaudy processions, to be proposed as the evidence of zeal; and then did the priesthood—the representatives of the holy and lowly Jesus, appointed to minister only in "heavenly things," begin to affect the style and dignity of secular princes, to lord it over their brethren, and to preach the supreme merit of contributing to the magnificence of "Holy Church." The sword of violence has been wielded by Satan to the destruction of thousands, and sophistries and superstitions to the destruction of tens of thousands, but the most deadly of his weapons, wherewith he has overcome millions to their ruin, have been the patronage of half-converted princes, the smiles of courtly favour, and the introduction among the hierarchy of temporal wealth, with its attendant luxuries and pageantry. Before the reign of Constantine the Church was all glorious within, in the exercise of her self-denial and her charities; and her clothing—her ministrations, in which she appeared before the people—was of the purity of wrought
gold: after Constantine her clothing became of genuine tinsel, fitly emblematical of her doctrines of human merit, and dead men's mediation.

Now, when the professing Church had thus become wedded to the world, where should the ever-retiring spouse of Christ—members, equally, of the organised Apostolic Church—hope to find an unobtrusive sphere of action, congenial to her dispositions? Where, but in what is denominated "the wilderness"? Thither she went, even to the wilderness of sacred privacy and unostentatious poverty, content to feed in secret on the manna of the desert—the ever-present Word of God, and to forego the polluted springs of the Basilica and its almost heathenish rites. She fled away (it is said) on "two wings of a great eagle." This affords a complete assurance as to the era of her flight. The empire had become Christian:—for prior to this epoch, Rome would not have lent the wings of her eagle—the protection of her laws, to aid the escape of one she had been so long the willing instrument in the Dragon's hand of destroying. Also, it must have been immediately on the empire becoming Christian; for the causes of the woman's disgust did not delay their coming. The giving her emphatically "two wings of a great eagle" seems to denote a physical as well as a moral removal, and to two mountainous regions where eagles find their home;—such (for instance) as the mountains of Kurdistan on the one hand, and of Piedmont on the other. And we should not fail to remark upon what is, apparently, here pointed out—the great benefit derivable to the true and humble Church, from the powerful and splendid external one who bids her live. The imperial profession of Christianity became a source and means of security to the "woman"; and instead of the imperial arm being ready as heretofore, at the bidding of Satan, to slay her children new-born to Christ, the imperial "wings" are now extended for her protection.

The "time, times, and a-half" (ver. 14)—the period of the woman's retirement, is a subject that will demand our separate attention. The period is exact; and it supposes that, at the end of the time specifically mentioned, the true
Church issues from her seclusion, resolving to confront boldly her enemies. At this point the narrative arrives at the three verses separately appended.

In consequence of his defeat, and the escape of the "woman," the Devil casts after her (ver. 15) "out of his mouth water as a flood that he might cause her to be carried away of the flood":—that is, he brings down upon the professing empire a multitude of barbarous nations, worshippers of idols, by whom (and here we get at the secret springs of that wonderful portion of history) he hoped to overwhelm Christianity altogether, and therewith the spouse of Christ now sheltering under the imperial wings. What a terrific figure of the eternal war and deep hatred of Satan against the sons of light—the great Scandinavian dragon vomiting forth, age after age, from the deep recesses of his bowels, restless and savage tribes of men, seeking to settle down like the all-devouring locusts in the newly-planted vineyards of the Lord! The sending these nations out of "his mouth" may be further construed to signify, that he sent them, as Christ His apostles and the seventy, charged with the propagation of his word—those heathen lies and fables with which, equally as with sword and spear, he armed his legions, hoping by the inundation to effect a ruin at once spiritual and physical.

But—"the earth helped the woman" (ver. 16):—the commonalty of the empire, as they were gradually brought to Christ, became more attached to His cause than were their betters. On this point, we are glad to see a paragraph in Gibbon headed "Christianity most favourably received by the poor and simple" (chap. xv.).

"It is an odious imputation (he says) less strenuously denied by the apologists than it is urged by the adversaries of the faith, that the new sect of Christians was almost entirely composed of the dregs of the populace, of peasants and mechanics, of beggars and slaves, the last of whom might sometimes introduce the missionaries into the rich and noble families to which they belonged. These obscure teachers (such was the charge of malice and infidelity) are as mute in public, as they are loquacious and dogmatical in private. Cautionly avoiding the dangerous encounter of Philosophers, they mingle with the rude and illiterate crowd, and insinuate themselves into those minds whom circumstances have best disposed to receive the impressions of religious terror."
Proceeding to say that the humble faith of Christ was embraced, nevertheless, by many of the higher ranks of life, the Historian continues,—

"And yet these exceptions are either too few in number, or too recent in time, entirely to remove the imputation of ignorance and obscurity which has been so arrogantly cast upon the first proselytes of Christianity. Instead of employing in our defence the fictions of later ages, it will be more prudent to convert the occasion of scandal into a subject of edification. Our serious thoughts will suggest to us, that the apostles themselves were chosen by Providence among the fishermen of Galilee, and that the lower we depress the temporal condition of the first Christians, the more reason we shall find to admire their merit and success. It is incumbent on us diligently to remember that the kingdom of heaven was promised to the poor in spirit; and that minds afflicted by calamity and the contempt of mankind cheerfully listen to the promise of future happiness, while on the contrary the fortunate are satisfied with the possession of this world." (ib.)

It is pleasant to draw from so unexceptionable a witness so perfect a commentary on the words before us—" the earth helped the woman."

We proceed:—"and the earth opened her mouth and swallowed up the flood"; that is to say—this flood of nations, instead of overthrowing and uprooting the Christian empire (as was the design of Satan it should) did but amalgamate with it, embracing at once its government, its customs, its religion, and even much of its language. Instead of bringing desolation on the "earth" over which it was rolled, the flood was so absorbed into its nature, as to advance its fertility and improve its qualities; introducing into it that Northern strength of purpose, and vigour of intellect, wherein have been laid the best defences of Christianity through all-succeeding ages. "The dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed" (ver. 17):—this introduces us to the persecutions of the next chapter, and a more advanced age—part, notwithstanding, of the 1260 years; and to those atrocious cruelties inflicted from time to time, and in different localities, upon the mere "remnant" of the faithful Church—the Waldenses, the Bohemians, the Wickliffites; and which, as the prophetic day of suffering drew to a close, issued in the Great Reformation.

N 2
In the first division of the prophecy (ver. 5) the new-born man-child is spoken of as destined to "rule all nations with a rod of iron";—by which we are inclined to understand that, by the time the sceptre, as foretold, should be of "iron"—i.e., in about seven hundred years from St. John's day, all nations owning the boundless sway of pagan Rome should be brought under subjection to the Christian faith, and every potentate be Christian;—and this was the case even with far-distant Britain. But in a more perfect sense, the rod of iron—the rod perfected in the age of iron—is being fashioned in the days we live in, by the missionary preachers of Christ's kingdom; and will pass, perhaps not so long hence, into the hands of Him of whom it is said, that "the government shall be upon His shoulders." Now, whereas in this first division, so soon as the birth of the wondrous child is recorded, attention is directed to the final consequence of his birth—that all nations should be brought under subjection to Him; in the second division, the intermediate progress of his ascent to power is given,—the whole truth being thus collected from a comparison and adjustment of these correlative effusions. The first step in the ascent of the mystic child—born originally in a manger, crucified among thieves, and slain in His members by divers deaths throughout three centuries of heathen cruelty—must obviously be, to obtain the countenance, and be admitted into the society of the great. But in the same spiritual society the Christian and the Heathen cannot sit; and the admission of the former into the imperial intimacy is synonymous with the dismissal of the latter. At the imperial court then, Michael and his angels—the promoters of learning, investigation, and truth, dispossessed of their influence the devil and his angels—those who would keep the world in a settled ignorance, and the darkness of the bottomless pit. It was an immense step in the direction of the predicted rule, that to the professors of the Gospel was allotted secular precedence over those of the old religion; still more that the "place" of Satan "was not found any more in the (imperial) heaven" (ver. 8)—that is, that the profession of the Christian faith became the preliminary requisite to employment in places of trust and of
government. This step in advance occasions joy among the holy angels, who sing (ver. 10) "now is come salvation and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of His Christ." And undoubtedly (speaking humanly) had not the hierarchy and nobility, in whose persons the holy "woman" may be said to have been first introduced into the assemblies of the great, become corrupted by cupidity and ambition, the progress thenceforward would have been rapid of the kingdom of Christ. The "heavens and they that dwell in them" (ver. 12)—the high in Christian station and knowledge, are called to "rejoice" at the glorious prospect, and to acknowledge the beneficence of God in bringing kings and queens to be as parents in the care of the Church, and in gathering into her coffers those riches of the Gentiles, without which in moderation it is impossible that a learned clergy should be maintained. "Woe to the inhabitants of the earth and of the sea! for the devil is come down unto you having great wrath"—woe to those who are content to remain, or are let remain, in ignorance and superstition; to those whose views of salvation, and of the means of escaping the power of Satan, are determined by the maxims of a restless and gainsaying world.

The text, speaking prospectively, bids us look for these evils after the devil is cast out in the days of Constantine: it alludes to the speedy and universal spread of worldliness in those triumphal days of the Truth, among all ranks; and the easy servitude to Satan to which all quickly bend. But the text goes on further to say (ver. 13) that "when the dragon saw that he was cast unto the earth, he persecuted the woman which brought forth the man-child": who thereupon fled into the wilderness. Hence it appears that while the "woe" of spiritual contentment and security was fastened upon the great body of the Church—"the inhabitants of the earth and of the sea," the devil found in the same "earth," or lower orders, the mother of the man-child:—she had seeded already from the palaces of the nobility and hierarchy, and was (as it were) in a temporary lodging among the people.

Now, if we should fix a point of time close upon the acces-
sion of Constantine for the flight of the woman because of spiritual persecution (as in a future page we propose to do); and if, moreover, the devil is cast out after Constantine's accession—having found time, notwithstanding, for that persecution of the "woman" which obliged her to take her departure; it is evident there is an incongruity in respect of time in the circumstances of this explanation;—that is to say, there is proposed no sufficient space of time for the operations of Satan so set forth. Here it becomes necessary to advert to a mental perception which the reader should ever keep alive in the study of Prophecy, that in all instances wherein an event is alluded to, that event is but an index, or starting point, in its immediate accomplishment, of an accomplishment continuing from it, and which is (as it were) its more true substance and fulness. As an instance—it was said just now that the Lord Christ, though first slain on Calvary, continued to be slain in His members throughout the three first centuries. The same idea is exhibited in the "Heads of kingdoms" in Daniel; and so if the "woman"—the faithful Church—took her flight in some particular year (say A.D. 313), this did not prevent but that she continued to make her escape through many succeeding generations. And this consideration (as we venture to think) opens the true interpretation, in respect of time, of ver. 13:—the persecution referred to had its place after the flight of the "woman" had commenced, and was the cause of its continuing. The persecution consisted, first, in those oppressive measures set on foot by Constantine (Gibbon, in loc.) in enforcement of his "orthodoxy"; and secondly, for a couple of centuries and more, in the religious contentions and animosities of the Arian controversy. The faithful bride, become few in number, was glad to seek her peace in the solitudes of a despised but protected piety, abounding in good works pre-ordained for her probation, and shunning the chambers of dispute. And there let her rest, until we may return to seek her again in a brighter day.

We have deferred hitherto to touch upon the subject which called our attention to this chapter—the bestial power,
or "imperial rule of man"—the old instrument of Satan, brought forward for the first time in this prophecy from the book of Daniel. "Behold (says St. John, ver. 3) a great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns upon his heads—and his tail drew," &c.:—we quote the latter words in order to show, that the dragon is here set forth in his full length from head to tail. What power is here described? Hitherto we have had to do with the Beast, or Beasts, "with seven heads and ten horns": the question is—to what extent does the present symbolism in which for the bestial power is substituted the draconic, differ from the preceding?

It is almost universally said that the "dragon" is the ordinary symbol of Heathenism, and that consequently in this vision it stands for Heathen Rome. Now it is true that the "Dragon" is here mainly seen in the line of heathen Roman emperors, but it is quite necessary to inquire how this comes to pass; for the "Dragon" (i.e., "Satan," ver. 9) is an universal power; and to make him symbolize a particular creed, or nation, to the exclusion of all others,—to make him represent (for instance) Heathenism, and not corrupt Christianity,—Pagan Rome, and not Papal,—is obviously to detract from his attribute of universality. Moreover, the Dragon, being Satan, is spiritual. Can an angel, whether of light or of darkness, be an appropriated symbol of aught terrestrial! We should have imagined that wherever the spirit of Satan is pre-eminently to be recognised—whether in respect of persecution, or of usurpation, or of false pretension—there he might be said to be pre-eminently displayed; but to say of Satan that he is a specific symbol—for instance, of Heathenism, has to our ears as harsh a sound, as to say of the Lord Christ that He is a symbol of His Church,—a most revolting idea! Now the "Dragon" in the imagery before us is the same as Satan, in the sense that he is a symbol of Satan: (how then—it may well be asked—can he be a symbol of Heathenism?). So likewise the "Lamb" is the same as Christ, being a symbol of Christ. And having thus in these two cases of spiritual existences (and it requires no apology that we confront them the one against the other—
though versus Apollo—for it is of the essence of this prophecy; having thus (we say) material elements to work upon, and having brought (as it were) the two spiritual existences under the laws of matter, by the means of exhibiting them under material symbols; it is possible to make these symbols enter, each of them, into a compound symbolism:—the “dragon,” for instance, may be invested with “seven heads and ten horns”—the mystic depositories and ensigns of human imperial rule, in like manner as the Lamb is said to possess “seven horns and seven eyes” (Rev. v. 6). When thus invested with the instruments of his will, Satan is to be understood as resident in some special manner, and for special ends, in human government:—the questions arise—in what manner? and for what ends?

It might justly be objected here that Satan ever resides in human government, as “prince of this world”; and has so effectually instilled his principles into it, as that the seven great rulers of the world—types of the general line of rulers—have obtained in prophecy the appellation of the “Wild-beast,” the fierce unreasoning agent of Satan, to the loss of the character of “Man” (Dan. vii. 4) the special agent in Creation of the Deity. True! but there is a department of rule in which the Beast, as such, can have no ministration—it is the spiritual department. The principles of the Beast, per se, do not reach to spiritual concerns,—do not touch at all upon many of the chief attributes of Satan, especially spiritual enterprise and aggression. The “Beast” is altogether a secular power,—its aims have respect to the present life, and are conversant chiefly with its interests and enjoyments: the symbol discovers in Christian times a state of fascination, wherein the secular ruler becomes the deluded tool of Satan; doing really his work, though acting professionally against him. The principles of the world, of which it is the embodiment, do not imply hostility to religion and religious truth, but rather indifference, and an aptitude in parrying her admonitions. But the attributes of Satan, which the “dragon” symbolizes, are spiritual falsehood, and hate, and cunning: and the most appropriate means of their exercise among men is—not primarily the secular power,
but—the agency of a corrupt and degenerate Priesthood,—a *spiritual* body influencing and directing the secular arm. Hence we should deem that the "dragon" in this vision—the great spiritual adversary residing in an enraged Priesthood, but equipped also with "seven heads and ten horns"—the insignia of secular power, is a representation of the Heathen hierarchy obtaining the ear of the early Roman emperors—their own "Pontifices maximi," and inciting *them* to the "holy" duty of cleansing the world of that new system of belief, which was springing up to the ruin of the old idolatry. The object being of this depth and magnitude, Satan is seen (we say) to call into activity a *spiritual power* to excite and counsel the old *Bestial agency*, of itself too intent on the things of time to be a sufficient instrument in the great emergency. We may understand then, that in this early day of the Faith, there was foreseen in the line of Roman emperors, under guidance of a crafty priesthood—the real promoters of the evil, a deeper scheme of spiritual malice than could have been entrusted to the ordinary habits of thought of the "Beast" to carry out. We behold, in consequence, the master-mason (as it were) coming forward for the work, instead of his usual foreman. It is not that our old friend the Beast is dismissed from his employment; but that in this scene, in a lengthened line of *great men* under inspiration of the *exasperated priestly agents* of Satan, he is himself impelled to the unceasing and universal work of *spiritual* persecution. This exceeding virulence of the draconic spirit, beginning with Tiberius in whose reign our Lord was slain, pervaded the imperial line for three hundred years.

This "red dragon" had "seven heads and ten horns, with seven crowns upon his heads";—that is to say (in respect, first, of the "heads") he stood in the great line of Rulers that proceeded from Cyrus. It would be a notion equally extravagant and perplexing, that there were intended in the works of Daniel and John any more than one septenary line of these lively symbols of empire; but it is necessary to acquire a right apprehension of the constitution of the line, as consisting of a number, (viz., "seven") which expresses sym-
bolically the whole continuous line—scores in number—who sat successively on the imperial throne. The Beast himself ever lives since the days of his first appearing; and assuredly he can only have been, at any one moment, single-headed; and further, can never have been without a head. Consequently, the seven imperial heads are presented to the imagination only (we repeat) as representations of a continuing headship,—the single actual Beast, or Dragon, being said to carry them all. If the reader will reflect upon the expression in Rev. xvii. 10—"five are fallen, and one is"—referring to this very line of "heads," he cannot fail to present the symbol correctly to his imagination. But now comes something of a difficulty:—it is not a necessity of this symbolism, that in different Visions referring to the one undying Beast, the same personal Heads should be always alluded to as constituting the "seven"; but only that they should be, and be spoken of as being, of the one right line of "seven":—for instance, it is a matter of perfect indifference whether we call the third head of the "leopard" by the name of Justinian, of Theodoric, or of Alboin king of the Lombards. Indeed, so unrestricted is the rule as to the position of the heads in this line, that, in another vision, we shall find four heads enumerated of another kingdom than that we are now in of the four-headed "leopard" (vid. Dan. xi. 2)—yet are they assuredly, of the one original line.

Now in the vision of Dan. vii., the "leopard"—whose kingdom includes the age of the "dragon"—has (we have just said) "four heads"; and this we deem a sufficient reason for assigning not more than four heads to the "dragon," albeit he is said—because of standing in the original line of Rulers—to have "seven": while yet we assign as many as four, instead of one only, for the reason that four, when amassed on any particular portion of the line of "seven," seem to express a high and continuing intensity of the spirit declared to belong to the first of the four,—to whom the undivided headship would naturally belong. How then shall we name the four heads of the dragon, so that, together, they may be easily recognised as a just impersonation of the draconic spirit,—four instead of one, the real Head?
The heads of the "leopard" are Augustus, Constantine, Justinian, and Charlemagne: they were so chosen because the index pointed to them of a continual change of the seat of empire, during the restless ages they represent. What index have we to the heads of the dragon? Let it be remembered that the dragon ceased to be in heaven (i.e., in the imperial court and government), with "crows upon his heads" (i.e., in sovereign authority), at the accession of Constantine; and that—however tremendous the power remaining to him, wherewith he was able in later ages to draw down torrents of barbarous nations upon the Christianizing empire—he still had fallen to the "earth" of the lower orders;—he could raise no head to wear a "crown." It must therefore be between Augustus and Constantine, the first and second of the "leopard," that the heads of the dragon must be found. Neither Augustus can be named, for in his day Christ had not been brought into collision among the dead with the powers of Hell; nor Tiberius, excepting it be on the ground of the Saviour having suffered under him; for he is said so highly to have esteemed the character of Christ, as to have proposed to enrol him among the gods. But we need not be particular about that which is only a numeric representation; and we shall not widely err in naming Nero, Domitian, Decius, and Diocletian, as constituting together the red imperial dragon.

Perhaps a little reflection may suggest, that in the circumstance of the power of the "red dragon" being included entirely within the three first centuries of the Faith, we may read the reason why precisely those centuries are made the subject of the double scene in the construction of the vision:—it is the honour done by the inditing Spirit to the saints of those ages—the warriors who, with the sword of their faith, and the irresistible word of their testimony, overcame "the devil and his angels."

And here a further view opens before us of the remarkable words (ver. 4) "his tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven," connecting them again with the times of the three last verses of the chapter. Wherever the "dragon" is, there is his "tail,"—i.e., he is ever ready to destroy
by the *entanglement* of *false doctrine*, according to the saying of Isaiah (ix. 15) "the prophet that teacheth lies, he is the tail." This we have shewn to have been the case (*i.e.*, that the "tail" was in activity) even in the earliest days of the Faith. But further, whatever the ages overlaid by the *body* of the dragon, it may be presumed that the *tail* would be traceable in ages long thence extending. If then the body consist, *in time*, of the three first centuries, the tail would extend the length of the remaining five centuries of the "leopard kingdom," or even of the remaining nine and a-half of the retirement of the "holy woman." The latter we greatly prefer. The slimy paths of the Dragon, endangering the footsteps even of saints, are throughout, and to the last, to be recognised. It is well known from Gibbon that the empire was never more rent with heresy and schism, with controversies ecclesiastic and iconoclastic, than during the remainder of the "leopard kingdom"; and as to the still later ages of the "tail," wherein the masses of mankind were enclosed irremediably within its spiritual *ring* of ignorance and superstition, the "third part of the stars" which it drew and cast "to the earth" would refer, in the sequel, to the ruin—the result of transgression (Dan. viii. 12), which the dragon brought upon the Greek Church—the *third part* of Christendom, so late as the middle of the fifteenth century.

This proposed extension of the "tail" of ver. 4, into the ages beyond the draconic period (which terminated, as regards its chief characteristics, with Constantine) meets with its responsive note in the symbolism of the later scene of the vision, in the words "woe to the inhabitants of the earth, and of the sea! for the devil is come down unto you having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time,"—words which (as before said) equally refer to the post-Constantine ages. And as to its being an objection to this prolongation of the "tail," that it brings forward the era of the "dragon" so far into the department of a future symbolism, and beyond its apparent sphere; it may be argued, on the contrary, that this interlacing of the prophetic fabric, without confusion, is one great feature of its excellence. By
way of illustration, we may not inaptply be reminded of
the manner in which the same monster (the "great dragon")
draws his tortuous length along in the sky, intertwining
his path with those of the "great and little bears," the
"cameleopard," and other constellations. Furthermore, if
the faithful "woman" is seen to languish in the wilderness
for twelve hundred and sixty years, does it not seem in
accord with this symbolism that the "dragon" should be
all the time at hand, to "make war with the remnant of her
seed" (ver. 17)?

A few words are necessary upon the "ten horns" of
the dragon. Horns are instruments of the specific sort
of power which belongs to him who carries them. If (for
instance) the "Beast" be viewed territorially, the "horns"
must be territorial, and would be the provinces of his
"kingdom";—if in the character of a Head, they are
his viceregal supporters. The analogy extends to the
question of spiritual or physical, in the nature of the Head;
and as in the present instance the works of the Head are
spiritual, so also must be those of the Horns. And hence we
are led to recognise, in the "ten persecutions" under the
Heathen emperors, the proper evidence of the Horns of the
Dragon during the period;—and it may be mentioned, that
these assaults of the "horns" were carried on with chiefest
violence (as History informs us) by the governors of the
imperial provinces (vide Univ. Hist. xv. 563).

Lastly, in addition to what has been said on the symbolic
propriety of introducing into this vision the dragon himself
(Satan) instead of his usual tool the beast; if we do but carry
back our thoughts to the terrific nature of the incidents
foreshadowed in the vision,—the early flames of persecution,
that short way to heaven,—the extravagant heretical doctrines
sown deep and manifold by the father of lies,—the deadly
attempts of the same power to overwhelm the new-born
Christ by a torrent of barbarous nations; can we not perceive
that, had the "wildbeast" been mentioned as the instru-
ment in these mighty achievements, there would have been
conveyed to the admiring student of symbolism a sense of
disappointment—as if of an inadequate and disproportionate
instrumentality—in there being thus ascribed to the agency of man, and so to the common course of things, such prodigious operations as these? Is it not a more just, as well as more magnificent, symbolism, that ascribes the disposition of such gigantic combinations to the great enemy himself—the true fountain not only of the bestial, but of a more farsighted and more malevolent inspiration?—for with Satan, these were the ages of his most desperate endeavour to maintain himself on the throne of the world. But further, there was a reason not of good taste only, but of necessity, for the preference given to the symbol—the "dragon." The plan of the prophecy was to show, that Satan would first attempt to quench the Church by the instrumentality of the Roman emperors; but that, meeting with nothing but failure in this supremacy of worldly power, and being at length "cast out of heaven"—i.e., deprived of this instrumentality through the imperial conversion, he would secondly seek other agencies—those of savage, invading nations. Now it is clear that, when dislodged from the imperial "heaven," Satan's character of a crowned dragon with seven heads and ten horns ceases. But he does not on this account relinquish his object;—he changes his means of attack, carrying his inspirations among the idolatrous tribes of the North—the "herd of swine"; who, at his bidding, rush violently into the placid waters of the South, and (as swine) perish in them—are "swallowed up of the earth" (ver. 16). Satan's object in organising these interruptions was to extirpate the Christian Faith, but an overruling Hand made them subserve an opposite purpose—the chastisement of the persecuting empire. It is evident that, had the "beast with seven heads and ten horns" (though really brought into action) occupied by name his usual place in the prophetic scene, the history of the Scandinavian agency must have been inconveniently set forth, in a totally separate scene.

If then the view of Chap. xii.—which we here bring to a close—be correct, it is in brief as follows. In the first fourteen verses are presented two scenes, supplemental to each other, relating equally, though directly, to the three first centuries of the Faith:—the next two verses carry on the
affairs of the Church to the end of Daniel's "leopard" kingdom—the end of the eighth century:—the last verse stretches forward with telescopic eye to the distant age of the Great Reformation. The chief personages of the drama are the "great red dragon"—the old bestial power invested with the spiritual habiliments of its founder and inspirer; and the "woman"—the Lord's wife, whom the dragon persecutes, first bringing forth male children—martyrs to the Faith, and then retiring from the world into the safe asylum of poverty and devotion.

The writer feels himself constrained at this point—stopping the progress of the press, to call the attention of his friends to a doubt he has lately conceived, suggested by the prophecy we have been considering, as to the correctness of the dimensions he has assigned to a most important portion of the great Image—the "brazen thighs." The reflecting reader will not be surprised at this announcement, as he will know that prophetic difficulties and doubts are almost always dispelled, if dispelled, by means of light reflected upon them from other cognate prophecies. We are inclined to think the "thighs" commence in the Augustan age. We have ever felt embarrassed by the absence of due proportion between the "thighs" and the "legs," as hitherto we have described them,—the one enduring only 500 years (from Constantine to Charlemagne), the other 1,000 years (from Charlemagne to Napoleon)—a deviation from the symmetries of nature, which, if proportion is to be regarded, certainly cannot hold. Eight hundred years of "brass" (Augustus to Charlemagne) against the thousand of "iron," commends itself as a measurement in perfect keeping. But what, then, will constitute the "thighs" (μηπότ divisions)—for History tells us of no political divisions in the Augustan age? We conceive they are yet more clearly seen in the two great divisions of mankind, represented by the Greek and Latin tongues, as they were brought by Roman conquest under one imperial rule, and amalgamated into one prophetic "kingdom." The political divisions of Constantine and
others find (we suspect) no mention in Prophecy; nor that the imperial establishment of Christianity in his age is otherwise marked, than by the *flight of the holy woman.* In this scheme, the "breast and arms" of the Image will be the Persian kingdom, and the Macedonian—the latter consisting, in strict unison with History, of the single career of its founder. The three hundred years between Alexander and Augustus will be the "belly"—the place of assimilation, into which the disjointed members of Alexander's empire were brought, as food to promote the growth of the great Roman foetus. For a short moment supremacy of dominion might have seemed to oscillate between the East and the West; yet was the star of Roman destiny ever brightening and ascending:—its blood-red light became fixed in the Eastern sky, in the overthrow of Antiochus the Great about a couple of centuries before Christ; and it gained the mid heaven in the age of Augustus.

Now the advantage of this amended division of the Image (in addition to the more natural length it gives to the members in question) is this, that the "thighs of brass" become exactly commensurate with the "leopard kingdom":—on which, however, we have nothing further to observe, than that the *adjustment* of these two visions of unequal length, takes place—not as previously said, in Charlemagne, but—in Augustus. But the value of the new division is truly seen, in the light it throws on the vision we have just been considering; and which is, unquestionably, an evangelical picture of the "leopard" kingdom. The striking peculiarity of this vision is the separation of its constituent parts and events into two parallel scenes. The reason we have suggested for this peculiarity, a page or two back, is too fanciful, and carries too little of prophetic character; and further, the analogy on which we founded it fails—that of Pharaoh's two dreams (Gen. xxi. 25) which were declared "one," for these were *distinct* dreams, each *complete* in its purpose; whereas the two parts of the vision are intermingled in their contents, so as to yield, *when taken together,* one whole. This last feature is in strict accord with History; for the great events of these ages were enacted, equally
though separately, in both halves of the great empire, the same lot in all respects awaiting them both: such, for instance, as the persecution of the nascent Church, and such as the irruption of the Northern nations,—as when Alaric, having carried his arms almost within sight of Constantinople, and to Athens, turned suddenly towards Italy, which he visited with an equal devastation. Do we not then catch at once the beauty of this duplex construction? It is in conformity with the duplex constitution of the Roman empire which it symbolizes—the empire of the "thighs," the combined destiny of the Greek and Latin nations. For the rest, we do not believe that any preceding arguments of importance, founded on the notion of the Christian "legs" having their commencement in Constantine, will be so disturbed, but that they may easily be accommodated on the like ground to the age of Augustus.

CHAPTER XIII.

In entering upon the next vision, we enter likewise upon the next age of the Church. In like manner as the twelfth chapter refers in all its leading imagery to the "Leopard" kingdom of Daniel, ending with Charlemagne, so the thirteenth refers to the kingdom of the Beast of "iron" commencing with Charlemagne:—it gives an account of the foundation, character, and course of the "Holy Roman Empire"; and onwards, considerably beyond what is commonly called its termination. It is during this period (as we hold)—and not far off at present, that the "time of the end" (Dan. xi. 40) will occur,—that time of final struggle between Christ and the infidel usurper of His throne; and fraught with so much of suffering, and eventually of blessedness, to the Church of His saints (Dan. vii. 27). It is in "the time of the end," and just at its commencement—as we shall hereafter endeavour to show, but ever within the "kingdom of iron," that the Antichrist will be overthrown; and so willing has the Holy Spirit been that this consummator of the evil age should come to a not unexpectant Church, that —after the important notices of him in the latter half of
this chapter—a name is given, of which the only doubt can be, whether it is given to designate the age in which, or the individual in whom, the power of Antichrist is supremely and finally manifested.

The three first verses of the chapter are as follows:—

"And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads the name of blasphemy. And the beast which I saw was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion: and the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority. And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed: and all the world wondered after the beast."

The belief that this "Beast from the sea" is Charlemagne in headship, and that he is the sixth Head of empire, is founded entirely on the discovery of the name of the seventh Head, who is Napoleon;—the seventh, because preceding the "eighth" of Rev. xvii. 11. We do not see by what other means this conclusion could with any assurance have been arrived at: it has already been found to derive great support from the two visions of Daniel we have investigated; and we hope now to put it beyond dispute.

The prophet "stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea" (ver. 1). The "sea" is the troubled, upheaving mass of the overthrown Roman empire; and the prophet stood on its shore on a particular day, and while it was in a particular condition; and as he not only saw the "sea" in this state, (which he might have done in the spirit at the distance of centuries) but also "stood upon the sand" of it, i.e., quite close to it, it is presumable that he therein became, in respect both of place and time, a present spectator in the scene. Not only (we say) did the Holy Spirit place the prophet in a convenient position (the sand) to behold the ascending beast, but He carried him forward in respect of time to that age of the future, where and when, in the counsels of the Eternal, the great event was to happen.

This view of the expression "I stood upon the sand" will, we doubt not, be objected to, as assigning weight where none was intended; but we reply with confidence that no
word of the Revelation is without its weight; and that in these light touches, pregnant with meaning, the excellency of the Divine work is chiefly seen. St. Paul tells us he "was caught up into paradise," but that whether it were "in the body or out of the body" he could not tell. Ezekiel was lifted up by the Spirit "between the earth and the heaven, and brought in the visions of God to Jerusalem" (Ezekiel viii. 3). Philip was "caught away by the Spirit of the Lord" (Acts viii. 39). Now in all these instances of rapture, no difficulty arises regarding time, as each occurrence and its circumstances happened in simply the time then present; but are we not right in saying that, in a case where a similar rapture is presumed, but where the scene to which the body is translated belongs necessarily to a future age—the narrative being prophetic, the rapture must needs be in time as well as in space? At any rate we have as much right to say that St. John was carried "in the visions of God" forward in time, so as to be personally present in the distant scene he beheld, as to say that the scene itself was brought backward from the future so as to be present to him. We infer then that as he "stood on the sand," he stood in close proximity to the transaction, as though he were living—indeed that he did live—in the very day of the future wherein it came, or (grammatically speaking) should come to pass: for the past, the present, and the future are limitations unknown in the eternal world. We presume it is a fair question to ask of an objector,—for what reason is St. John so careful to say that he took up his position in any particular spot, if it be not to indicate his bodily presence in the scene—even be the scene one of futurity?—The most usual mode of the Holy Spirit's prophetic communication has been (it would seem) by "vision of the night," (vide Dan. ii. 19; Dan. vii. 1) in conformity with the Divine word (Num. xii. 6), "I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a vision, I will speak unto him in a dream," wherein the darkness may be considered emblematic of futurity, and where a mention of time is not supposed. But if it should be added that the person visited is taken to a particular place; as, for instance, in Dan. viii. 2, "I saw in a vision, and I was by the river of
Ulai," it must surely be that the place has some reference to the scene foretold; and as it is certain otherwise that the person visited is in the scene, whether the place be mentioned or not, it would seem that the mention of place is evidence of his being in the scene in the very day of its future happening.

We may imagine the beloved John in these visions to be introduced before his time (as it were) into the sublime academies of heaven, where, in august symbolic forms, are disposed the resemblances of things and events to come, especially in their connexion with the fortunes of the Church:—forms which engage the earnest contemplation and study of angels and redeemed saints,—"things which they desire to look into," as they repeat in their anxieties for their brethren on earth the everlasting question "how long?" We may imagine mystic responses to this question to be conveyed by these effigies, enabling the subtle spirits of heaven to calculate both the time and place of things future, and in granted measure to interpose in the issues of them; and thereby that there is "made known to them by (through) the Church, the manifold wisdom of God" (Eph. iii. 10). In these academies we may imagine, as in the hall of a statuary, that he who would contemplate the illustrious specimens of the Divine art, must go to them severally in succession; and that if St. John would bear witness to what should take place in the future day of Charlemagne, he must go to that compartment of the hall of futurity where its everlasting type is seen. Under guidance of some such imagination we are led to the opinion, that St. John, rapt bodily into future times, beheld the Beast "rise from the sea" in the very day of Charlemagne.

The beast which was seen to rise (says St. John) "was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion." No attentive reader can possibly doubt but that this beast is an aggregation of the several beasts in Daniel's vision (chap. vii.), and that it carries proof in the features mentioned of the relationship between the two visions. Daniel presents a plurality of Beasts rising successively to view; but he adds (ver. 12)
that "they (all) remain for a season and time";—that is to say—though retiring successively from an ascendant position and giving place to each other, they yet do not resign their existence. St. John takes up the idea when he presents them all in one, but differing as to the quantity of each in the vision. The perception of this relationship establishes the important fact, that the "seven heads" are in the two visions the same individuals, or (what is the same thing) denote the same divisions of time.

In the ordering of the beasts by the elder prophet,—and which is done in conformity with their precedence in time then to come, the lion comes first, then the bear, then the leopard; but St. John reverses this order,—he speaks of the leopard, the bear, and the lion. And the reason is obvious,—the vision of the ever-enduring "beast" was presented to the later prophet's eye in an order of its parts, which marks emphatically both the epoch of the vision, and the point of view from which it was seen; but only so to a beholder in that epoch:—thus making good our foregoing remarks on the position in time assigned to the seer, as suggested by the first words of the chapter. For nothing is more certain than that St. John, had he been gazing in his own natural day, would have stood in the vision in the commencement, instead of the end, of the Leopard kingdom; and then he would have had the "leopard" in front of him, with the "lion" and "bear" in his rear—positions that would have precluded their amalgamation in the vision. In viewing them as one, he must have viewed them in a straight line; and this could only be done by his standing on the very "sand of the (very) sea" from whence the Beast rose (A.D. 800), and gazing at it in the single direction of past time; whereby the "leopard" became the bulk of the beast, and the "lion" and "bear" presented only traces of themselves in the more distant past. It is clear from the narrative that, up to his completing the character of a "leopard," the Beast was in a receding position to the prophet's eye; who beholds it, historically, in the regions of past time—the three beasts of Daniel having grown, in the dimness of receding ages, into one.
Now as regards this method of expressing the position of the Beast in time,—i.e., in calling attention to a particular day of his existence, a moment's reflection will tell us that it is in exact unison with the prophetic method of expressing his perpetuity; which is done by ever recounting as present the "seven heads" (though many of them may be past) into which his destined existence is divided. The Beast lives through all generations, and no part of him dies:—therefore his heads all live:—and by naming them together, a visible representation is placed before the eye of the imagination, of his entire life; the condition of such representation being, that the eye shall rest at once on the beginning, the progress, and the end of his duration. But as an ephemeral beholder of St. John's day, or any other day, must needs observe these heads, some behind, and some in front of him, a method hence suggests itself of fixing on a single point of the Beast's life, viz., by placing the beholder at that point.

Now, as in Daniel's vision the six first heads are on the lion, the bear, and the leopard—the leopard having four, it is evident that in this cognate vision of the Revelation, St. John gazed as it rose upon the sixth head, being the last head of the retiring "leopard"; and that the whole beast that met his eye (as said above) belonged by its constitution to past time. But then, the prophet likewise saw this beast "rise," an expression which plainly intimates the commencement of another period of existence, and another "kingdom." From this arrangement we learn that the "leopard" belonged equally to past and present time, i.e., was at once, in some sense, and some condition, both terminating and continuing his reign. And this, the reader will recollect, exactly agrees with that double view of Charlemagne which the knee of the great "Image" presented, and which the vision of the "four beasts" confirmed. It is in the like conformity that we now behold him, both in a receding attitude,—i.e. that we view him from behind; while at the same time he emerges from the deep into fresh existence:—from the deep into which he had fallen, as part of the great mountain that had rolled into the "sea"
(Rev. viii. 8), and where he had remained in a somnolent state for the space of three or four centuries, ever since the deposition of Augustulus. With this again agrees an expression in Rev. xvii.—(a chapter that sheds an essential light upon the present portion of Scripture)—"five (heads) are fallen, and one is" (ver. 10). The "head," which is here described as "one is"—being the sixth of the original series descending from Cyrus—is clearly the last of the four-headed "leopard":—so that we have here the remarkable fact of the last head of this beast not "falling" with the other three,—in other words, of the life of the Beast being continued into the next "kingdom." If an illustration be needed, let us imagine the great sea-serpent to spring out of the deep:—you see half of him, consisting of three parts—the head, the neck, and the body. Had you only the experience of an infant, you would imagine that the whole animal was within your sight; but experience has taught, that if he should now swim away from you, he will certainly bring more of himself—i.e., of his body, the third part, into view. Thus the "beast" in question, with body of leopard, feet of bear, and mouth of lion,—if he should move forward, (and this is guaranteed by his rising from the sea to new existence) may certainly be expected, notwithstanding our inexperience in symbolism, to develop more of his body—the leopard. And here we may observe that in the second verse, where an exact account is given of the constitution of this beast as he rose to view—("the beast that I saw was like," &c.) no specific allusion is made to a fourth kingdom. Why is this? It is that the headship (or rather, the origination) of the fourth kingdom is really alluded to, however disguisedly,—for it is of the "Leopard"; in like manner as the antitypical power of Charlemagne is of the old Roman power—being itself restored. No shape drawn from the kingdom of nature is given either by Daniel or John as symbolical of the "fourth kingdom," but only (by Daniel) the appurtenances of "iron teeth," &c., as if the preceding beast had put on the attributes indicated by these instruments;—as if (that is) the "leopard" had become the Beast of "iron." And we can scarcely enough admire the beauty
of this symbolism, when we call to mind that the "beast with iron teeth" is really, according to history, a continuation of the "leopard" kingdom (being the latter portion of the one Roman empire), and bears the same relation to the earlier portion as the "leg" of the Image to the "thigh": and further that its imperial founder brought into it the power that he had really amassed in the first portion of the duplex "kingdom." It follows from these observations that the "head" in the third verse, which receives a "deadly wound," is not the sixth head (which is a head of the receding—that is, past "leopard," and is connected with the next beast only to originate his "iron" reign)—but must be the seventh head, and last in the succession; respecting which it was possible to say that the Prophet—looking from the position he was in at the entrance of the "iron" kingdom into futurity—looking (that is to say) at the rising leopard—saw the wound inflicted. And this "head" is declared, in the mystical cypher written underneath, to be Napoleon.

Having now determined the "beast from the sea" to have arisen under the sixth headship of imperial rule, our attention is called to his "ten horns." That the "Holy Roman empire" had ever, and still has, ten (that is, many) quasi-subordinate rulers and territorial divisions, has already been sufficiently shown; and we shall therefore employ the present occasion of the occurrence of this symbol in demonstrating (what has been before suggested) that "ten horns" is a characteristic of all the "four kingdoms" of Daniel, and of all imperial rule subsequent to the days of Nebuchadnezzar.

If the student of ancient symbolism should encounter unexpectedly a figure equipped with two contiguous and apparently coeval emblems—"seven heads," and "ten horns"—on a Beast or Dragon, it would be an involuntary conclusion, arising out of a perception of fitness—and on that account claiming not to be disregarded, that they constituted a double correlative sign, and that their co-existence was essential to each other. It is true that in Daniel's vision of the "four beasts," the symbol of "ten horns" is affixed to
the last only; but the opinion that most people (perhaps all) have hence entertained, that the symbol is an exclusive distinction of the "fourth kingdom," leads to a result which, under the view we have propounded of the "seven heads," is altogether untenable. The "seven heads" have a duration reaching from the earliest days of the vision to the end of prophetic time; and to place "ten horns" upon them as if of co-ordinate rank and duration, when in reality this hypothesis assigns to them a very limited existence—viz., the times only of the seventh head, or "fourth kingdom"—is an awkwardness of symbolism which the judgment at once repudiates. There is wanted undoubtedly a reason why, if "ten horns" appertain to the whole series of kingdoms, they are mentioned by Daniel as belonging to the fourth alone; and the only one that readily suggests itself is this—that supposing it was not necessary for purposes of recognition to speak of "ten horns" of the earlier kingdoms; or that it was not deemed in good taste to speak of horns as belonging to the lion, bear, and leopard; it was yet necessary to do so in the kingdom of the "beast of iron" because of what was immediately to follow, viz., that, "behold there came up among them another little horn":—and thus the "ten" become introductory to the portentous "little" one, whom we have found to be admirably described under that symbol. It cannot stand that "ten horns" belong only to Daniel's "fourth kingdom," except it be under the assumption that the "fourth kingdom" is invariably spoken of, whenever the symbol of "ten horns" occurs. But this ground gives way even during its recital; for the "dragon" of Rev. xii., and the "beast" of Rev. xiii.—both with "ten horns"—would then be of the same kingdom,—which is absurd:—and if one of these apparitions coincide in "kingdom" with the "horns" of Daniel, the other serves to confute the supposition against which we contend.

There is a moral aspect suggested by the duplex symbol "seven heads and ten horns," which, if just, may be considered to throw some light upon its material constitution; it is this—that whereas the "seven heads" denote never-failing continuance, the "ten horns" denote indefinite in-
crease,—marks that respond to such as the following of Christ's kingdom, "Thy throne, O Lord, remains from generation to generation" (Lam. v. 19); and "of the increase of His government shall be no end" (Is. ix. 7). And if we thus regard the "ten horns" as symbolizing an all-pervading principle, in conjunction with the fact of the symbol being seen at the very end only of Daniel's vision, we are reminded of the effect on St. Paul's mind of reflecting on the last commandment of the decalogue—the last (that is) on the list of ten. By the words "thou shalt not covet," he became acquainted with the spirituality of the whole law,—the spirituality of the last commandment opening to his view the like characteristick in the preceding nine; and teaching with reference to them all, that even "those motives and desires of the heart towards sin which never come into act, are sinful" (Henry on Rom. vii. 7). The same retrospective action we ascribe to the "ten horns," occurring statedly in the last kingdom only; they denote an all-pervading principle of augmentation.

As exactness of number is not required, but may be supposed to incline in different ages, and in different "kingdoms," on either side of "ten"; the principle of increase we suppose them to denote would be at the first (as generally happens) but feebly manifested. In this respect it would correspond with the associated principle exhibited in the "seven heads," which commences with the single "head," the number, as time rolls on, being augmented by many more (for "the king never dies") reminding us in their long succession of a well-known scene in Macbeth, when the line of kings—a similar line of royal Heads—is said to "stretch out to the crack of doom." The horns are ever sprouting and observing a like succession from age to age; i.e., the boundaries of the bestial kingdom are being ever enlarged.

Now it is requisite that this view, if correct, shall be in unison both with prophecy and with history:—and first, as to prophecy. The "fourth kingdom" is well provided for: Daniel says of it (vii. 7) "it had ten horns":—he meant probably to say (as some time ago hinted) that this beast had
the prodigious number of ten horns. The "third kingdom"—that of the "leopard" (which, as a "kingdom," may be called the first part of the fourth) includes the times of the "red dragon," who also has "ten horns" (Rev. xii. 3): for in point of fact the horns are those of the Beast,—as are originally (as before shown) his heads likewise. And now as to the second, and the first, kingdoms. In the first two verses of Rev. xiii. St. John beholds a Beast compounded of the first three Beasts of Daniel; and to this beast, so constituted,—to the exclusion of the "fourth" to whom they are expressly given by Daniel, he ascribes "ten horns." How is it possible to gainsay the inference that each of these component kingdoms had "ten horns"? To which of them should they be distinctly and preferentially ascribed? They belonged to all alike; for certainly, they all partook of them. This inference appears not less clear and unexceptionable, than is the information in the case of the horns of the fourth kingdom.

It is the common idea regarding the "ten horns" of this chapter that, being borrowed from Daniel, they not only belong exclusively to that prophet's "fourth kingdom," but are, in John's imagery, representative of that "kingdom":—that is to say, that it had been the object of St. John, by their means, in company with the emblems of the other three kingdoms, to construct a "Beast" representing all four kingdoms. Now, in opposition to this idea, we beg the reader to read, soberly and thoughtfully, the second verse by itself:—let him observe in what a measured manner the prophet proceeds, there and there only, to indite a detailed description of the Beast:—"And the beast which I saw was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion." It will be said that, here, is no allusion to the fourth beast, while certainly some is necessary. True! But surely we are not at liberty to seek the allusion in the preceding verse, in defiance of this formal manner of entering upon the one description! Where then is the requisite allusion? To this question an answer has already been given; it is, that in the leopard itself—the leopard rising as well as receding, and therefore
with a fresh history descending from him—the allusion is found:—the dragon gave him then and there authority. In the first verse (we repeat) the "seven heads" and the "ten horns" present themselves as essential accompaniments one of the other; the latter seeming to partake with the heads of the property of succession, to be a constituent part of their nature, and to be necessary to the completion of their symbolic character; and consequently, to be ever, when the heads are so, within the circle of sight. Yet, inasmuch as the expression "seven heads" points generally to one existing head, so the expression "ten horns" here points to one existing age;—we have in the description—not upon his horns crowns, but—"upon his horns ten crowns," pointing emphatically to the "fourth kingdom." The personal description given of the beast in the second verse is a description totally unconnected with the more universal characteristic sticks enumerated in the preceding verse; as may be further gathered from this circumstance—that in the preceding verse the "beast," having "seven heads," must have had seven mouths; but in the second verse he has one only. Giving the utmost weight we are able to the popular explanation we would combat, it is surely a very perplexing sort of symbolism that would have us imagine a seven-headed monster with ten horns on one head, and none on the others; for such does an unreflecting adherence to Daniel require.

It must be acknowledged that another view of this vision suggests another means of recognising in it the "fourth kingdom." It might have been (and this will put on a greater probability as we advance in the Vision) that the Beast—which the Prophet might be supposed to have seen in its entirety, and which (as he saw it rising) was certainly coming into being—was a compound of the three former beasts:—i.e., that possessing no features distinctively its own, it comprised all the features (territories and moral properties) of the three former beasts. History has not yet enabled us to verify this interpretation; but we shall find presently such prophetic matter in favour of it, as to make it at least no wild speculation.
Presuming now it has been satisfactorily shown that Prophecy ascribes "ten horns" to all the four beasts of Daniel, though not through his prophecy; or at least that the opposite argument tends "ad absurdum"; we must endeavour to show that History verifies the prediction. Viewing the "ten horns" as expressive of the principle of enlargement, and as likely to be small in its first application, we observe that the Persian empire consisted of "two horns"—the kingdoms of Media and Persia, of which Daniel observes (viii. 3) that "the higher horn came up last." Of the Grecian empire—regarding it as Scripture regards it as a single "kingdom"—it is needless to do more than point to the several illustrious independent states—"horns" of empire, of which it in a similar manner consisted; the chief of them being bound together by confederate ties, which imparted to their union the character of a single power. So much for the two early kingdoms.

We are now to consider the third and fourth kingdoms. It is necessary for the moment to speak of these together, to mark the following special distinction between them:—of the third kingdom it is said (Rev. xii. 3) that he (the dragon) had seven heads and ten horns, "and seven crowns upon his heads";—of the fourth it is said (Rev. xiii. 1) that he (the Beast) had seven heads and ten horns, "and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads the name of blasphemy." The difference here noted in the placement of the "crowns" has been generally, and we believe rightly, assumed to consist in this—that the sovereign power, as expressed by the "crowns," is resident—in the third kingdom in the "heads,"—in the fourth in the "horns."

Now in the third or old Roman kingdom, it is necessary to consider of the number of "horns," all those provincial governments in the wide empire of ancient Rome, where the rulers exercised kingly, though subordinate, authority. In the time of Augustus (to begin early) Cælius Gallus undertook on his own account, as governor of Egypt, an expedition against the Arabs. In a later age Caracalla, following his own judgment or inclination—though a subordinate, made war with the Scots. Such were powerful personal
horns; and similar instances might be multiplied indefinitely. In the time of Diocletian, himself Augustus, two Cæsars were made who had separate jurisdiction as princes; to the one of them were appointed the territories of Illyricum, Thrace, Macedon, and Greece; to the other, Britain, Gaul, Spain, and Mauritania,—enormous territorial horns, or rather clusters of them. Constantine, in dividing his empire, appointed to his two younger sons extensive provinces, while to his eldest he gave the succession of highest rank,—thus retaining to him the headship; and whereby the possessions of the younger sons became horns of the one empire. These are specimens of "horns" both personal and territorial. King Agrippa is a good specimen of a personal horn: though a royal personage himself, an appeal to Caesar superseded his power (Acts xxvi. 32). And as to territorial horns, every new province added to the empire, and confided to a governor of more or less absolute authority, but responsible to Rome (this is the essential thing) was a sample. In another view of the subordinate state we may include among these "horns" the numerous magnificent Gothic kingdoms which arose within the territories of Rome at her downfall; independent in government, but boasting (for such was the case) of being portions of the one undivided Roman empire.* No further proof then can be required, that ten horns belong historically to the "third kingdom."

But let us now examine the statement, that the Beast, during this period, has "seven crowns upon his heads." There is a meaning in this passage not quite so simple, as that which is satisfied with saying, that in the time of the "dragon" the sovereign power was in the "head." It is not meant to state that the "seven heads" and the "seven crowns" are intended severally for each other, for imperial heads could scarcely appear uncrowned; and we have no right to regard the crowns as partaking with the heads of the property of succession. Now be it remembered that the head of the beast expresses—though literally a ruler, (or it may be even a plurality of rulers, as when there were several Augusti of equal rank in the great empire, conjoined in the

* Vid. Tregelles on Daniel, p. 68.
sovereign authority) yet symbolically it expresses—a period of time; for it expresses the beast under the whole headship
—i.e., during a period consisting of many ages. And further, the words “upon his heads” mean—during the headship then in being, without regard to the plural nature of the expression:—this requires no further explanation. As then we are at liberty to substitute, for the words “upon his heads,” the words during this headship, the sentence will so assume the following form—“with seven crowns during this period of headship.” Under this view we conceive the words “with seven crowns upon his heads” to carry a truly interesting reference. In a general sense they are equivalent to the words of Daniel (vii. 6) describing the same kingdom of the beast—“and dominion was given to it”; the reference being to the unbounded, sevenfold, universal sway which should be exercised by imperial Rome: in a more particular sense, it glances at the nature of the States subjected to her, as consisting of numerous magnificent kingdoms—powers of sovereign rank, brought under, or forming part of, her widespread dominions.

In descending to the kingdom of “iron,” we find in every age a full complement of “horns” sprouting out of the imperial Head. As to their ever-varying names, the reader is referred to Mr. Birks’ tables. In agreement with them is the short statement of Mr. Pinnock in an Elementary work, that “about three hundred years after Charlemagne, in the time of the emperor Henry III., the great vassals of the empire asserted that complete independence, from which have resulted the present states of Europe.” As then the sign “ten horns” is put beyond dispute in this kingdom, we may as well proceed at once to the consideration of the peculiar marks the Beast in the age of “iron” is said to carry, viz., “upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads the name of blasphemy,”—and first as to the ten crowns on the horns.

Although the word “heads,” in the passage “upon his heads seven crowns,” was observed to mean the one head then dominant, it is not so with the “ten horns”: these appear always together, the succession they observe not being of one to the next, but of the whole number to a similar number,
and during a succession of ages: so that we are to conceive of the \textit{whole batch} of ten horns, as being crowned. This prophetic sign of \textit{crows on the horns} is a first-rate index in determining the period of the Beast's existence, as being when the Head—to whom the horns naturally appertain—exercised only, \textit{as Head}, a nominal authority; the horns acknowledging no subjection to him, but only the deference due to supreme rank. And further, this change in their relation to the supreme dominion, on the part of chiefs possessed in the earlier Roman kingdom of \textit{subordinate} authority, so remarkable as to have attracted the notice of prophecy, presupposes a cause of no ordinary extent and efficiency, in its operation upon the laws of social organization. It becomes us to look into this cause—productive of so great and novel a change;—it was the rise of the feudal system of government, and on it, we may well afford to spend a few moments' attention.

The peculiar feature of the feudal system, introduced by the Norman and other northern nations, was that it recognised the perfect freedom of its subordinate military leaders in all civil affairs:—so that, owing nothing but military service to their sovereign, these chiefs were absolute despots among their own retainers and followers. This system carries on its face the stamp of its origin—that of the camp-practice of a migrating, invading, and perhaps we should add conquering population,—that state which, when the martial horde should be actually on the move, and when the excitement of every day stimulates to a ready and rapid discharge of the functions of internal government, necessarily throws into the hands of immediate commanders the settlement of disputes and the punishment of offences; of which necessity and practice the drum-head court-martial of the present day is a tolerable illustration. When become stationary in new territories these martial hordes would not depart in the character of husbandmen from the habits thus entered upon—perhaps acted upon already for a number of years. It is known moreover from history, that all things in feudal times—the division of land, the foundations of property, the claim of armed service, were adjusted upon a plan which had entirely
in view to strengthen the early military connexion of the chief with his followers. It is easy to comprehend that a system of this kind, widely diffused, and based upon the irruptive spirit of the age, shall be found to generate in its own bosom a principle of consolidation; and shall result in the creation of a number of independent powers, not disavowing a higher allegiance, but asserting for themselves territorial jurisdiction, and resolute in the maintenance of their separate rights and laws. Such military states will become more and more intolerant of political subjection, and the dictation of the higher sovereign authority; and several perhaps will combine to quench that authority, excepting so far as, by upholding its perhaps illustrious name, they preserve the fountain of their own dignity. In an empire so constructed, the struggles for the maintenance of imperial rights, excepting so far as they assert an empty chieftainship, are likely enough to terminate in their abrogation; and the allegiance of the great vassals, as they increase in consequence, to be reduced to a traditionary respect. Service will be forthcoming only on occasions of general interest—such as of external aggression; and the imperial chief will become, in respect of government, simply "primus inter pares." From history we learn that such, in brief, was the manner of the growth of the German empire, and of those once feudatory principalities, from among which were appointed the seven Electorates, as "representatives of the whole and all its various orders";* and to which was accorded the choice of successors to the imperial dignity. In all respects these electoral "horns" were sovereignties, and their chiefs were "kings"; as indeed they have remained, except in name, up to the present day—now drawing nigh to a thousand years—to attest the fulfilment of the prophecy, viz., that the Beast should have "upon his horns ten crowns."

The mention of these German sovereigns, in government absolutely independent, but in respect of rank acknowledging the supremacy of a chief, introduces a view of the "Holy Roman empire" of the utmost importance in its connexion with these prophecies. It may be asserted with truth, in one

* "Russell's Modern Europe," p. 87.
and the same breath, that Charlemagne's empire ceased to exist, and continued in existence, the whole space of its thousand years:—so that, after Charlemagne himself, the next real emperor of the West was Napoleon. During this long interval, the chief and proudest province of the empire, France, was never wholly included within its boundaries. Le Débonnaire, the successor of Charlemagne, began to alienate from his empire extensive portions of France, within three years from his father's death; the independent kingdom of Arles sprung up; and during the one century wherein the imperial headship remained with the French, only detached pieces of that kingdom were ranged under its banner. And when, eventually, the empire was transferred to the Germans, France did not even preserve a voice in the election of its head. In those respects, then, wherein consists the idea of imperial rule—extent of dominion and supremacy of power, the "Holy Roman empire" was altogether deficient—did not exist: yet, by reason of its continuing title, and of the deference that title commanded, its existence was affirmed. The feeling of the French on this point is not unworthy of notice. In 1814, the common ornament in works of art in Paris were the united heads of "The two emperors of the French"—Charlemagne and Napoleon:—the writer himself purchased a snuff-box there, in that year, whereon this subject was represented in a beautiful medallion. The glory of the Western empire was, then, much reduced in the long interval between these chieftains; and the line of sovereignty was continuous only, as a railroad is continuous between two termini—the residence of a Headman being no where discernible in the interim. We have dwelt the longer on this remarkable feature of the New Roman empire, as a right view of it will much facilitate our way in a future prophecy.

Now if the "horns" of this "kingdom" had become thus independent as political bodies, and the supreme authority of its "Head" was reduced to a nominal superiority, is it the case that there was nothing beyond a name to constitute the bond of their union? It is far otherwise:—and to set forth the mysterious connexion derived from another source is
a principal object of this chapter of prophecy. The connecting bond, strong in the mixed texture of its fabric, was the Papacy. It was, and is, that all-absorbing power which encloses within the folds of its red garments, as they were its children, all the otherwise independent states which acknowledge its sacro-secular jurisdiction,—a power which is first announced in prophecy as a "little horn" (Dan. vii.), but which soon becomes "more stout than its fellows," and famous for its "big words;" acknowledging the rightful existence of the temporal crowns around it, but claiming to bestow them at its will. In describing times to come, it is the plan of Prophecy to seize the features that are most chargeable with anomaly; and a right conception of this peculiar feature of the rule of the "iron" age—the Papacy domineering over the temporal authority, and seizing for Christ a rule which He has personally repudiated—will go far to unlock the mysteries of the vision with which we are engaged.*

There is a well-known appellation in Scripture for the seat of this power—the "City,"—the appellation likewise, by an ordinary expansion of the meaning, of the full territorial circumference of its dominion. But the "City," in a symbolical sense, denoted originally not a spiritual but a temporal dominion,—as may be seen by a reference to the history of Babel, where the builders builted "a tower and a city"; of which the former (probably a light-tower, and the original of all the pyramids and pillars of subsequent ages)

* If the symbol of "ten horns" denotes a principle of enlargement and multiplication; and if the present "ten horns," wearing independent crowns, are bound together only by the tie of Romanism, it would seem that to whatever countries the shadow of Rome should be made to reach—wherever the rightful head should learn to do obeisance to her name, there a "horn" appears. Territorial boundaries as fixed by other causes can have nothing to do with determining the extent of such a dominion; which rather is measured by the spiritual elements it contains. And hence, in these later ages of the world, we are not a little inclined to number all the new-born Roman Catholic kingdoms, the Brazils, Mexico, Lower Canada, &c., among the "horns" of the Roman empire, resulting from the law of unlimited augmentation. However, as these countries can scarcely be imagined to be constituent portions of Daniel's "fourth kingdom," we will do no more than mention the idea, for others to work out if, hereafter, it should seem to be not so extravagant.
was certainly intended as a means of concentrating the *spiritual* aspirations of the departing tribes, and the latter as the seat and source of *temporal* government and law. It is in this symbol—the City, the "eternal" city, and in this retrospect upon its origin, that we may best discern the nature of the power exercised by Rome. It is not so much a *church as a city* she would see rise around her, of which her *name* ("let us make us a name") should be the palladium and bulwark. She would compel all kings to lodge within her *palaces,*—her aim not being the glory of the temple, but the extension of her city walls. Pretending to be the true centre of spiritual light, the only tower of ascent to heaven, she uses the pretension as the means of acquiring a directing voice in all the most weighty concerns of empire, and of enforcing an universal subjection to her will. It is most likely, in this similarity of her views with those of ancient Babel, that she becomes entitled to the name of Babylon.

Now this consideration will best enable us to appreciate the other of the two peculiar marks to which attention is called—to be seen on the "heads" (*i.e.*, during the headship) of the Beast of these ages:—divested of their crowns, they put on "the name of blasphemy" (ver. 3). This name of blasphemy is the title of "Holy," which was stamped on the forefront of the "Holy Roman empire," at the time of its institution, by him in whose will (as we shall see) it originated. The Roman pontiff having arrogated to himself the title of "holiness," has his seat in the "holy," the "eternal" city, and extends the title to that family of nations whom he finds within the *city walls.* The blasphemous title legitimately descends from him; and it is the seal by which Antichrist appropriates to himself what he considers to be his own. On the title of "holiness," reserved to the Pope by a "very iniquitous courtesy," Dr. O'Sullivan writes:—

"If use had not dulled the quickness of apprehension, the obvious profaneness of applying such a title as this to man would be manifest to all. Even now it is not possible to reflect upon it for a moment without feeling that it is a title for God only." (Apostacy, 463.)

And on the title "The Holy Roman empire," the same
learned author (for it is said he is the author of the "Kings of the East"; qu. vid., p. 382) pronounces, that it was blasphemy, in submitting to the yoke of Antichrist, "to place upon its front the sacred title of 'The Holy Roman empire.'" "A name of blasphemy (says Kirchever Arnold, Theol. Critic, No. 3, 1851, p. 389) is in general any name by which a creature invades the name of God, presumptuously assuming a greatness which is independent of Him." If the Roman empire be "holy," then is every institution of man holy where law and order prevail:—the House of Commons is holy: the national school which teaches no religion is holy: the Ottoman Porte is holy: even the institution of Freemasonry—that singular medley of all religious creeds, which literally assumes to itself the sacred title (the only institution in Great Britain we are aware of that does so); where Christians accommodate their unbelieving brethren by expunging from the united prayer of the Lodge-meeting the name of our Lord—that which alone can make their own prayer holy and acceptable;—even it is holy. But let the true Church of Christ be informed, that it is given among the certain marks of the blasphemous beast, that he thus invades the title of "the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy" (Is. lxvii. 15).* This offen-

* It seems incumbent, when pointing out this "mark of the beast" on the brow of the Western Empire, not to omit the notice of it, where deeply stamped upon our own. The circumstances under which this high and sacred title is adopted by Freemasons are as follows. It is a fundamental tenet of Freemasonry that it cannot exist without religion; and inasmuch as, under direction of this tenet, regulations are framed regarding prayer to Almighty God, it is to all intents and purposes a Spiritual Institution. Now of these regulations the most important is the one, whereby from Masonic prayer is excluded everything of a "peculiar" nature, as connected with the divers systems of Faith among the brethren; and the necessary, and admitted consequence of this is, that, together with the mention of Buddha, of Mahomet, &c., is excluded the name of the Lord Christ. It will scarcely be believed, perhaps, by those who have not looked into the subject, that the blessed name of Jesus is, deliberately and systematically, excluded from Masonic prayer—i.e., from the united prayer of the brethren at Lodge. For the sake of conciliation, and in pursuit of "friendship," or "brotherhood," or (as it is said) of "charity," the Lord Christ is deposed from the presidential chair in that
sive "name" is said to be upon the "heads" of the beast;—not because (as it might at first seem) it was a title enjoyed by the *temporal ruler*—the Head of the Beast for the time being; for, in fact, it was not *peculiarly* held by him;

which, notwithstanding, is called a *Christian Lodge*: and in the abandonment of His name—the symbol of His presence, He is of course to all intents and purposes *thrust out*. It is the fundamental doctrine of Christianity that Christ is the "*ONE WAY*" of access to the throne of grace, for all over whom His holy name has been called, and who (be it further remembered) have undertaken at all times, and by every means, to set forth the infinite value of that "Way" among men:—but here is an attempt to establish the exactly opposite doctrine; and to engage Christians to *push* their unaided approaches into the presence of the Divine Majesty, and to "come boldly (boldly, indeed!) to the throne of grace" by another way—one which only the veriest deism could have suggested. No arm of support, we are here taught, is needed by the supplicant; no sin-offering; no gracious word of mediation. Christ has said that "wherever two or three are gathered together *in His name*, there is He in the midst of them": is His presence equally sure—is it not rather presumptuous to expect it—when the "gathering together" is avowedly *not* in His name?—when His open invocation is prohibited, and His intercession unsought, in the united prayer of an assembly consisting mainly of members of His Church? To such an extent is the judgment warped by the high and fascinating pretensions of this Institution, that many of the best men of this land are totally unconscious of that, which to others is most manifest, that they are failing to uphold the honour of their Saviour in a world, which is ever ready to detract from His claims, and to depreciate the value and object of His sacrifice. God, it is true, is the "Universal Father" of us all; but is it not equally true that to *promote His glory* is the great privilege and duty of His children? And are we not told that the most effectual way to promote His glory, is to labour, that "every tongue shall *confess* that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the *glory of God the Father*"? And is this "glory" had in view, when the spiritual arrangements at Lodge are entirely to the advantage of the enemies of the Gospel: when the suppression of all that is most holy in God's truth—the sanctifying name of the Holy One—is conceded to them: when spiritual peace is sought by the means of withdrawing from the Prince of peace himself the honour due, and usually rendered, to Him? And yet we are told that Freemasons are a "holy brotherhood," a "peculiar people," dedicated to God's honour and service!

As regards the Masonic argument that there is a necessity at Lodge for a *broad basis* of religion, the writer would wish to call the attention of young Christians—unhappily entangled in this sophistic web of infidelity, to the following sentences, which come as reverberations from the two
but for the reason above given, that the expression "upon his heads" signifies the *times of the headship*;—and here, the headship bounded by Charlemagne and Napoleon.

The "ten horns"—the symbol of ever-extending power—have now been recognised, prophetically and historically, in all the "four kingdoms," and gradually increasing in number and strength. It is a circumstance deserving of remark, that in the midst of the long series of horns (taking together the old and the new empires of Rome) there appears from Mr. Birks' tables to have been, in the time of Charlemagne—the founder of the fourth kingdom, a suspension of the symbol, and the whole force of empire to have been concentrated

most opposite pillars of God's present temple in this land:—Dr. Cumming says, "Unity in error is apostacy" ("The End," p. 235). Dr. Wordsworth says, "Unity in error is not true unity, but is rather to be called an impious conspiracy against the God of unity and truth" (Apoc. 313). Freemasons pretend they have discovered the "Art (the very word used) of reconciling all religions":—but can they end their address to the Almighty with a Masonic hymn, as thus, "Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power be unto the Lamb that was slain"? No! Can they sing the "new song" (as Luther interprets that phrase in the Revelation) "Thou Jesus art my righteousness, I am thy sin: Thou hast taken on thyself what was mine, Thou hast given me what is thine"? No! Let then these young men know of a certainty, that the Masonic Lodge is not a fit place for a Christian.

A question here arises—how far an individual has a right thus to comment upon an Institution, which has all the appearance of a strictly private character,—a question which is best answered by another, viz., Is there any reason arising out of the extension of this Society for assuming, that the offence it commits is national? Be it known then, that of this Antichristian Institution, there are no less than some seven hundred Lodges—a few more or less—in this Christian land:—seven hundred places of worship where this "mark of the blasphemous beast" is seen! Is it any wonder that the land should at this moment be notoriously and widely infected with the disease of Socinianism, which the Masonic plan of worship so directly promotes! Be it also further known that these Lodges are composed—not (as one might have imagined) of the lower and illiterate classes of men, whom the Enemy had not found it difficult to inoculate with his false ideas on the comprehensive nature of Divine truth; but—of the very highest classes of the country—men almost universally of enviable position, almost all pre-eminent in rank, in opulence, and in education.
in him—the knee of the great "Image,"—a very remarkable point of agreement between history and sacred symbolism! In the meteoric reign of his successor in headship Napoleon—the real representative, or focal point, of the fourth kingdom, there was a befitting crown of ten fiery stars, servile military horns, of his own creation. As to the "horns" of the last forty years, the period has been peculiar in prophecy:—it is ever Napoleonic:—mankind have lived in the jaws of the great cut, or "deadly wound," by which the imperial power has been "divided," and which is scarcely yet "healed." And this wound has laid open to view the previous state of things as respects the "horns," so that they are for the most part the same as before the rise of Napoleon. On the healing of the wound, when Louis Napoleon shall assume the imperial crown of Rome, then will arise the ten last horns, in spiritual as well as secular independence—the "toes" of the great "Image," sustaining the tread of the imperial "beast," and giving to him their power "until the words of God shall be fulfilled" (Rev. xvii. 17)—i. e., in the rise of the kingdom of the "Stone."

Up to this point our investigation has been of the external appearance and constitution of the "Beast"; it is now to be shown, first, from whence he came, and secondly, in what manner he ascended to power. St. John standing on the "sand of the sea," sees him emerge from the waves of the sea,—i. e., from the chaos of nations which had ensued on the overthrow of the old Roman empire. The symbol of the "sand" is to be considered with reference to the Prophet's acquaintance with the usual aspect of that beautiful margin of the deep. As the tide in the Mediterranean is exceedingly small, and the shore consequently narrow, the very ability to "stand on the sand" assures us that the tide was out—that is, that the tumult of the nations was subsiding:—also, that it was that serene hour after storm, when the monsters of the deep—i. e., great men—most frequently ascend. And this agrees remarkably with the state of things when the great conqueror Charlemagne appeared.

To understand the full force of the symbol—the "Sea," it is desirable to place ourselves with the prophet quite close to
its brink—not like him with the aid of the Holy Spirit, but of History, and to witness the convulsions of those awful times. James, in his "Introduction to the Life of Charlemagne," gives the following out of many similar pictures of the state of society, in the times not long antecedent to his day:—

"Those were days of change when nothing was fixed; and the nation which ruled to-day to-morrow had passed away and was unknown; and all that continued with unaltered force was ravage, disorder, and destruction." (p. 3.)

Of a generation or two later he says:—

"New wars, new intrigues, new assassinations, offering a picture of anarchy, blood, and horror, more dreadful perhaps than any in the range of time." (p. 57.)

Again of a generation or two later:—

"The seas of blood which had been poured out in the intestine struggles of the French nobles, had washed away every tincture of literature which had been left by the Romans. ... No acknowledged power of legislation existed except in the sword. Such was the state of the kingdom over which Charles Martel fixed his sway." (p. 68.)

Now Charlemagne, whom St. John sees ascend, was great among conquerors: he shone as a philosopher and administrator: and as he proceeded in the path of never-halting victory, it was his aim—with the unsheathed sword resting on his left arm, to spread with his right, on the troubled waters, the tranquillizing oil of his power. War was not so much his pursuit as it was the necessity of the time. Though his path lay through massacre and revolution, he rose among the nations not so much to satisfy with their shattered elements the appetite of his ambition, as to substitute for the violence of an universal hostility and disorganization the refuge of a general union.

"The conferring of the imperial crown on Charlemagne was that which deserved to be ranked as the characteristick event, not only of the royal visit of the King of the Franks to Rome, in the year 800; but of the age itself. Up to that instant, nothing but chaos had prevailed among the tribes that had overturned Pagan Rome and its empire."— ("Harrison, 'On the Prophecies,' p. 353.")

Again,—
"The effect of that stroke of policy which revived the empire of the West was magical; . . . . from that hour the barbarian tribes acquired a new relation—one that attached them all, simultaneously, to a grand idea of general and permanent association. This was the beginning of modern Europe." (ib.)

These last words are in unison with the general testimony of History, that the reign of Charlemagne is to be regarded as the great frontier line between ancient and modern times; and serve to justify our mode of understanding the symbolic expression of the same idea by Daniel—where he makes the knee of his "Image" the point of junction between the "leopard" and "iron" kingdoms. It is then, we presume, affirmed, that the rise of Charlemagne was—if from the turbulent, so also from the subsiding sea.

To this beast, so rising, "the Dragon gave his power, and his seat, and great authority." The "dragon" in this place, as in the preceding chapter, is unquestionably "that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan" (xii. 9), putting on (as we shall see) the mask of piety,—calling evil good and good evil. We cannot but repeat our surprise at the ill-conceived notion, that the "dragon" is specially the symbol of Pagan Rome. In the warfare carried on between the Son of God and Satan, both are principals: the field the universal heart of man: the forces of each enlisted from the whole human race. How then can the dragon, with any regard to symbolic propriety, be set apart as the symbol of a portion only—a mere fraction—of the multitudes enlisted in his service? A principal representing his own agents! Queen Victoria the symbol of Hindostan! Christ of the Anglican Church! The passage before us in this manner interpreted is made to say, that Pagan Rome handed over its "power and its seat" to Papal Rome, the recipient being the Roman pontiff:—to this interpretation we shall no otherwise reply, than by pursuing our own contrary scheme.

The dragon, being a spirit, can achieve his ends in a material world, only through material agents:—and they are his agents who manifestly do his work. Who then—what agent is referred to,—also what recipient is referred to,—when it is said "The dragon gave him his power"?
History tells us who in both cases:—the Pope of Rome was the giver, and he gave to Charlemagne.

The mind naturally recoils at the suggestion, that a high minister of Christ can have attracted to himself the appellation of the "dragon"; nay trembles, lest to entertain the thought should be to sin against the precept "Thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people" (Acts xxiii. 5). On this account a few words are necessary regarding the high personage in question.

The Pope of Rome, and the Bishop of Rome, are two distinct characters:—it is true they are combined in one person, but as functionaries they are two, having the same relation to each other as a magistrate and a clergyman in our own country, who (as we all know) are oftentimes but one. There is however this great difference between the two cases—that whereas the clergyman is called to the magistracy by a competent external authority, the secular power of the Papacy is entirely of its own raising, the spiritual dignity having been prostituted to the end of acquiring for this additional dignity a sure foundation. And this being the epitome of its well known history, it should not occasion surprise that, following the ordinary rule of the builder, the Papal builder has buried deep, and far out of sight, his foundation-stone the episcopacy, on which he was bent on raising the edifice of his worldly dominion.

"Rome claims two swords. 'Lord, behold! here are two swords.' One of her pontiffs has interpreted these words of St. Peter as authorizing her double sway. She holds in her hands two keys—the emblems, as she asserts, of universal power. The Roman pontiff is twice crowned, once with the Mitre, his symbol of an universal Bishoprick; and once with the Tiara, in token of imperial supremacy. He wears both diadems." (Wordsworth, Apoc. 393.)

So accoutred, Rome sits as a queen upon many waters, which are peoples, and nations, and multitudes, and tongues.

"She has claimed this double power for more than a thousand years. 'Ruler of the world'—'Universal Pastor'—these are the titles of her Pontiff." (Ib. 412.)

After receiving the title of "Sovereign Pontiff," no ordinary bishop (as Dr. O'Sullivan informed us some pages
back) dared to name him *brother*; demonstrating clearly that the Papacy had become "essentially separate from the Episcopacy as an Apostolic institution." Seeing then who the Pope of Rome is, as distinguished from the Bishop of Rome, and that he is a secular prince; to which circumstance may be added, that the cardinals who compose his senate and council are "ecclesiastical princes," of whom several are only "deacons" in the Church (Robinson's Eccles. Dict.); it ceases to be an attack upon the "Lord's anointed" —whoseunction was never spent on any such creation—to admit the suggestion that the "Dragon," in the passage of Scripture before us, is the Roman pontiff. No possible reason can be suggested why the title should not apply personally to the Pope, which would not forbid its application to Nero or Domitian, his predecessors in the same temporal throne.

Now, without intending to reflect on the *social value* of the event which placed the diadem of the West on the brow of Charlemagne, it is impossible for a Christian to read the account of the pride-begotten transaction of Christmas-day, A.D. 800—the day devoted to the celebration of the "visit of the Son of God in great humility"—without discerning the working of Satan, in a successful attempt to confound heavenly wisdom with earthly greatness; to make the glory of the Church consist in being the depository of earthly power—a power expressly repudiated by our Lord; and to fix his power as prince of this world in the midst of God's holy temple. It has ever been a favourite artifice with him to get the reins of secular and spiritual government entrusted to the same hands; and so, by presenting to the eye of the vulgar but one source of good, to abolish the distinction in their estimation between spiritual and temporal prosperity. It was in pursuance of this desire that, on the occasion of Charlemagne's elevation, the "dragon"—the indwelling and actuating spirit—succeeded in persuading the pontiff to assume to himself this creation of sovereignty, and this bestowal of high dominion. History records that so completely was the institution of the "Holy Roman empire" the work of the pontiff, that even the
purpose of placing the imperial crown on the head of Charlemagne, and the necessary arrangements for the solemnity, were designed and matured by him without even the knowledge of the great chieftain. Eginhard states:—

"The monarch was known to declare, that if he had suspected the intention of the pontiff, on the day on which he was saluted Emperor, he would not have entered the church of St. Peter. To suppose this declaration a piece of useless hypocrisy . . . . is so absolutely opposed to the whole life and character of Charlemagne, that such a suspicion deserves not to be entertained for a moment."* "On Christmas-day, Charlemagne with the rest of the Catholic world presented himself in the church of St. Peter, to offer up his prayers with the multitude to the Giver of all dignities and debasements. . . . The church was filled with the nobility of Italy and France. . . . At the high-altar stood the head of the Christian Church, surrounded by all the splendid clergy of Italy; and the monarch approaching, knelt at the steps of the altar, and for some moments continued to offer up his prayers. As he was about to rise, Leo advanced, and raising an imperial crown, he placed it suddenly on the brow of the monarch, whilst the imperial salutation burst in thunder from the people, 'Long life and victory to Charles Augustus, crowned by God, great and pacific Emperor of the Romans.'"†

It belongs to the historian to search into the actuating motive of the Papal "dragon" in this high enterprise: to us, the fact alone is of consequence as an illustration of prophecy. Nevertheless, we feel no difficulty in accepting the following as the probable solution of the question:—

"The distant prospect of future claims and encroachments, to be founded on the gift of an imperial diadem, might present itself vaguely to the eye of sacerdotal policy; and a basis for entire territorial independence, and immense ecclesiastical dominion, might perhaps be seen by the pontiff, in his creation of an Emperor." (Ib.)

The feelings with which the unexpected gift was received by Charlemagne, were also of small consequence to our subject:—but we need not hesitate to believe,—

"The only alternative now left him was either to refuse the dignity for ever, or to accept it at once; and though, in all probability, he would willingly have delayed the expression of his determination, he acquiesced in the proceeding when the ceremony had commenced." (Ib.).

Now, whether we regard the Pope as the successor of the humble fisherman, or as the vicar of the more humble

* Vide James's Hist. of Charlemagne, p. 417.  † Ib. 449.
Saviour, it is impossible (we repeat) to view this transaction but as the exploit of Satanic arrogance and usurpation. Although to our Lord "all power is given," hitherto He has not taken upon Himself openly to reign:—yet does the minister of this crucified One dare to create, of his own good will, the chief dignity of the world, and to bestow it on whom he will. On what occasion was it that St. Peter drew upon himself the appellation of Satan?—it was when he would oppose the steps of our Lord in His foreordained humiliation (Matt. xvi. 23). Did his haughty successor (?) less oppose the arrangements of Him who has said "My kingdom is not of this world"? Is it not a fact that the Pope constituted himself on that day "king of kings" among men? And is it less true that Satan has ever since maintained that position in his person, among the kingdoms of the Roman rule? Dismissing all doubt then, we may venture to pronounce that, in the coronation of Charlemagne, this same Satan, the subtle supplanting spirit, was, in the Pope's office and person, embodied and enthroned.

When the dragon, acting in the person of the Pope, gave to the Beast "his power," he gave him also "his seat, and great authority." It is remarkable that, in the Latin Vulgate, "his seat" (i.e., his throne) is omitted; the sufficient explanation of which circumstance will be thought (we presume) to be, that St. Jerome used a defective copy of the original. But it must be mentioned that this omission, when contrasted with the fuller text, has a peculiarly instructive appearance; as if itself—that is, the omission—were intended as a sign. When Charlemagne became "Emperor of the West" by the revival of the title, he might rightly have claimed Rome for his capital, and the place of his throne; but it was not given him. And when, on the same occasion, his son was created by the pontiff "King of Rome"—a title ever after held by the successor-elect to the empire, it might have been expected that a step nearer was made to having possession of the throne of Rome. But it did not so happen;—Rome, though giving the title, did not give the "seat" of empire:—and it comes to pass instead, that the very liberty to receive or to reject the words "his seat,"
raises an additional presumption of the Divine source of the passage. Of the "great authority" conferred—a fact sufficiently attested by the magnificent title, the "Emperor of the West"—the following passage from James (p. 469) will afford the best illustration. Speaking of the "extreme bulk" of Charlemagne's dominions, he says:

"The acquisitions of ancient Rome had been gradual, and in comparison slow. Step by step each province had in general been fully incorporated with the empire before other conquests were achieved; and but a small district added to the dominions of Rome was enough for the glory and triumph of a life. But warring upon every frontier at once, Charlemagne had added to his native kingdom, in the short space of one man's existence, as much as it would have cost two centuries of Roman conquest to acquire."

To the same effect Ranke thus writes (I. 14.)

"The aged monarch (Charlemagne) was now full of fame and victory; he had gradually subdued all his neighbours, and had united under his own banner the greater part of the Romano-Germanic nations of Christendom: . . . and it was matter of remark that he possessed all the seats of the western emperors, whether in Italy, Germany, or Gaul; and had, besides, inherited all their power." "With this act (that of his coronation) the series of events which had commenced with the first incursions of the German tribes into the Roman empire was fully completed."

To rule with imperial sway these vast dominions, the great conqueror deigned to accept the leave of sacerdotal Rome; and imagined his power to be sanctified, and the empire itself made "holy," by being called a donative of the priest. Such was the dazzling achievement which the spirit of Antichrist, embodied in the Pope, both planned and effected; and such the elucidation the tale affords of the pregnant words of Prophecy. Great was the exaltation of the Roman pontiff:—and from that time, the imperial dignity was considered to be perfected only when presented by Papal hands,—and when the "name of blasphemy" came direct from its original source. The most noble of his generation, in giving his sanction to this act of priestly ambition, did infinite injury to the cause of spiritual religion; while notwithstanding (so much is good and evil mixed together in this world) he is said in the same act to have laid the
first stone of the wonderful edifice of European prosperity. Unbounded was the imperial gratitude—and bowing still more profoundly at the subtle shrine of his idolatry, he issued the famous decree that the Roman pontiff, "being God's vicar, could not be subject to the judgment of man"; nay, that he is "not to be bound by any law of God or man." (Bishop Newton, ii. 406.)

But it is not to be imagined that the solution of this great sign—"the dragon gave him his power, &c.," was evolved in a single generation. The sign which expresses the grasping domination of the priest, and the miserable subserviency of the civil power, constitute the chief characteristic of the "holy" empire, in the full length of its existence. As the head of a beast is at all times the index of the whole body, and thus Charlemagne of his own age and empire, so in a more extended sense may he be regarded as the Head and exponent of the whole series of ages that make

* An observer of the ways of our great Creator—who is so often seen to suit, as well the exterior appearance as the inward qualities of His instruments, to the parts to be assigned them in history, will not fail to be struck with the personal description we possess of Charlemagne,—presented in Prophecy as the image of a double age, standing on the margin between the third and fourth "kingdoms"—those of ancient and modern Rome. Menzell says of this "first of the German Cæsars" (History of Germany, i. 247) that he was "seven feet in height, of wonderful strength and activity; and that his arm was as irresistible as his commanding genius. Majestick in his deportment, every heart throbbed higher, every head bent with deference and awe, at his presence. Wisdom and nobility sat enthroned on his broad open brow, every eye sank beneath his piercing and commanding glance." Charlemagne was a distinguished patron of learning; he founded academies in aid of the Church, which were the means of raising Germany from her barbarous state:—he was also a great promoter of agriculture, trade, and commerce. "The effect of his genius, far from ceasing with his life, shed a lustre over succeeding centuries. Radiant with majesty and sanctity, the founder of the new empire stood, as it were, on the threshold of that great and brilliant era—his creation, the middle age then opening on the world. The memory of his glory bestowed imperishable dignity on the imperial crown, though subsequently placed on such unworthy brows. Hence the great emperor, his warriors, his sages, and their mighty exploits, formed the inexhaustible subject of the poetry of the middle ages; which describes his reign as the concentrating point of all that is sublime, glorious, great, and beautiful."
up the "Beast" which dates from him,—i.e., his prophetic "kingdom." The whole career of the conqueror—his victories, his admirable civil institutions, his superstitions; as likewise the grasping ambition of the Roman prelate; as likewise the blind enchantment of the people, are to be regarded together, not only as a single passage of history, but as a type and exponent of the "Beast's" career, in its full extent of a thousand years. The facts of history might be marshalled in great strength to elucidate this position. Let us look, for instance, at this "Beast," when between two and three centuries old in Hildebrand; whose project it was to subject to the Papal authority all temporal princes, and render their dominions tributary to the See of Rome. Bishops he asserted to be "superior to kings, and made to judge them." (Russell, I. 161.) Before this prelate the great emperor Henry IV. was content, in order to secure his crown, "to present himself as a humble penitent:"—"stripped of his robes, and wrapped in sackcloth, he was obliged to remain three days in the month of January, barefooted and fasting, before he was permitted to kiss the feet of his holiness" (ib. 162). Take a well-known illustration five hundred years later, when the Papal dragon would have deprived our Queen Elizabeth "of all title to the crown, and absolved her subjects from their oath of allegiance" (ib.); and when the language held was to the effect, that the Pope was raised up as a prince over all nations, to build up, to pull down, and to destroy,—a presumptuous appropriation of Jer. i. 10 to the Papal office. The following from Mr. Birks' extracts from the Romish "Decretals" are good in their way:—

"The tribunals of kings are subject to the sacerdotal power. The law of Christ subjects you; . . . . for He has given us a principedom far more perfect than your principedom. Does it seem just to you that the spirit yield to the flesh, that heavenly things be surpassed by the earthly?" (I. 203) Nicholas the Pope to Michael the emperor, "We are utterly ignorant how those who preside only in human affairs, and not in divine, can presume to judge those by whom things divine are ministered" (ib. 211), Gregory VII. to the Bishop of Metz, "Who can doubt that the priests of Christ are accounted the fathers and masters of kings, princes, and all the faithful? Is it not wretched madness when the son strives to subjugate his father, the servant his master, by whom he believes he may
be bound or loosed, not only in earth, but in heaven?" (ib.) "St. Ambrose shows in his writings, that gold is not so much more precious than lead, as the sacerdotal dignity is higher than that of kings" (ib.). Boniface VIII., "All the faithful of Christ, by necessity of salvation, are subject to the Roman Pontiff, who has both swords, and judges all men, but is judged by no one" (ib. 217).

And to shew how little the spirit is changed in our days—the spirit of the "dragon" which presided at the initiation of the Western empire, the following words addressed by the Pope to Napoleon, when the latter was attempting to deprive him of temporal power, and to render him as the first bishop of his realm subordinate to himself, are sufficiently instructive. "Napoleon (says Menzell, p. 294) no sooner spoke the language of Charlemagne, than the Pope responded in the words of Gregory VII. and of Innocent IV.: 'Time has produced no change in the authority of the Pope; now as ever does the Pope reign supreme over the emperors and kings of the earth.'"

The prophecy proceeds (ver. 3), "And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed: And all the world wondered after the beast." An effort of the imagination is at this point called for, requiring the reader, when looking forward from Charlemagne, to exclude from his view the full range of a thousand years. The fact is not to be doubted that the "beast wounded to death" is the beast in the age and person of Napoleon; for who shall gainsay what is "written in ink and by the Spirit"—in the last verse of this chapter? Whatever inconsistencies and follies the present scheme of interpretation may be chargeable with, yet does the writer pronounce it to be based upon what he fearlessly calls a corner-stone of truth—the written "name of the beast." Had the spirit of prophecy chosen, in addition to the indications afforded that Charlemagne is the sixth head (for that is the main point), and Napoleon the seventh of its scheme, to introduce between them a quantity of historical details, so as to lead the eye in a more gradual manner to these "latter days"—the great object of the prophecy, it would have only encumbered the narrative (as we think) without adding to the clearness with which the great object has been
attained. When Bruce was at the fountains of the Nile—a spot he had reached by another route than that of ascending the course of the stream; and when he sat himself down pensively to meditate on the task before him, of getting in his return to the river’s mouth; the idea never entered his mind of following the tortuosities, the swamps, the cataracts of the stream,—for these, if visited, he rightly judged would not add to the proofs of the great discovery he had made. The two points of interest were the source and the mouth: the rest might be taken for granted. So we, standing at the “holy” springs in the mountains of Charlemagne, have no need of intermediate history to show, that these are the very waters which flow into the sea at the estuary of Napoleon. Of the general character of the long period we have abundant notices soon to be examined; and with these, in addition to the great facts adumbrated—that Charlemagne stands at the beginning, and Napoleon at the end, of this prophetic “kingdom”—it is expected we shall be content.

But it would be false to imagine that no event has guided the construction, having for its object a separation between Charlemagne and Napoleon:—let us see. In ver. 2 the prophet sees a beast like “a leopard, a bear, and a lion”; but it is not immediately added, “and I saw one of his heads wounded to death”—as would have been done had the sole object been a personal description—a description having in view to unite at once the times of these long distant worthies; but there is interposed the sentence “and the dragon gave him his power, &c.” Here (be it observed) a piece of history is introduced. We cannot doubt it is a constructive device, and intended as the sign and proof, as well as an epitome or picture, of an intermediate period, viz., of the intervening thousand years:—it is in fact the very notice of the “fourth kingdom,” serving in its place to give a consecutiveness to the whole narrative. Construction is of the very essence of these writings; and we have just seen that these prolific words are reflected in the facts of history extending over that whole space of time.

“One of his heads as it were wounded to death, and the deadly wound healed.” What a wonderful sign! Perhaps
the whole range of prophecy does not offer another so remarkable. The passing events of the day, not less than the handwriting on the sacred page, render its interpretation exceedingly easy. At this point, however, the reader must determine for himself, whether he will open his eyes to see the beast wounded and restored, as the writer sees him; or, whether, lingering in the old notions, he will prefer to say, with Mr. Frere, that this "deadly wound" was given to the beast by the sword of the barbarians in A.D. 476, when the imperial title ceased under Augustulus, and was healed when Charlemagne was crowned in A.D. 800"; or, with Dr. Cumming, that this beast is the Pope, who "was grafted upon the neck of the Pagan Roman empire, as soon as it had received its deadly wound from the sword of Theodosius." Of these and such like notions we shall only observe, that they spring altogether from a wrong view, at the outset, of Daniel's "fourth kingdom." The "head wounded to death" (we say without faltering) was the great Napoleon, A.D. 1814. It had required three years to despatch him, commencing in 1812:—the first dressing was applied to the wound in 1848, the second in 1852, and it is not yet "healed." But before speaking of the "healing," we ought rightly to call attention to the infliction of the wound.

In order to a beast being "slain," it is necessary to the perfection of the sign, that he be in possession of vigorous life. Now it has been mentioned already, that from Charlemagne to Napoleon, it was but a quasi-life the "Holy Roman empire" (the body of this Beast) possessed; its various members—the independent kingdoms, having been so much detached from their "head" the Emperor, as that the image they collectively presented could in no wise be said to sustain the idea, of a beast "dreadful, and terrible, and strong exceedingly." These words, after the decline of Charlemagne's power, met with their first response in Napoleon—the culminating point of the "iron" kingdom. In the intermediate ages, notwithstanding the potential oil of the Papacy, lubricating and connecting the mighty limbs of the beast, these ever remained in their civil interests too detached, to let them as a body be brought, becomingly,
under the infliction of the “wound”: hence the historical necessity of the victories of Napoleon, and of the binding strength of his single rule; whereby it came to pass that the beast was beheld in his complete integrity, when the time came that the fatal stroke should fall.* Now as this death-stroke was prepared for the whole Roman empire,—although it was prepared also for the head as a sign, we may understand that, to inflict it, occupied in time (in respect of the empire) the whole ten years of the reign of Napoleon. It was close upon the beginning of that reign (1806) that the battle of Austerlitz was fought, which brought to an end the ancient German empire, and transferred the power (the requisite title having been already assumed) to France. And it is an historical fact, of the first consequence in a symbolical point of view, that from this date to the end of the ten years’ reign, the Roman beast was ever under the axe of the slaughterer. It is computed that, in these ten years, there were slain of men six million; and to assure us of the prophetic age in which we stand, the Holy Spirit has constructed (as we shall see) from these six million, the sign of the age Napoleon. This sign (we say) is derived from, and overlays, the whole of the ten-year reign; which reign, like that of Alexander on the part of the Grecian “kingdom,” stands as the token of the whole kingdom of iron. But the deadly stroke fell upon the Head himself as well; and this we consider was effected, when Napoleon—having brought the bleeding empire to the perfection of its suicidal “glory,” was subjected forthwith, in 1812, to a process of decapitation—the weapon acting upon him with a double edge, like the guillotine, both in Spain and Russia. And (as we said just

* How fully this was accomplished, the following notice from Menzell regarding the composition of the “Grand Army,” tells. “For the first time—an event unknown in the history of the world—the whole of Germany was reduced to submission. Napoleon, greater than conquering Attila, who took the field at the head of one half of Germany against the other, dragged the whole of Germany in his train” (III. 309). “Upwards of 200,000 Germans, at the lowest computation, marched against Russia—a number far superior to that of the French in the army; the remainder of the host (i.e., of the half-million)—&c.” (ib. 310.).
now) it took the three last years of the ten to despatch him.

Let us now examine the great event of the revivification of the Beast (though not yet fully accomplished)—and is it (we ask) less than "wonderful"! (ver. 3.) The case is this—that, contrary to all calculation or precedent from History, the power wrenched from the accursed grasp of the Beast in A.D. 1814 began suddenly to be restored to the same beast—after many years and two intervening dynasties—in A.D. 1848. As the figure is of a "head" restored to life, identity between the hands deprived of power and the hands that recover it becomes essential; and the identity consists—not in the resurrection of the bodily frame, but of the name and spirit (the "numen") of the great Napoleon. We must look for something here to certify the spiritual presence in which, more than in bodily presence, identity consists—something too in which is made manifest the suppressed power of him who is departed. Personal identity may be predicated (says Bishop Butler) "when the material part is in a state of flux, provided the immaterial part remain unchanged; and of such a being only is a resurrection from the dead possible." Upon this ground we infer that, when Prophecy speaks in figure of a resurrection from the dead ("his deadly wound was healed"), it is to be understood that the very same spirit—sanguinary, merciless, and calculating—is restored; and that a quasi-identity, such as consanguinity amounts to, may be expected even of the external form. But further, the revival of the name on such an account as the present, may be viewed (as Coleridge expresses it†) as the revival of the "nomen substantivum" of the great emperor; and he who is recognised as bearing it (the better, if so recognised on account of no foreknown merit of his own) becomes the visible earnest of his existence. This "name," reconstituted by the hands of violence, is stamped upon the brow of Louis Napoleon—the next of kin; who, rightly conscious of the single foundation of his claim,

* The sufferings of the Roman empire under the infliction of its own "head,"—himsel doom to fall as thus symbolized, seems to have its counterpart in the "fourth vial" (xvi. 8).

† "Aids to Reflection"—p. 169.
invokes the *abiding renown*—the "præsens numen"—of his illustrious forerunner:—and to the *name* of "Napoleon" (whereby "he that is dead yet speaketh") the relifted throne is restored.

And what may be the complete measure of the expression "the deadly wound was healed"? Does it denote that the lost dominion will be restored in its fulness to the resuscitated beast? What scenes of foul aggression and sanguinary resistance does the thought present! We must not omit, when speaking of the "healing of the deadly wound," and the return in life and vigour of the embodied spirit of evil—for a while subdued under the mighty hand of God; to notice the parallelism that has been observed between it, and the death and resurrection of our Lord. Counterfeit glory, and the burlesque imitation of what is most holy, are the soul of Antichrist. In Rev. v. 6, the description given of Christ is that of a Lamb "as it had been slain"; and of his adversary, in Rev. xiii. 3, as of a beast "as it were slain" (margin)—the same words in the orginal (*ως εσφαγμένον*) being used in both cases, and showing the intended contrast. "As when slain," or, "in the condition attendant upon being slain," we believe to be the real meaning in both cases; and not as Kir. Arnold has it (Theol. Critic. Sept. 1851, p. 395) that the "beast" was seen by St. John only in a restored state, "with the scar of a wound that had been absolutely fatal." St. John, we believe, saw the whole proceeding:—it was to his eye, what he has evidently intended his words shall be to his readers, an historic representation.

This resurrection of the Beast, or restoration of the age of violence and desolation after its temporary suppression, is the great feat—while also it is the final struggle of Satan; who sees the arms of the Holy One, the words of truth and soberness, making from day to day successful inroads into his kingdom. The resurrection of the Son of God is that which, above all other acts of His divinity, appealed to the understanding, and secured the devotion of mankind—the act which entitles His name to be called "wonderful":—in like manner, the recovery of his lost strength on the part of the "beast"—the godless power of the world, will, we are told (ver. 3), excite the "wonderment" of mankind; and his
future triumphs be regarded by a blaspheming generation, as carrying in themselves the evidence of the Divine approba-
tion.

The examination being now concluded of the three first verses of the prophecy, we are in a position to speak of the shape into which the whole is moulded. The great feature of the scene is the "mortal wound" inflicted on the "beast," and its cure: and—whether by design or not—it so happens, that the entire prophecy is put into a form to set forth this idea. This chapter is divided into two distinct parts, separated from each other by the barrier of the ninth and tenth verses, having eight verses on either side. The prophet, having his eyes open in the days of Charlemagne, looks through a vista of a thousand years, and sees the "beast" decapitated in Napoleon: he sees him restored in L. Napoleon: and he sees all the world (a startling expres-
sion) "wonder after the beast" (ver. 3). The decapita-
tion is represented by the barrier, which separates all that happened before Napoleon from all that is to happen after. And as a barrier—for instance a parlour-door—will often partake of the colouring of the scene on either side of it, we find it mentioned that "he that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity: he that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword." Napoleon having led the chief of his religion—him whom, in conformity with any belief at all, he must have regarded as the locum-tenentem of the Saviour—into captivity; and having assigned to the cardinal princes of the "holy" empire a miserable exile in different towns of France, leaving them to subsist on the alms of the people (vide Card. Pacca, i. 327), was himself led into captivity:—the inevitable inference supplied by the barrier is—that he in whom he is resuscitated will be "killed with the sword." With this agree the words of Is. xiv. 19, "thrust through with a sword." In the earlier exterior of the barrier (ver. 9) addressed to the Church in the present day, a call is made to examine the prophecy with attention; as though it said—"Whoever pretends to have his ears open to divine admonitions in the day when these things shall be fulfilling, let him hear." In the later exterior, when the Antichrist shall be striding across the earth with a rod of
chastisement, the time will be come (it is sand) for "patience" in suffering, and "faith" in the ultimate return of God's countenance, and accomplishment of His promises regarding the final exaltation of the saintly nation.

We return to the first half of the chapter. In the three first verses a rapid outline of the Beast was placed before the eye in his physical history and prolonged career, as that career was seen at a glance by the prophet—who says in each of the verses "I saw." The five subsequent verses are delineations of the bestial character and government, dating from the day of manifestation. They are as follows:

"(4.) And they worshipped the dragon which gave power unto the beast: and they worshipped the beast, saying, Who is like unto the beast?—who is able to make war with him? (5.) And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies: and power was given unto him to continue forty and two months. (6.) And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle and them that dwell in heaven. (7.) And it was given unto him to make war with the saints and to overcome them: and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations. (8.) And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life, of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world."

An attentive inspection of these verses will perhaps lead to the division of them into three portions,—the fourth verse by itself, the fifth and sixth by themselves, and the seventh and eighth by themselves. In the fourth verse, there are two objects of worship mentioned; and it is consequently the more necessary to arrive at a clear conception regarding the term worship, and whether in each case it means the same thing. In the Greek it is προσκυνεῖ—"to do obeisance," "to prostrate oneself," in allusion to the outward act:—but how far the higher senses of the word—adoration, praise, fear, and such like, are realized in any particular case, must be determined by the object to which the worship is addressed. The word itself, like "fear," or "praise," has a varying signification,—we praise God, and we praise a little child:—it is the object that determines the sentiment.

The first object mentioned is the "dragon"—i.e., as seen in the person of the Pope. The ground of the worship is—
that he had given power to the "beast." It is not meant to say that the honour rendered him proceeded from a sense of gratitude for the act done, but of that reverential fear which the doing it inspired,—for if the "beast" is great, how great must he be from whom his power is derived! And as the spiritual pretension of the Pope was the acknowledged foundation of his claim to the disposal of earthly dignities, it cannot be doubted it was a spiritual worship which it is meant to say was rendered him. He came to hold in the eyes of men a heavenly dominion, and to be regarded in all things as God's vicegerent in the government of the world:—nay, to be himself as God upon earth! He came to be addressed as "Dominus Deus noster Papa"; and it is said of him, "The same is the dominion of God and the Pope." His power "is greater than all created power; and extends itself to things celestial, terrestrial, and infernal." "The Pope doeth whatsoever he listeth, even things unlawful, and is more than God." (Bishop Newton, 2, 399). Do we need further witness regarding the scope of the expression "they worshipped the dragon"!

Now, if it be true that the pretensions exhibited in these quotations have been put forth at any time by the Papacy—(and every one who is likely to read this volume knows well that it is so) who shall dare to accuse the writer of arrogance and uncharitableness, in venturing to entertain and express the belief, that, by the "dragon" in this prophecy is meant the Pope of Rome? Is there any other than one spirit in the wide creation of God who could have suggested such language—any but the malignant and undying rival of His Holy Son? And (to bring the question out of what are commonly called the "dark ages" into the age we live in) is there of human kind, whether he live at St. Jarlath's or at Rome, who, unless under possession of the "dragon," will not shrink into himself when styled "the Lion of the tribe of Judah"? Horrible blasphemy!—which seeks not even the excuse of usage—a crazy shelter enough!—an excuse however which charity pleads for the successive occupants of St. Peter's chair. Barring the excuse of delusion, each of these occupants is, unquestionably, in turn, a personification of the "dragon":—installed in him is the spirit of evil,
receiving on his own account, as lord-paramount in the Church—the palace of the King of kings, the homage due to Christ alone. The nature of the worship received by the Pope is clear evidence of the infernal factory from whence it comes; having for its end to depict human nature as in possession of Divine attributes, and so to abrogate the necessity of a personal application to the Saviour; and this design of Satan is accomplished by the deliberate appointment of one still subject to death, to sit for Christ in a throne commanding both earth and heaven.

But also, "they worshipped the beast." The very inferior nature of the worship here announced,—the very different sentiment it called forth—is shown by what is immediately added, "saying, Who is like unto the beast? who is able to make war with him?" The praise of martial glory is the "worship" rendered to the imperial conqueror:—he is extolled as their god of war, and as destined by heaven to lead them to fight and victory. Who is like unto the beast? —who is able to make war with him?—fit superscription for the image of the age of iron!

In illustration of this view, is it not true that the histories of Christian kingdoms are the histories of aggressive wars and fields of strife, far beyond what marked the ages of heathenism? The question has been asked before:—and we are persuaded that a fair comparison of the times of Christian civilization with those of heathen barbarism, seeing that hitherto civilization has but perfected the arms without taming the spirit of conquest, will give a balance of peace immensely in favour of the less favoured ages of the world. So far as the above words allude to Charlemagne personally, James supplies abundant illustrations of them:—for instance:—

"The disposition of that monarch, by the habits of his nation, by the circumstances of his country, by the character of his age, by the education of his youth, by the constitution of his body, by the very qualities of his mind, was warlike." (James 191). "The nations around never suffered him to withdraw his hand from the sword; and as fast as by victory he had crushed one of the hydra heads of war, another was raised to attack him at a different point." (Ib.) "War was a necessity of the time. Charlemagne, happily for himself and for his people, brought with him to the throne warlike talents, and a warlike disposition; and, happily
for the world, possessed likewise the spirit of civilization and improve-
ment." (P. 495.)

We are not however to imagine the age of Charlemagne alone to be depicted in the pregnant words of the prophet—though primarily, no doubt, it is so, as witnessing to the rise of the "beast," and as a sample and type of his general constitution. Every reigning emperor has been illustrious, during the last thousand years, in proportion as he has been victorious in war; and the most superficial glance at history,—at the crusades, at the intestine feuds of the empire, at its great commanders, at the very fact that no one has become "great" except by arms—must lead to the conviction that the words "they worshipped the dragon, and they worshipped the beast," each in his degree, is a comprehensive but exact delineation of Papal Roman history from the rise of the "beast" in Charlemagne to his mortal wound in the great Napoleon.

Now, the prophet having shown the positions relatively to each other of these two great depositories of power, and the influences they would separately exercise upon mankind; having represented the Pontiff as the head, and the Emperor as the right arm, of imperial rule; it seems to the writer that he speaks in the next verse (ver. 5)—(as it is natural he should, in accordance with the ordinary manner of a narrative) of a conjoined, and consequently single, exercise of authority. When the head and the arm act in unison, the arm claiming only the subordinate glory that nature prescribes, the power exercised is one. Though the ill-made sceptre of rule may require to be held up by two hands, the result to the governed will be single; and hence we are called upon, it would seem, to regard the doings of the "beast"—which do in fact in the prophecy here begin, as those of a single actor; taking care only to remember, that the temporal executive power is ministering to a spiritual will, and that the nature of the government to result from this binary source, should be expected to receive its complexion from him who is supreme in authority. Speaking of the power thus exercised by the Church of Rome, a recent author says:—
“Though she wielded not the sword with her own hand, nor gave
directly from herself the command for the execution of her sentence; yet
would she give her victims over to the secular power, and make kings and
princes inflict the punishment which she pronounced on the guilty.”

Such is the double-faced power at once “holy” and
tyrrannical, which St. John saw rise from the sea,—a deep
device of the prince of this world, and masterpiece of Satan.†

* Archdeacon Harrison, p. 355.
† The following from “Ranke’s Popes of Rome,” p. 32, is an illustra-
tion of this “holy” draconic power. Speaking of the cession of the
attributes of sovereignty to the princes of the empire, he says, “Italy as
well as Germany was full of independent states, while a power capable of
combining and uniting them resided almost exclusively in the Pope; and
accordingly, the independence (previously acquired) of the spiritual
principle soon passed into a new kind of sovereignty. The peculiar
character—religious and secular which life had assumed, and the settled
course of things, must of themselves have invested him (the Pope) with
such a sovereignty. When countries, long lost, were at last rescued from
Mahommedanism; when hundreds of thousands were ever going forth
for the purpose of fixing the banner of the cross on the holy sepulchre;
must not the pontiff, who shared in all those enterprises, and who received
the homage of the vanquished, have enjoyed immense respect? Under
his guidance, and in his name, the Western nations diffused themselves,
as if one people, in immense colonies, and sought to occupy the world.
We cannot wonder, then, if he exercised at such a time, even in internal
affairs, an all-powerful authority. Amazing physiognomy of these times,
which no one has ever delineated in all their fulness and truth! Even
piety itself assumed the most contradictory character; retiring at times to
the rough mountain, rock, or lonely glen, there in harmless devotion to
devote a whole lifetime to the contemplation of God:—while in juxta-
position with this we find another piety—that invented by the Inquisition.”
The piety of the times (says this author) would present these widely
differing aspects at the same moment of time:—“On coming within sight
of Jerusalem, the crusaders would dismount from horseback, and bare
their feet, in order that they might arrive at the holy walls as true
pilgrims. In the hottest assaults they imagined they experienced the
assistance of the saints and angels. But no sooner had they fought their
way over the ramparts than they immediately began the work of devast-
tation and blood; on the very site of Solomon’s temple they butchered
many thousand Saracens; they burned the Jews in their synagogues; the
very sacred thresholds, to which they had come that they might worship
upon them, they first drenched in blood. This inconsistency runs through
the whole state of things at that time, and forms its essential character.”
One could not desire of the historian a better critique on the picture pre-
In proceeding to the fifth and sixth verses, the reason will not fail to be perceived why we put them together:—in the fifth, power is "given unto him" (the Beast) to "speak great things" and to "blaspheme"; and in the sixth, the manner is detailed in which that power is carried out. The introduction into the exact centre of these verses, of the notice which relates to the duration of the beast, is equally remarkable and important. It may be taken as a certain rule, that any thing very peculiar in the construction of a prophecy is intended as a clue to its chief mystery:—in the present instance, from the very position of these ciphers there is derivable (as we believe) a sure index of the age to which the prophet would draw our attention;—that age we believe to be the first quarter of the fifteenth century. This opinion will find its defence in a future page, when we are on the subject of the sacred numbers; at present the reader is requested to take it on trust. Now it cannot be necessary to add any thing further in illustration of the "great things" here said to be spoken by this draconic power (ver. 5): allusion is no doubt made to the Divine titles and pretensions assumed by the Pope, and at humble distance participated in by the imperial "head":—let us turn to the "blasphemies."

In searching into History with reference to the age we have indicated (say 1421) it appears that the years just preceding and following this year are among the darkest of the Roman "kingdom"—itself the centre (as it were) of Satan's reign:—it was the time of the Council of Constance. The leading features of this age are given by Russell (i. 382) to the following effect. At the opening of the Council, the Christian world beheld the disgraceful spectacle of three Popes ruling at the same time. At this Council, where the emperor Sigismund appeared in all his glory, there were present, besides cardinals, prelates, and doctors,—more than a hundred sovereign princes, one hundred and eight counts, sentenced by Prophecy—that of a secular religion spreading a tint of sanctity over the wild passions of the times,—the Dragon taking the lead in deeds of piety and violence combined, and so attracting to himself the "worship" of mankind.
two hundred barons, and twenty-seven ambassadors, who vied with each other in luxury and magnificence. There were also five hundred players on instruments, and seven hundred and eighteen courtiers, who were protected by the magistrates! During four years (A.D. 1414—17) various endeavours were made to get rid of the Papal competitors, the emperor himself rushing to Spain in pursuit of one of them, with the zest of a bailiff in full chase; and during his absence the august assembly amused themselves (for as little thought was expended on the matter as on an ordinary amusement) by burning John Huss and Jerome of Prague. In A.D. 1417, a new Pope was elected:—he rode in procession to the cathedral mounted on a white horse, the emperor and the elector of Brandenburgh on foot leading it by the reins. From A.D. 1419 to 1424 an exterminating war was waged against the Hussites, until the death of their famous chief Ziska; who ordered a drum to be made of his skin, which was long among them the symbol of victory. Thus the tyrannical and blasphemous spirit of Rome is seen, just at the time indicated by the ciphers (viz., the middle of the iron kingdom), at the summit of its power, exhibiting to the world the congenial results of its sacro-secular foundation. Moreover, on either side of A.D. 1421, it might be expected from the prophecy that the times would be signalized by “blasphemy.” We will mention on the earlier side one specimen only—the great cause of the Hussite war—the Papal refusal of the Cup to the laity. On the later side, where we approach the age directly preceding the great Reformation, the Papal blasphemies constitute a subject so trite among Protestants, that there is no need to expatiating upon them. The reader is referred for examples to pp. 312-13 of Dr. Cumming’s Apocalyptic sketches. One we may notice on the part of the Emperor, showing how true it is that but one mind possessed both the secular and the spiritual power of the age:—we read that “it was proclaimed by the oracles of the civil law, that the Roman emperor was the rightful sovereign of the earth from the rising to the setting sun; and the contrary opinion was condemned, not simply as an error, but even as a heresy”!

* Archdeacon Harrison, p. 358.
But the prophecy mentions specifically the "blasphemies against God" of this age, and as having for their scope "to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven" (ver. 6). The "name" of God in the Christian world is that sacred name revealed in Jesus Christ, through whom an access is provided to the throne of grace,—the possessor of this name being himself God: and as to "his tabernacle, and they that dwell in heaven," these are expressions which denote the two great bodies of His redeemed people—the saints of His temporary Church on earth, and those of His eternal Church in heaven. It is altogether premature to remark on the construction of this sentence, as the subject belongs rather to the latter part of this treatise; yet, having no other satisfactory comment to offer upon it than what is prompted by the construction, we must anticipate what we have hereon to say.

The words "His name, and His tabernacle, and they that dwell in heaven" are a specimen, and a very perfect one, of a class of tripartite expressions with which the Apocalypse abounds. They are constructed so as to exhibit, as it were, a fountain with a plurality of streams—a trunk with its many branches: in fact in the construction is involved a Sign. The nature of such a tripartite sign is, that from the most noble—or (vice versa) from the most vicious portion of it, are held to be derived the qualities of the other two, placed on the right hand and on the left, as recipients of the grace, or of the vice (as the case may be), which emanate from the great central fountain. To display such a sign before the eye, it is necessary to place the more eminent portion in the centre; but in reading off the sign, this portion is mentioned first. A familiar instance from Scripture is that of the three graces of "faith, hope, and charity," as the component parts, and full representation, of the Christian character. Here, "faith" is read off first; but when the three are displayed in emblem as a sign, the cross of faith (as every young lady who wears a bracelet knows) is placed in the centre, between the anchor of hope and the heart of charity; for the reason that faith is the source of all other Christian graces—represented in the sign by hope and charity. In the sign of "redemption"—our Saviour hanging on the accursed tree between
two malefactors—the like arrangement takes place. As the Head of the human race, He hangs in the midst; and from Him the streams of life issue forth, to the right hand and to the left, whether it be to purify, or to overwhelm in perdition: but we read off the sign thus, "The Redeemer, with the millions of mankind He has brought with Him from the grave." In fact, these and such like instances are all examples of the great law, familiar in common life and equally observable in the constitution of these mysterious symbols, that the centre is to a system what the head is to a living body. Faith—the centre and source of all Christian graces, is likewise their head and leader when brought into activity; and the Redeemer—the centre and sum of the Christian system, is likewise the Head or Captain of the infinite hosts, whom He sets free from the captivity of death. The Head and the Centre are then places of equal dignity. And it happens consequently that when a systematized body, first seen in tranquil display as inviting contemplation, is to be converted into an active agency; a transference takes place—the central point of the system assuming to be the head of the active body. Thus, when a regiment is drawn up in line to receive a reviewing general—an exhibition of system, the place of the commanding officer is in the centre of the line; but on the line breaking into companies, to "pass by," he becomes the head of the column. Thus again in the instance before us, if the three parts of the sentence were visibly displayed in the form of a sign, they would be seen in the following order—His tabernacle, His name, His church in heaven,—the central "name," as a light in a chamber, casting its sanctifying beams on all the chamber contains, and uniting them (as it were) to itself: and the sign so exhibited would express—The universal Church of the Redeemer. But the same sign, when brought into a narrative, reads as we find it.*

* The number seven we have seen to be peculiarly a mark of system, both in the sacred and the profane philosophy of ancient times. In it the number one,—though naturally the head, or origin, of the whole system (as when the one Church of Israel becomes by expansion the seven of Christ) gives place oftentimes in dignity to the central number Four, as
The blasphemies of the beast are directed, then, against the "Universal Church of Christ": and herein (it is said) "he openeth his mouth in blasphemy against God." "He that seeth me (saith our Lord) seeth Him that sent me";—and consequently, he that blasphemeth Christ blasphemeth Him that sent Him:—he insults the King of kings. And again, he that blasphemeth the members of the true Church of Christ,—being therein members of Christ (whether they still belong to the unsettled tabernacle of earth, or are already dwelling in heaven) blasphemeth Christ, and so the Judge of all. Thus, to speak injuriously of either portion of the tripartite sign, in respect of the unity which, through the efficacy of the central "name," subsists between them, is "blasphemy against God."

The beast may be said to "open his mouth" in these blasphemies, when he both decrees and enforces an universal participation in them. Some people believe in the infallibility of Pope or Council; some in transsubstantiation; some in works of supererogation; some in winking virgins; some in travelling cottages; but of all such fantasies, Christian charity bids us say of the holders of them—"to their own Master let them stand or fall." So long as coercive obligation is not resorted to to fasten them on the consciences of other men, they may be held (for aught we know) innocently and harmlessly. But blasphemy consists in opening the mouth—whether it be to teach these delusious with ministerial authority, or with the strong arm to enforce them on the free-born sons of the Gospel.

But there is always to be understood in prophetic expressions a peculiar reach of signification, which—if we would assign it to the circumstances of this tripartite sign, induces the belief that the true Church was spoken of in its separate as well as collective parts, as the butt of Romish blasphemy:

when the sun—the ruler of our created system—claims to have been created on the fourth day. As an illustration of this use of the number "four" in the numeric symbolism of past times, we may cite the following remarkable expression which it lately occurred to the writer to read, in a Review of the recently-discovered work of Hippolytus—"ο τέταρτος ο μέσος τῶν έπτα"—(the fourth the centre of the seven).
—in making good this view by examples, the task is one of selection. First, the name of God being given as a light, it is blasphemy against that name in any way to obstruct that light; as when the use of the holy scriptures, old and new, which testify of Him—the “two candlesticks” of the Lord is prohibited. To come before the Lord pleading any other than the one only name by which we can be saved, or in the base spirit of deism leaning on no mediation at all, are blasphemies against the holy name. And in general, as the humiliation of the Lord Jesus is His great glory, whatever detracts from or adds to that humiliation,—whatever exalts Him where He would not be exalted in worldly glory, or by depressing Him in the midst of His enemies puts Him to an open shame—is of the nature of the first-mentioned sort of blasphemy.

Secondly, in respect of blasphemy against “God’s tabernacle,” the word tabernacle—besides expressing the true Church in its pilgrim state, seems to comprehend in its allusion all places of the Divine residence of a more or less unfixed nature, wherever found; as, for instance, the churches in the mountains of Piedmont and Auvergne, continuing their precarious existence in obscurity and independence; as likewise all such communities and individuals as have been led by an enlightened faith to quit the gorgeous, domineering, and worldly establishment of Rome,—taking refuge in the tent-like habitations of an unsettled system. Is it the right hand of Christian fellowship that the sacro-secular Beast has ever extended to such as these?—or has it not rather been the taunting lip of blasphemy?—treating them as the dung of the earth, ignoring them as of the Christian fold, excluding them from the pale of salvation, because not receiving his tyrannical decrees.

Thirdly, the beast blasphemes against “them that dwell in heaven;”—an allusion, we presume, to the imagination not more blasphemous than vain and ridiculous, of the Papal power extending even to the destinies of the defunct, and of the pains of their purgatory being shortened by its intercession;—this, we may remember, was the peculiar blas-
phemy which led to the great Reformation, having received its expression in the *sale of indulgences* — the darkest hour is that which precedes the break of day. In these two verses then (the 5th and 6th) there is presented in brief—but how faithful outline, what we recognise from history as the pretensions of this insolent, Antichristian power, claiming to stand in Christ's stead, and to have all things under its feet—whether they be things on earth, or things in heaven,—whether the church militant below, or the church ransomed, and glorified, and standing before the heavenly throne.

The seventh and eight verses have the same sort of relation to each other as the fifth and sixth. As in the fifth was given a license to boast and blaspheme, and it was extended to the sixth in the manner we have seen; so in the seventh verse it is permitted to persecute and destroy the saints, and in the eighth is described the baneful domination that ensued in consequence, throughout the Roman earth to its utmost bounds. These verses direct attention pointedly to the epoch of the great Reformation:—they describe the persecutions which naturally resulted from the blasphemies, on resistance to them, of the two preceding verses; when the light of truth began to struggle resolutely with the darkness of the bestial kingdom; and when Antichrist, bitterly exasperated, put forth his utmost endeavour that his standard should continue to wave "over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations,"—that is, of the Roman earth. It is scarcely necessary to observe that the expression "all kindreds, tribes, &c.," does not mean all nations of the world. The millions still remaining, and to remain, of the followers of Brahma and Buddha forbid the idea:—we say "to remain," for the Gospel, it is acknowledged, is to be preached only as a witness among all nations (Matt. xxiv. 14). But it may be questioned whether the word "all"—a pleonasm for the purpose of effect—does not point to an enormous extension of the Roman "kingdom"; reminding us of the mighty "horns" that have sprung up (as just now suggested) in the New World and other regions;—reminding us too of the old Roman boast, that although the territorial patrimony
of St. Peter, the seat of the dominion, is but small, they have fellow subjects throughout the world to the number of two hundred millions.

It would require some time to collect into a list however partial, the innumerable doleful scenes of torture, lamentation, and woe, which, in public at the stake, and in private by every ingenious contrivance of cruelty, were enacted, in the course of the ages alluded to, in every state of the Roman world. It would be necessary to examine at greater length than we can afford the frightful memoirs of the Duke of Alva, of Louis XIV., and of many other royal miscreants, tools of Satan, to tell us that the saints were indeed "warred against and overcome." Fleming enumerates in a few lines, and they but partially filled up (p. 34), more than two millions and a half of martyrs to the truth, who, before his day, had been thus overcome and slain,—only a portion, it may be, of the 144,000 (Rev. xiv. 1) who shall ascend in like manner, in the flames of persecution, to the throne of Christ on mount Zion. "Power was given him," i. e., power to carry out these tyrannical measures (vid. Lee, p. 394) "over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations,"—a plain indication that there should arise an opposition. "And all that dwell upon the earth (the Roman earth) shall worship him"—shall bend before him; all excepting those who have been chosen to a contrary part "from the foundation of the world." The word "all" alludes to "kindreds, and tongues, and nations"—and the exception made affords a hint of the emancipation of many states, notwithstanding, from this enormous despotism.

It is much to be believed that, in every country of Christendom, and in every age, the light of Gospel truth and sanctity has borne witness to the continuing work of Christ, its irrepressible rays shining forth, and imparting their vitalizing warmth with hope-inspiring energy: but the tyrannical Roman beast, seeking in its way to do God service,—and for that end to multiply on the one hand the forms of death and torment, and on the other its own peculiar fascinations—has very generally succeeded in extinguishing the hope of a steady and extending flame. And thus it happens that the
prostration of the world is spoken of as complete, and the
power of the "beast" absolute—to the total exclusion of
all private judgment, "over all nations" (i.e.) that compose
and enter into his own being. "All that dwell upon the
earth"—(i.e.) all who deem it the chiepest good to possess
their lives in peace, and dwell without molestation, have
found it necessary to receive with reverence the Papal-
Imperial mandates. From this peaceful and careless com-
pany, multitudinous in number, and inviting to the natural
eye by the delusive appearance of their repose, have been
excepted those only whom God had ordained from eternity
to bear, in so many cases unto death, the reproach of the
Redeemer's name.

The ninth and tenth verses carry a similar relation to each
other as the two preceding. They tell us that the study of
prophecy shall be attended with profit; that retaliation
shall be the rule of God's providence,—we presume the rule
extends to nations; to whom as well as to individuals the
invitation is given, in patience to possess their souls. But
let not the particular purpose already adverted to of these
verses escape the reader,—that of acting as a peremptory line
of demarcation, between the two very distinct divisions of
this great prophecy.

We enter now upon the second scene of the prophecy, and
have as a first step to examine the much disputed symbol—
"the beast with two horns like a lamb." The text (vers.
11 to 15) is as follows:—

"(11.) And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth; and he
had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon. (12.) And he
exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him, and causeth the
earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast whose deadly
wound was healed. (13.) And he doeth great wonders, so that he maketh
fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men. (14.) And
deceiveth them that dwell in the earth by the means of those miracles which
he had power to do in the sight of the beast; saying to them that dwell
on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast, which had
the wound by a sword and did live. (15.) And he had power to give life
unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both
speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the
beast should be killed."
REV. XIII. 11—18.

We believe that the whole of the circumstances related in these verses, without any as yet perceptible exception, are in the womb of a near futurity; and we discard in consequence every scheme of interpretation, which supposes the agencies contained in them to be already engaged in bringing them into effect. It may help us to give an outline of Bp. Newton's ideas on the subject of these agencies. The bishop regards the two-horned beast as the Roman Church; his horns as the clergy regular and secular. The beast groweth up "out of the earth"—i.e., like plants silently. He is the prime-minister and adviser of the first beast. The "image" (ver. 14) he considers to be the Pope, the idol of the Church, made by them the head of all authority temporal and spiritual. He was a private person: the clergy give him life: they elect him, and then they adore him—"quem creant adorant." In the prohibition of the common intercourse of life (ver. 17) the beast "spake as a dragon." (Ver. 11.) Now to this scheme we object that a Church cannot be a "beast," for the reason some time since given, that the idea does not accord with the original symbolism of nature, which regards a creature called to the service of God as necessarily of the human race (Dan. vii. 4). The proper symbol of a Church is a chaste or adulterous woman, as the case may be.

It is not a pleasant comment upon the present state of prophetic interpretation, that the "image," by far the most important portion of this symbolism—the "Pope" of Bishop Newton—is thought by Mr. Elliott to denote "the general councils and synods of the Church." Is there not (we would ask) a circumstantiality about this view, but little accordant with the massive features of the Prophecy? But the Bishop's interpretation is chiefly chargeable with a disregard of the decided barrier and line of demarcation, between the two divisions of the prophecy, to be found in the 9th and 10th verses. In the face of that barrier (which is clearly one of some sort; and we believe it to refer to time) it is impossible to view the "horned beast" as such, as an actor in the earlier division; however true it may be that he is there under another guise. The studious introduction into the tenth verse of apparently general reflections, has for its main
object to show, that the particular subject until then under representation is concluded; and that the prophetic narrative enters, there and then, upon a second and altogether separate scene:—indeed, have we not found that the first scene is complete without the help of any agency but what itself contains?

Now, if the agencies of the first scene are continued in a second and new scene, as we shall hope to show they are, it is clear that—their own form and appearance being changed—the field of their action must be in later times:—on what times, then, do we enter at the 11th verse? We answer—on the times of the Beast recovered from a mortal wound. It is in the 12th verse that we observe this healed beast for the first time brought actively upon the scene; and to whom no allusion had been made (for indeed he was non-existent) ever since the one preceding mention of him in ver. 3—in the short programme of the entire prophecy. It is impossible to be too thankful for this wonderful sign—the extinction of the imperial power by the sword, and its restoration on the same prophetic “head”; and we say with confidence that such a sign has not been seen, nor any thing the words will apply to, since the first rising of the “beast”—the Western empire, until the day we live in. The whole power (or “kingdom”) was to last 1260 years (ver. 5) to be dated from A.D. 800. In the records of the first ten centuries and a-half, we have ourselves witnessed to the completion of the first portion of the prophecy; and at that point of time the healing of the wound has occurred—or (more strictly) is occurring. Ought we then to doubt that the remainder of the prophecy applies to the remainder of the period?

Who is the “beast with the two horns like a lamb”? Our entire belief is, that he is the Pope of Rome. The symbol is that of a sacro-secular power—a secular “beast,” with the insignia of (not λ, but) the “Lamb.” Although no article is prefixed in the Greek to Λῦνα, it is plain we are to understand the Lamb, Λῦνα being written with a capital letter. Λῦνα, according to Dr. Wordsworth, is the special name of the Saviour throughout the Revelation, the word occurring no less than twenty-nine times, and always
REV. XIII. 11-18.

with reference to Him (p. 384). The symbol represents earthly sovereignty—denoted by the head, wielding the powers of the Son of God. There is a great difference between this symbol, and that of the "little horn, with eyes like the eyes of man" (Dan. vii. 8); this latter represents a secular power, subordinate by nature (the horn), but actually holding a commission in God's service—a divinely-appointed commission; but the "two horns of the Lamb" on the head of a wildbeast, set forth a sovereign human power, hoisting divine colours, and claiming to wield the arms and possess the attributes of the Holy One. The "horns of the Lamb" on the head of the "beast" are clearly an exhibition of blasphemy, pride, and usurpation,—it is in fact the sacro-secular sovereignty of the Papacy in its full growth. We believe this to be the full signification of the symbol; but if there be any thing to be added, it will be that the "two horns"—in a material view of them, represent Christ's visible kingdom—the two Churches Eastern and Western which make up the original Roman kingdom—the two legs of the great Image which we have shown to be especially Christian. And then, instead of beholding "in the midst of the seven candlesticks one like unto the Son of man" (Rev. i. 13), we behold a human power arrogating divine dominion over the same Churches. We can have no doubt that this "horned beast" is the Pope of Rome,—being elsewhere designated the "false prophet" (Rev. xix. 20); that is to say, a true prophet of God, bartering, like Balaam, his spiritual gift for worldly advantage, and the wages of this present time.

On the circumstance that, in symbolism, the Pope of Rome rightfully belongs to the bestial rather than the human kingdom of nature, we scarcely need again to speak—it would be as contrary to any intelligible rules of the science to represent the secular part of the Papal character (which is "of earth") as that of an "angel of the Church," or by any thing borrowed from human kind, as it would be to represent the spiritual part (which is of "heaven") by that which has no communication with heaven. It is in the secular part of his character that the Pope is, of his own preference and
assumption, mostly,—we may say, wholly—manifested to the world; and he is consequently, in his main aspect, of the bestial nature in symbolism. As ecumenical Bishop, it is unquestionably more with temporal than with spiritual views the lofty title is assumed; but as claiming, in consequence, a sovereign power over states and nations, he is a self-constituted being—unknown in the economy of Christ's Church. Imagine at a village fair, that we should see a flag with its gaudy drapery rising gaily out of a venerable oak tree,—would there be danger of our regarding it as of the natural growth of the oak? Or, in gazing at a noble fortress on a hill, if we should see the chimney of a manufactory towering high within its walls, and vomiting forth volumes of smoke and flame,—would there be danger of our considering it an essential part of the works, however well adapted it might be for casting an ambitious eye on the neighbouring territory? Neither can we regard the Roman Pontiff, as such, as belonging to the Christian Church. The Papal power is bestial; and the prophet saw it "coming up from the earth."

The "earth" is one of those figures which are ever to be interpreted (as we believe) by a consideration of its opposite, either expressed or implied. In the passage "God created the heaven and the earth" the word has an obviously different meaning from what it can have in a symbolical narration; and we can imagine no other guide in the latter case than that of contrast. The expression "another beast" directs us to the first beast, who rose out of the sea—the turbulent state of the nations, tossed about in political anarchy: the second beast therefore, rising out of the earth, rises out of that which is fixed and stable: and this can be only what resists (and but one thing is there which has ever well resisted) the roaring element of the people—the Church of God. This figure of stability rising out of confusion was set up on an early day in creation, when God bid "the dry land appear," and "called it earth" (Gen. i. 9, 10):—and like to this redemption from the primal element of chaos—the sea, was that of the Church elected and established from out of the unstable people. It is an old observation that "the land," as a symbol signifying the "holy land," is in prophecy often
put in contrast with the "isles of the Gentiles"—meaning the countries of Europe, to be reached from Palestine only by sea. The reason for this may be the same as the above: —the chosen land, the land of promise, may be accounted to carry the same relation to other lands, that the earth lifted up in the day of creation does to the sea; and as "holy Church" does to the institutions of man. Under this view, the "beast from the sea" might additionally signify the beast from the distant countries of the West, and the "beast from the earth" the beast springing up in the East, or Palestine. It is not desirable, we admit, to affix a double interpretation to a figure of this sort; but it happens that the interpretation is not thus altered in its historical anticipations (if it have any) in the least degree, but strengthened: —let the suggestion pass for what it is worth. That "the earth" means the holy land, and for the reason just given, in several instances that immediately follow, we have but little doubt;—for instance (ver. 12) "the earth and them which dwell therein"; and again (ver. 14) "them that dwell in the earth"; and the same words pointedly repeated in the same verse. We can imagine no other contrast to the term in these passages than the one we have named:—and this idea has the greater verisimilitude when it is observed, that in the intermediate verse (ver. 13) a totally different contrast obtains,—"he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth."

Standing on "the sand of the sea," and looking seaward, St. John sees the first beast "rise up out of the sea"; then, turning towards the land, he sees "another beast coming up out of the earth." There can be no doubt that the visual appearance, in respect of the two parts of this vision, was simultaneous,—a fact which the form of the narrative, and in particular the use of the word "another," sufficiently attest: —how then can it be accounted for that the mere turning upon the heel (as it were)—the mere movement of the head on the part of the prophet, was attended in time with the lapse of a thousand years?—for if the commencement of the vision was in the day of Charlemagne, and the last mentioned "beast" was to come into action only in our own day, such
is the obvious inference from the symbolism. This difficulty yields to a little reflection. It is possible that the beast "from the earth" might have been coming up even the earliest of the two beasts—earliest by many centuries, though the action ascribed to him were at this long distance of time. Perhaps there may be discerned a hint of this sort in the difference of the two expressions—"I saw a beast rise up out of the sea" (ver. 6), where the whole process may be supposed to meet the eye; and "I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth," wherein the commencement of the process is evidently lost to the beholder. The sudden rising of the first beast has been sufficiently described,—he rose from out the tumultuous but subsiding sea: the gradual rising of the second beast—"like a plant silently" (as Bishop Newton beautifully expresses it) is to be recognised in the well known history of Papal growth and increase through many preceding centuries.

Let us view this increase as dating from three centuries earlier than Charlemagne, and we easily observe a series of successful acts of "rising" occupying many ages, yet seeming naturally to spring out of, and to sanction—each one the one next to come; and all agreeing in a single aim—the abasement of the civil power, and the aggrandizement of the Roman pontiff as a temporal lord. Not wishing to be led more than is necessary into repetition, we will merely cite among these steps of increase—the decree of Justinian (A.D. 533) delivering over dissentients from Romish doctrine to be dealt with by the secular arm: the appointment of the Pope to the whole temporal rule of Italy in A.D. 552: the imperial decree of A.D. 606, constituting him "Universal Bishop": his rising to the dignity of an independent sovereign in the times, and by the decrees of Pepin and Charlemagne. To these—preceding the rise of the "Beast from the sea" in A.D. 800, might be added, in the present instance, a notable list from succeeding ages; but it would tend just now to confuse the scene. The name of Charlemagne marks the climax of the Papal growth, in the full union of its spiritual and temporal sovereignty:—and thus it happens, in conformity with the requirements of the symbolism, that in all
respects the "beast from the sea," and the "horned beast from the earth," presented to the prophet's eye the appropriate materials of a single though duplex vision,—the one plunging violently, the other rising cautiously into existence, and each attaining its perfection through the instrumentality of the other.

Now if it be true that the Pope is to be recognised in the first scene, only under the name of his inspirer the "Dragon"—only therefore in his agency (i.e., no symbol of him appearing in the scene); while yet the prophet beheld him in the second scene "coming up" in the shape of a "horned beast," it evidently becomes of first importance to show (if we may), that even according to the text, which asserts as much, these two characters—the "dragon," and the "horned beast"—must have been regarded by the prophet as the one Papal power:—this must be our immediate endeavour.

This horned beast "spake as a dragon." We object to this reading that, as there is but one "dragon"—Satan, it should have been rendered—"spake as the dragon." The circumstance of there being no definite article in the Greek cannot command a reading opposed to the order of nature. But further, if we have rightly pointed out that the beast had "two horns" like (not a, but) THE Lamb, we must in all consistency, in the same sentence, read "THE dragon."• Furthermore, instead of "as the dragon"—which might seem to refer to manner only, we may read as if (vid. "οὐ" Jones's Lexicon). The passage thus cleared states, that the beast had two horns like the Lamb, and that he spake as if he were the dragon. But what is meant by spake as if he were the dragon? Does it refer to the tone of his speech, or to the matter of it? The first supposition cannot surely stand: it were quite beneath the dignity of the subject. There remains the matter,—and the question arises, What did he say, and when? Now to understand this, it is necessary to call to mind that, although the "beast from the earth" was

* The reader is recommended to consult Mr. Tilloch's Dissertation (pp. 258, et seq.) on the use of the Greek article in the Apocalypse: the remarks are too elaborate to admit of their introduction here, even in a note. They will be found to afford countenance to the view here taken.
seen contemporaneously with the rest of the vision, his action belongs to a later age by a thousand years; and that, consequently, in proceeding to describe that action, and that too in a distinctly separate scene, it was necessary the prophet should project (as it were) his own presence to that advanced period of time; and so be able, in speaking of the beast, to employ the tense befitting his position, as if he stood alongside him:—thus (e.g.) it is, that in the next verse the prophet says—"he exerciseth all the power, &c.,"—speaking in the present tense in the style of a narrative,—i.e., as if accompanying the Beast’s movements. Also we may fairly assume that, in each scene of the vision, the Pope is an indispensable character—whether he be the "image" (as says Bishop Newton), or the "horned beast" as here propounded. With these preliminaries, we may venture the following answer to the above question—What did the horned beast say, and when? The "dragon" under the guise of the Pope "spake" to Charlemagne, conferring on him "his power, and his seat, and great authority": the "horned beast"—equally the Pope, "spake as the dragon." Hence it appears that these words are intended as a means of recognition. They do not state in themselves what the beast said, or when he said it; but they do state that on some previous and peculiar occasion he said something; and what that was must be discovered by referring to the earlier scene; for "he spake (i.e., had spoken) as if he were the dragon." They were the words the "dragon" spake to Charlemagne in the sea vision. In unison with this view we find the word "εἶλετ" (he spake) in the imperfect tense; as if the prophet, instead of saying—"and he spake as a dragon," should have said—"and he was speaking awhile since as if he were the dragon"; or, "and he it is who spake on the late occasion in the character of the dragon." The short notice "he spake as a (the) dragon," when viewed in this the intended light, is of the highest importance; it serves to establish an identity between the "dragon" of ver. 2 and the "horned beast" of ver. 11,—between the pontifical agent of the early, and him of the later age.

But why then (it will be asked) is it not the "horned
beast" (a specific and intelligible symbol), instead of the "dragon," who gives to Charlemagne "his power and authority"? We feel the importance of this objection, and have more than one answer to suggest.

First, regarding the symbolism as adapting itself so far as may be to the changes induced by time, it is a fact that the Pope was not, at the time of Charlemagne's rise, a "beast with the horns of the Lamb." A "beast" he was, because an independent temporal sovereign, having just become entitled to the appellation. But the horns of the Lamb—i.e., the pretentious and claims of the Lord Christ, had still, many of them, to shoot forth from the bestial brow. Not to dwell upon its having been an act of Charlemagne's subsequent to his own coronation, and therefore subsequent to the vision of that coronation, to declare the Pope above all law human and divine, we must look to later ages for the full growth of the Papal assumptions. We must observe Hildebrand (for instance) untying the knot which bound to their "better halves" (an excellent phrase) the priesthood of the whole Roman world—in direct contempt of the Lord's injunction, "what God hath put together, let not man put asunder" (vid. Sir J. Stephens, on Hildebrand). We must look at him some centuries later, dispensing "Indulgences" for the remission of sin.* We must behold him, even quite lately, selecting saints for glory from among departed souls—their titles to the honour being all sorts of "lying miracles." Above all we must hear him pronouncing the Grand Lie—an "immaculate conception" in the race of Adam—subversive at once of the whole spiritual history of mankind. These and such like—the growth of later ages, are the instances that fulfil the symbol, "the two (i.e., all) horns of the

* Of that trap for pelf and plunder the cunning account given is—that "indulgence" does not profess to free from sin, but only from the penalties incurred by sin: on which M. von Hirscher, a Roman Catholic Dean, very candidly observes (vid. "Sympathies of the Continent," p. 211)—"it is the penalty, and not the guilt, of sin, which the people regard as the important thing; and whatever frees them from the punishment of sin frees them, so far as they care about it, from sin itself." "Say what you will, there it remains: the people understand by 'indulgence' the remission of sins."
Lamb"—to which however must be added (the most important consideration of all) whatever of illustration the future may reveal.

Again, the symbolism might have been guided by an important moral consideration, to be apprehended only by that sense, which tells us of the admirable wisdom and propriety, with which all the instrumentalities of Divine Providence are selected. Satan, like every creature, is an instrument of God to effect His will; and his doings at all times—whatever be their motives, cannot but result, eventually, to the praise of that great Being, who bids all things, whether they be things of heaven, of earth, or of hell, bring accession to His glory. But when we call to mind what is revealed of Satan; that he is the first-born of God's creation; that before his fall he had high command in heaven, and to this day (it is to be believed) retains the lofty intellectual attributes—vast range of thought and freedom of purpose—vast administrative power, and talent of rule, with which he was at the first endowed; may we not imagine that it may please God still to give employment to such endowments, overruling the issues of them to His own ends?—that, being "prince of this world," there may be committed to his management all the more extensive steps of revolution and change of government, by which it is the Divine pleasure the temporal interests of man shall be advanced?—that whilst permitting a vast latitude of contrivance and of action, it may be the delight of the Supreme Disposer of events to draw out of his gigantick projects of evil, the means of His people's improvement and civilization? All nature in her more stern operations bears witness in favour of the proposition; in the purification of the atmosphere that results from storm and hurricane, the science that springs out of fire-damp and mildew, the fertility of the land that owes its origin to showers lifted up by the tempestuous ocean. So too in the moral world, the history of human civilization testifies continually to the fact, that "the highest purposes of Providence have been wrought out of the basest and most selfish schemes and inventions of man" ("Times" newspaper); and that even "war, as men's minds are at present constituted, is an essen-
tial element in the moral government and improvement of the 
world " (Blackwood).

It was the act of a calculating ambition which gave the 
imperial crown to Charlemagne; and the enterprise was suc-
cessful in its main purpose—that of exalting to high and 
supreme dignity the pontifical functionary, whom Satan had 
persuaded to seize upon the office of God himself, in the 
institution and disposal of this high sovereignty. The 
sceptre of the world was thus astutely placed, in the view of 
the wondering multitude, in the hands of " Christ's vicar " 
—the sceptre which Christ had himself refused:—and thus 
too, in him, did " the prince of this world " make patent to 
the wide universe his own real dominion, fixing his seat in 
the midst of the house of God. Yet, under the providence 
of God, did this high enthronement of Charlemagne become 
most beneficial to mankind, and gave evidence by its conse-
quences, that a more happy expedient could not have been 
devised for allaying the long-prevailing enmities, and turning 
even to the account of friendly help, the antipathies of the 
social world. By creating in the imperial majesty a centre 
of strength it called attention to the blessings of a general 
union, and gave an unwonted impulse to the sentiment of 
loyalty among long hostile tribes and peoples. In a word, 
the coronation of Charlemagne was of that order of events, 
wherein he who discerns a divine philosophy in history, does 
not fail to behold the malicious enemy of God's Son exerting 
himself, in some public act, to bring a scandal upon the 
Christian name and Church; but which it pleases the Most 
High, sending confusion on the plans of the adversary, to 
convert into the means of an enduring blessing. It was an 
instance of a manœuvre and a defeat, in the great war which is 
ever raging in the field of human history.

Now we conceive it was more accordant, in this case, with 
the dignity of a communication from the Holy Spirit, to 
name at once the secret inspirer of this august transaction, 
than to have designated by a symbol of easy application his 
merely outward agent. In this respect especially does 
Prophecy assert her higher rank over History—that she 
speaks with equal assurance of the originating, as of the im-

mediate causes of events; and we cannot but see that, in the transaction under examination, the external apparent cause—the fiat of the pontiff, viewed in the excellence of its results, is calculated to convey false notions of his legitimate power. To have stated simply by an easy symbol, that the head of the Church had, in the exercise of the power in his hands, achieved this great benefit, would have seemed to express an approval of the part he took; as though it were the Divine pleasure to make the Roman pontiff the channel of all good gifts, and to commend what had been done to the admiration of the Christian world: instead of stamping it, as by calling it the work of the Dragon He has done, with the brand of pride and usurpation. And we ask further, is there not a grandeur of description more befitting the pen of inspiration, in declaring the work achieved to be that of this high-born but false minister, than there would have been in ascribing it to an upstart, intermediate agent—the stalking-horse of Satan, to-day an humble seminarian, to-morrow "King of kings"; whose name in the prophetic page would have robbed it in great measure of the dignity of the connexion it now holds with the all-ruling mind of Providence, and have led to a mistaken view of the ministerial means, by which the government of the world is carried on.

At the twelfth verse we plunge into the "darkness visible" of futurity, where events are unfolded in complicated imagery, and the doubting eye is fain to declare it "sees men as trees walking." With regard to the two principal characters of this scene—the "horned beast" and the "healed beast," if the reader cannot assent to the opinion that the first of these is the Pope of Rome, it will be difficult to persuade him as to the other, or to reconcile him to any of our further speculations:—nevertheless, that the other character is L. Napoleon, and that his name is written by the pen of inspiration in the last verse of the scene, the writer announces with an assurance that scorns the expression of a doubt. The great question suggested by this fact is—to what extent do the intermediate verses (between the 12th and 18th) apply to him? Is he to be regarded only as the head and initiator of a system,—the inductor of an age in the general
course of which the events foretold will come to pass,—in like manner as is Charlemagne the inductor of the age of "iron": or, are we to expect that L. Napoleon will personally carry out all that is here written of the "resuscitated beast" —the "man of sin," the "little horn," the "vile person" (Dan. xi. 21)? In support of the first of these views we have the positive measurement of time—1260 years, supposed to commence in A.D. 800; denoting that a couple of centuries still remain of his "kingdom." On the other hand it should not be forgotten, that the descriptions of Daniel's several "kingdoms" have been found to be mainly those of the heads who have introduced, or who otherwise represent them,—these "heads" being set forth in their characters and acts as types of their "kingdoms"; and consequently, conjecture should rather, perhaps, lean to the idea, that the events here foretold will receive their accomplishment in the very days of Louis Napoleon. It is at any rate a perfectly consistent theory, that while the events attach themselves to Louis Napoleon as a head, and will bring him to perdition (Rev. xvi. 11), his "kingdom" will continue the time above indicated. In support of this view we may call to mind, that there is a positive period (i.e., "in the days of these kings," Dan. ii. 44) for the "stone" to fall upon the toes of the Image, and itself to grow into a mountain (Dan. ii. 35): during all which time, notwithstanding, the "beast" may,—indeed (says Rev. xiii. 5) "will," maintain his existence—will "continue." The points for examination arising out of the verses before us (12 to 15) are the following:—

What is meant by "he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him"?

What, by "the earth and them that dwell therein"?

What, by "making fire come down from heaven on the earth"?

What, by "making an image to the beast''?

What, by "giving life unto the image of the beast"?

It is not too much to say that either one of these points, were its meaning placed beyond doubt, would throw a light sufficient to unravel the whole mystery of the prophecy.

The first of these passages—"he exerciseth all the power
of the first beast before him," while it asserts a leading fact, calls attention primarily to the very different position occupied, and the very different office fulfilled, by the pontiff of this latter scene of the vision, from that in which he figures under guise of the "dragon." In the first scene, Charlemagne and the imperial line descending from him were instruments of the sublime pontiff, and second in imperial rule:—the Papal dragon "gave" the authority (ver. 2) and was therefore supreme. In the fifth verse, where we have supposed the power exercised (the united power of "dragon" and "beast") to be spoken of as one, the expression occurs "there was given unto him" (εδόθη αυτῷ): it is the peculiar characteristic of this, as distinguished from the later scene. It denotes a praeternatural inspiration—that of the dragon infusing itself continually into, and impelling, the instrument of his power;—in other words engaging by his Papal mouth-piece the services of the executive Head, to carry out his suggestions. A reference to the Greek will show the frequency of the expression. In contradistinction to this in the later scene, the Papal horned beast contrives, and brings to pass (πους) whatever is done. The imperial Beast whose deadly wound is healed, pre-eminent in rule, assumes a dignified passive part. He is entirely sustained by the obsequious "horned beast," which is prompted by an intense desire to advance the first beast's dignity: so much so, that Irenæus calls the horned beast the first beast's armour-bearer, and Bishop Newton his prime minister. A patient and sullen expectation of consequences is here the characteristic of the imperial "man of sin."

"He (the horned beast) exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him, and causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast." The expression εὐωνυμία αὐτοῦ, in its literal sense, certainly conveys the idea generally stated by commentators—that of the horned beast acting in the first beast's very presence; but does this certainly mean within sight? Is not delegated power always in the presence of the government that employs it? Is not the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, or the Governor General of India, always "in the presence of" the English throne?
And this—if the East be (as we conjecture from the word "earth" in the latter part of the verse) the scene of action—must certainly be the sense: the Papal emissaries will exercise their craft "before" i.e., in the governmental sight of—the Beast; whose Head, notwithstanding, might, or might not, remain at the original Western seat of government. But the Papal beast "exerciseth (calls into activity) all the power of the first beast." From what is gone before, we presume the word "all" is intended to embrace all the elements of that mixed rule—part spiritual, part secular—which we have seen established at the first rising of the "Beast from the sea." Or the word "all" may express the secular part only—all that pertains of right to the first beast; but being exercised by a spiritual functionary, it comes to the same thing. In what manner this will be verified it would be idle to conjecture; but we can imagine a no more probable fulfilment than what is contained in the words of the great Gregory, when speaking of the Antichrist of the last days—"Sacerdotum ei preparatur exercitus" (an army of priests is enlisted for his service).*

Should this observation of Gregory's be thought entitled to respect, it may be accepted under either of the two following very opposite views. We may imagine, first, the Pope in his furious zeal as an agent, to collect together armies professing only the Romish faith; and to send them forth, as the armies of Israel, under a spiritual leadership, for the simultaneous purposes of exterminating heretical opponents, and of offering to the Mahometans the alternative of the sword or the word; or it may be, literally, that a vast multitude—an organized array of Priests, will accomplish the conversion of the Mahometans, without the aid of the secular power, excepting as to its protection. The latter view we adopt, as it best agrees with the notice in Daniel relative (as we believe) to the same event, which expressly declares that the fall of Mahometanism shall be "without hands"—i.e., without the violence of man (Dan. viii. 25). It is in agreement herewith that we have found the diligent horned beast to be called emphatically "the false prophet" (Rev. xix. 20).

And from the context already given in Rev. xiii.—"he causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast whose deadly wound was healed"; it seems that the Pope will bring to pass that the oriental nations shall regard with profound respect the Western Beast, with its institutions spiritual and civil, and be induced to swear allegiance to its "Head."

We have here assumed, in connexion with previous observations, what the meaning may be of the expression "the earth"; which however claims a further short notice. It is held by some writers that the "earth" in this sentence is the holy land—the ancient heritage of the Church and home of the sacred writers, as contradistinguished from the isles of the Gentiles—lands to be approached from thence only by sea (Calmet Voc. Japheth). By others it is said that "the earth," in the whole book of Revelation, signifies the Roman empire ("Apocalypse Popularly Explained," p. 18).* Now we willingly accept the proposition that the symbol applies singly, whether to Eastern or Western territory. But in the scheme of interpretation here pursued, it is not possible it should mean the latter, for the following reason:—the Western empire has been assumed throughout to carry the designation of the "beast"; and if the "earth" is also the Western empire, then must the "earth" and the "beast" be figures importing the same thing in the same place (vid. ver. 12)—which is absurd. We venture then to think that the expression "the earth and them that dwell therein" points to the Holy-land, and its settled Mahometan inhabitants.†

* In the seventh chapter of Daniel we read (ver. 3) of "four beasts coming up from the sea": and in the same chapter (ver. 17) these four beasts are declared to be "four kings which arise out of the earth." To explain this apparent contradiction, it is necessary of course to take the "sea" and the "earth" severally under different contrasts; one of which will have reference, perhaps, to the manner of rising in each case.

† It is well known to the students of prophecy that, in laying these transactions for the reasons given in the East, we have the support of many other prophetic considerations. We keep within the latitude of a prevailing expectation, that the Holy-land will shortly become the scene of a tremendous struggle. The Jews are to be gathered in—the sum and
With regard to the "making fire come down from heaven on the earth," it seems this figure is chosen as affording the strongest hyperbole at all admissible, to set forth the wonder-working power of Rome; as it is said—"so that he maketh fire, &c.," as if it were her proudest feat. Yet, in addition to a general meaning, these sort of expressions decidedly require a distinct explanation. The present one seems to allude to that which would naturally be the primary object of the Papal wonderworker—to convince the Eastern nations of his supreme spiritual (high above, and far beyond, all temporal) power; to effect which, he resorts to some marvellous display indicative of his habitual communication with heaven,—in imitation (it may be) of the descent of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost. Or more probably, the passage may be regarded, with a slight variation of meaning, as a parallel one with that wherein our Lord describes the effects attendant upon His own preaching—"I am come to send fire on the earth; and what will I if it be already kindled"? (Luke xii. 49.) On which Bishop Sumner remarks, "His ministry and that of His apostles, lighted the fire of zeal, of piety, of love towards God and man: and it also lighted the unhallowed fire of hatred, suspicion, and jealousy." In like manner it may be meant to affirm that the effects of the Papal thaumaturgy would be to create dis-sensions among the Eastern nations, and that the projects of the pontiff would be advanced by the antagonistic principles these would evoke—the enthusiasm of many, and the resistance of many more. Every where in the Revelation the unholy attempts of the Antichrist are set forth in words, applicable in the first instance to the works of Him whom he would rival and supplant.

It is said of this Papal wonderworker that he "deceives" the people of "the earth" (ver. 14) "by the means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast." Observe the difference here declared between the earth and

substance of the struggle. And this will occasion the assemblage of many nations—some friendly, some adverse to their cause:—but this is beyond the proper limits of our subject.
the beast,—a corroboration of the view that the earth is the holy-land,—at least that it cannot be the Western empire. Observe too the words "he had power to do" (εδοθη αυτω); here we have the old draconic inspiration of the first scene; and the expression may be considered a link of connection between the two scenes, inasmuch as it shews that the miracles referred to—done in the sight of the "Holy Roman beast," are not present miracles only; but are also the long standing miracles of past ages, which had been accumulating in catalogues ever since his first manifestation. It means in fact that the Lamb-like beast, being fully accounted by the Western Church to possess this miraculous power,—by virtue of which painted virgins did wink beyond dispute, the blood of a saint did curdle at sight of a heretic, Mary's cottage did positively travel across the seas, &c., &c.,—was enabled to accumulate in support of his deceptions this universal testimony; whereby the Eastern disciples were satisfied of the supernatural powers of his priestly emissaries, and of his own unquestionable claim to the title of Vicegerent of the Most High.

The credit thus obtained by the Lamb-like beast issues in his persuading the Eastern people to "make an image to the beast which had a wound by a sword and did live." This is the most difficult—as also it is the most important—of the points we have to examine of this vision. It is certain that any attempt to elucidate it must be made under subjection to the previous question—What is an Image?

But first be it observed, that this "image," whatever its nature, is made "to the beast" (ver. 14): though also it is an image of the beast (ver. 15). The first expression denotes a certain property in the image accruing to the beast himself; as when (for instance) Solomon raises a temple to the Most High God—the edifice becomes God's own temple, being dedicated (i.e., given) to Him. If a nobleman should order a statue of Wellington for his gallery, all that he will have done is—to set up a statue of the Duke of Wellington; but if a grateful country should set up such a thing to his memory, she will have raised it to the great Duke, who (i.e., his abiding name—the present numen) has
a property in it. Hence, then, the image to be made of the beast will belong to the beast.

In all cases an image is a visible thing; and sets before the understanding its original prototype, either in an imitation of its outward form, or in an enigmatical allusion to some unseen quality it is known to possess. And as, thus, an image must be either mystic or direct, the first question for our judgment is—of which class is the image, to be raised by “them that dwell on the earth,” likely to be?—whether of the nature of “a woman sitting upon seven hills,” “a woman weeping under a palm tree,” “a colossal figure of empire on the plain of Dura,” all well-known images of the mystic sort; or whether it will carry a direct resemblance to its prototype—such as obtains among simple copies of things material? It must be evident on the least reflection, that if the image to be raised is to be of a mystic, or at all indirect nature, the hope of investigating with success the terms of its announcement is altogether visionary: but believing as we do that the intention of the Holy Spirit was, that this image should be a subject even of expectation to the Church,—that the announcement is for our admonition,—we are persuaded that it will be in its nature of the direct class; and as like to the original of which it is to be the copy, as is either of the two statues of the Duke of Wellington in our metropolis to the other, or to their original. But what, under this view, can be an “image of the beast”? We give at once the answer—the only possible answer (as we conceive) to this question; that the “image” will be nothing else, and nothing less, than an Eastern Empire, amassed out of many nations under the auspices of the Lamb-horned beast, and brought under both spiritual and temporal subjection to the supreme Head of the Western empire. But this opinion requires the support of further considerations on the nature of an image.

An image, even of the most direct and simple construction, while it carries a general resemblance in all its parts to its original, requires essentially that in one part—the head (as being representative of the spirit) the resemblance should be so close as to amount to identity. The two images above cited of the Duke of Wellington—which being images
of the same may be considered images of each other—have between them the most general resemblance (that only of both possessing the ordinary human limbs) in all but the head; which in both presents identity of feature, indicating sameness of spirit. And this is so important a characteristic of an image, that where the bodies of the two figures are exceedingly dissimilar,—as dissimilar as the human figure in a military or a sacerdotal garb; yet, if the heads are alike, manifesting the same anima, the ikonic character is set up. So much more does the perfection of an image depend upon identity of spirit with its original, than on any other point of agreement, that we find the distinction thus recognised in Scripture—"the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things" (he means) as has the Gospel (Heb. x. 1). "Here (says Calmet voc. 'image') the mere shadowy resemblance of 'things to come' exhibited by the law (i.e., in its worship) is put in contrast with the solid finished figure presented in the Gospel: "—this "solid finished figure" however, having its entire evidence in a closer identity of spirit with "the things to come" than had the law. And thus it is that the man Christ, whose spirit (we know) is identical with that of the Father, is styled "the express image of his substance" (Heb. i. 3)—on which the same author observes, to the effect that this express image is not "a ray only, but an emanation from the Father, an efflux of his light and substance." Thus identity of spirit—the one life—is spoken of as that in which the perfection of an image consists.

The most perfect image to be recognised in nature is that which the young presents of its sire: the identity being complete in all attributes—external as well as internal. In the case of States, the one "anima" which would make two states to be images of each other is—not mere resemblance of constitution, but—identity of the governing power. Thus the colonies of Great Britain are all images of the mother-country, for the reason that they are under the rule of the same instincts—the same head:—the variety in their external appearance is but as the variety of complexion and height in members of the same family, or as of dress in several marble
statues of the same individual. This observation has the sanction of Scripture: it calls these colonies her young—the most perfect of all images. In Ezekiel (xxxviii. 13) we read, "Sheba, and Dedan, and the merchants of Tarshish, with all the young lions thereof, shall say unto thee, Art thou come to take a spoil, hast thou gathered thy company to take a prey"?—where Tarshish (Great Britain)—the old lion, is represented as surrounded with his "young lions"—images of himself;—images, only because inhabited by the same spirit, governed by the same Head.

It is scarcely necessary to say, in answer to a possible objection, that the appointed governor of a colony is not its head, such officer being only representative. Moreover, if a Christian power should be raised up in the East, and some converted chieftain of note (say Abd el Kader) were invested with its sovereignty, the case would not present a fulfilment of the Prophecy—as offering an image either of the beast or to the beast. As the headship would be diverse, there would be no connexion of identity between it and the Western empire, to constitute it an image of that empire,—the tie would be only that of resemblance, as between a Persian and a Frenchman: much less would it be an image to (as appertaining to) the Beast.

From these considerations we can arrive but at one conclusion, viz., that not only will an Eastern empire be constructed under the auspices of the Lamb-like beast (for indeed, whether it be in the East or elsewhere, what other idea can correspond in a direct sense with the words "image of the beast"?)—but also, that its government will be committed to the Western Emperor;—whereby alone identity of spirit—the essential feature expressed in ordinary images by a common head—can be secured; and whereby alone can the image so raised "of" the beast be found to be raised likewise "to" the beast, and become his property:—for in the head—the symbol of power, resides likewise the claim and proof of property.

As the "beast" is both multitudinous and single,—is the entire body, also the supreme governor of the empire, of like constitution must be its "image;" so that the word
"image" must be viewed as expressing both its own full stature, and its head singly. And as, on the one hand, the essential condition of the ikonic character is the exhibition of the same spirit (or visible head, its representative) with the original; and as, on the other hand, a property in the image is in the present instance, said to belong to the original; there is but one means the writer can see of satisfying these premises—that of supposing a single sovereign of both empires—one governing mind presiding over both original and copy. This sovereign, we believe, will be Louis Napoleon. In respect of headship, then, this personage becomes both "Beast," and "Image of the beast";—reminding us of a somewhat similar view had of him some time ago, wherein he was seen as both Head of empire, and Horn of empire.*

Let us now move forward to the last article marked for consideration. The fifteenth verse says—"And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed." "He had power to give"—in the Greek "There was given him power to give" (ἐδόθην αὐτῷ δύναμιν)—the inspiration, as heretofore, of Satan:—shewing that, not to the Lamb-horned beast, but to Satan himself, is due the original conception of this, as well as of the former scheme of empire. As to the nature of the gift described as the gift of "life," the words, unaided by their context, would leave the subject in mystery. But the Holy Spirit has described the gift by its two great results. It is first said, "that the image of the beast should both speak":—now to give life for this end is to give breath (and "breath" we read in the margin)—which is the endowment of the Head. A State breathes and speaks through its government, in a despotism through its ruler;—and we consider the passage as asserting that the Pope appoints the headship of this Image; also that he appoints it to the ruler of the Western empire—the original Beast; because, in making the image "speak," i. e., in giving

* In unison herewith the numeric beast 666—a name of multitude, contains within itself, and exhibits in its whole construction, its numeric head, which is 10—66.
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it a Head, he appoints the only head which could make it an image. Secondly, that the Image should "cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed"; in which passage, the "life" imparted (aforetime "breath") becomes the spirit infused. By "worship" is of course meant allegiance. Here we have the announcement of persecution within the territories of the Image, analogous to that of the former scene of the vision (ver. 7). The Pope acting in the energy of Satan (εδοθη αυτω) sends forth from his rabid throne the elements of discord, fanaticism, and tyranny; and it will probably happen that the Head of the Image, at once his master and his tool—the "man of sin," will go forth, as did the impostor Mahomet in the same regions, to sow and to gather at the same time; finding in his custody of the "holy places" (which must "be filled"—Luke xiv. 23), the warrant for the so zealous use of his holy sickle.

It is an awful consideration that the project of building up this Eastern Image, is the consequence of the Beast being cured from his wound in the West, and restored from his losses by the sword (vide v. 14). As Head of the Image he calls on all on pain of death to worship him, i. e., acknowledge his supremacy, and help to swell his triumphal host. And thus he is faithful to his early prototype on the plain of Dura (Dan. iii. 6), with respect to which it was decreed, that "whoso would not fall down and worship the image," when he heard the triumphal sounds of flute, sackbut, and dulcimer, "should die." May we venture to think that a hint is hence deductible, regarding the locality of the future Eastern seat of empire?

In the sixteenth and seventeenth verses, the Lamb-horned Beast "causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads: And that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name." The officiousness and zeal of the great instigator of the movement are here particularly observable. A distinction is throughout maintained between the Eastern and
Western branches of the empire; and the meaning is—that all persons and all states are obliged to belong to one or other of them, and to enroll themselves as members of the Eastern or the Western Church. In this respect it may be, we repeat, that the Papal beast has "two horns" of the Faith, in like manner as Daniel's "Image" had two legs of Christian empire. The "small and great, rich and poor, free and bond," may apply generally to the communities of greater or lesser degree of each branch. The place of the mark of recognition—"on the right hand or forehead," seems also to apply generally; and to indicate that many of each branch will be tributary—supporting with the "right-hand," and many be brought under direct rule, and be especially interested to uphold the glory of the kingdom: for these marks assuredly refer, either to different states of bondage in ancient times, or to the different duties exacted of them.

The mark itself, it is important to observe, is not single; but answering to the constitution of the empire; and consists (so says the English text) of "the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name." A reference however to Griesbach will shew, that the first "or" in the 17th verse is absolutely rejected as spurious by that prince of critics: he has also another emendation of, perhaps, inferior importance—at least of inferior authority, viz., that he "proposes" to put "the name" (of the beast) in the genitive case—(τοῦ ονόματος instead of το ονόμα). Hence results necessarily one of the two following readings, "save he that had the mark—the name of the beast, or the number of his name," (that is to say, a mark consisting of the one or the other)—or, "save he that had the mark of the name of the beast, or the number of his name." We prefer greatly the latter of these; but it will be seen at once that there is no great difference between them: and the excellence of the emendation consists in this—that the three clauses, as they most erroneously stand in the English version, are reduced to two. The necessary mark must consequently be derived from, or refer to, the "name of the beast," or must consist
of "the number of his name." • The stamp to be applied is, in every case, a stamp of property. Every one must bear a "mark." And the necessity of its being in one of two forms shews, (as said above) that every one must belong either to the Eastern or Western imperial Church.

It is in Rev. xiii. that we are first apprised of this stamp —the mark, or the number, of the beast's name—to be set either on "the right-hand or the forehead." In several subsequent chapters an enumeration is made of these particulars, but with considerable variation of language:—for instance, in chap. xiv. 9 we read, "If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead or in his hand": and in ver. 11 "who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name." In chap. xv. 2 we read of "them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name." In chap. xvi. 2 "the men which had the mark of the beast, and them which worshipped his image." In chap. xx. 4 "which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands." Now it will be a fair enumeration (we presume) of these particulars, to regard them as consisting of "the beast," and "his image": "his mark," and "the number of his name." Does it not strike the reader that we have here four terms, of which it is intended

• Every reading of this passage at all sustained by authority is valuable; and believing as we do, that were it possible to give the text with certainty, the meaning would not long lag behind—the writer begs to say, that a version of it he has lately found in a book entitled "Wealth—the name of the Beast, 1844" (p. 69) appears to him preferable to any other: the book says, "One of the best MSS. (the Vat. 1160) with other corrections omits \(\eta\ \tauο\ \omega\upsilon\muα\ \tauου\ \thetaυριον\ ' (or the name of the beast) in the 17th verse": so that the passage would run thus, "that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the number of his name": i. e., in fact (as suggested by Griesbach) "the mark of the beast's name, or the number of his name." This is the most simple view of a text, which it is evident the Evil one has done his best to throw into confusion. It is to be commended on this account—that it does not disagree with either of the versions we have given above: indeed is just that which, on a comparison of them, seems to offer itself as the essence of their combined senses. We are to look then for the "mark" and the "number."
that the two last shall apply to the first two; and that one of the former pair, and one of the latter, shall be associated together? As the language of the text is so confused, it is with all due hesitation we pronounce upon the right manner of assorting them; but as it is given us to read with confidence on the prophetic page—a "mark" of a name, and a "number" of a name; so with equal confidence the writer pronounces, that it has been given him (by chance, if the reader pleases so to call it) to make discovery of this "mark," and of this "number"; and that the mark is that of the Napoleonic dynasty, the number that of the present imperial ruler—even of his very name;—so that the four terms before us may be paired (we think) as follows—the "beast" and the "mark," the "image" and the "number." This arrangement will be found in a future page of paramount importance.

It is likely enough that, in every page of this exposition, the writer may have fallen more or less into error; but in these numeric signs—the discovery of no systematic investigation, nor of any depth of thought, he for one would not venture for a moment—unless under the evidence of a faulty computation of them (and this he does not fear)—to believe himself in error. And as the predicted "Image" is among the things of the not distant future, the question—how far the discovery of the "Name of the beast" has led to the right elucidation of the Image, is assuredly the most important question that has hitherto been put forth in this treatise.

It is not obscurely intimated (ver. 17) that some "man" may be found resolute enough to withstand the pretensions of the "beast," and of his "image";—with such an one the common traffic of life—"to buy or sell," and all neighbourly intercourse, will be absolutely forbidden. Such a "man" (as we trust in God) will be the British nation. Established on her rocky throne, but still more on the rock of her faith, she will bid defiance (alas! as we believe not without great tribulation) to the daring demands of the "Man of sin." "Not to buy or sell" shews that her dependence on distant lands for supplies, will be regarded as the weak point of her
armour, and will occasion the re-enactment against her of the "Continental blockade." But taken spiritually, as perhaps ought to be done,—(vide Wordsworth in loc.) these words announce a prohibition of all spiritual intercourse as Christians; which (if the resolve should be consequent on success in war, and England be politically overthrown) amount to saying, that her faith shall be for a time forcibly suppressed:—and this will be found, unhappily, to agree with certain statements in Dan. xi., which will be considered in their place.*

The 18th verse, as it was essentially the cause of this

* The successful opponents of the Beast, it cannot be a question, are the Protestant nations—they who have forcibly disengaged themselves from the spiritual bonds of the bestial rule; and of these we believe the exponent to be Great Britain. Of these the magnificent language is held in the next chapter that—in number 144,000, they “stand with the Lamb on Mount Zion” (xiv. 1), “singing a new song before the throne of God” (ver. 3); that they are “redeemed from among men” (ver. 4), that “in their mouth was found no guile” (ver. 5). We shrink from the presumptuous conclusion to which an exact application of these terms would lead,—as if to be born a Romanist were helpless rejection, and to belong to the Reformed Church were sure acceptance. There is to be taken of every constituted body a comparative view, and an intrinsic view; in like manner as, in Sacred History, the Jewish nation is described as the charming “daughters of Israel,” and yet again as a “stiffnecked people.” In reading the language employed in respect of the blasphemous beast on the one hand, and the nations protesting against him on the other, it must ever be borne in mind that neither are the Divine maledictions pronounced on the former, nor the glorious praise spoken of the latter, to be taken but as referable to the system generally in each case; and to those members of it known only to God, who bear in their character the natural stamp of the system—the stamp it is calculated to impress, viz. the “mark of the beast,” or the “name of their God,” in the forehead. It may be a question whether the very worst members of the “beast” are not found in Protestant nations,—men who forfeit their privileges of inheritance, and fall into the greater condemnation. Notwithstanding which, privileged to live among the “saints,” they partake of their blessings; as likewise do the saintly children of the Roman Church, mixed up in the temporal lot of their prostitute mother, fall under her infictions, according to rules of wisdom which it is not given to the human understanding to fathom.
treatise being undertaken, so will it suitably serve as a signature at the end, to establish its conclusions.

In recapitulation of the latter scene of this chapter, we would say that the "healed beast"—having succeeded in re-erecting the scotched head of military despotism, with the aid of (the only source of such aid) the abject suffrages of the canaille, the base "legion," the six million, the power from beneath, the vox populi—will attempt the grasp of an universal dominion; that he will be incited and propelled to the gigantic enterprise by the Lamb-horned beast, whose object will be to extend his own spiritual domination co-ordinately with the successful strides of his imperial master and tool; the aim being to draw at once to his calamitous ensign the returning sons of Jacob, and to gather the Mahometan nations into his universal fold; that to this end, he will institute somewhere in the East, perhaps in the plain of Dura, a governmental basis of operations,—a focus, like the "city and tower" of Babel, of both spiritual and temporal dominion.

It is by no means necessary to suppose that this "man of sin" will be of inordinately sinful propensities; rather, it seems, he will lend himself to the inspiration of circumstances, and the calls of Satan through his organ the Pope, who exercises (he a Priest) "before him," and in behalf of him, "all the power" of the imperial station, directing its issues to his own ends. With whatever motive, whether of self-exaltation, or of that of the Roman Church, or of both combined, it is evident that the imperial beast lends himself blindly to the promotion of the Papal schemes. Perhaps the lowest degree of turpitude to which a man, or power, can descend, is that of prostituting the means in his hands to the promotion of another's iniquity. It is not without a misgiving that we apply to the "healed beast." St. Paul's designation "the man of sin;"—it is with much greater confidence we say, that the latter scene of this chapter is to be read in company with the six last verses of Dan. xi. as contemporaneous history. But it would require an angel's eye to discover through the mists of prophecy the steps by which he is led, on the one hand, to ascend the seat of God in His own temple.
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(2 Thess. ii. 4); or on the other hand, to fix his palaces "on the glorious holy mountain" of God (Dan. xi. 45); or indeed to determine how far these passages should be received in a material, and how far in a spiritual sense. This placing himself on "the throne of the most High" seems to be noted as the consummation of all impiety.

As to the name of this resuscitated beast, let it not be cavilled at by Christ's Church as by disbelievers in Prophecy. If not accepted as hereafter presented, let the fallacy of the reading be made apparent, and its folly exposed. To the apprehension of the writer, it is as plain as the "hand-writing on the wall." As a general rule he holds the common opinion, that prophecy is as a lamp that throws its rays behind, serving to guide those only who are content to walk in the light of its fulfilment. The name of the beast is an obvious exception. It is intended as a warning of the approach of the evil day. It says "'Come out of her, my people': desist from dalliance with the Papal whore,—they who are in any way allied to her shall partake of her plagues." Does it not say further—"Desist from alliance and fraternity with the 'Beast': break off the 'entente cordiale': admit not the Trojan horse of his friendship within your walls"! But we hear the old taunt singing in our ears—"Doth he not speak parables"!

CHAPTER XVII.

The seventeenth chapter upon which we now enter, as it has much directed, so will it greatly confirm the views we have set forth. This chapter professes to be a history of the judgment that shall shortly fall upon the Roman "whore." It begins by describing the Vision in which this history is concealed; but as the favoured seer was only confounded by the sight, an attendant angel adds an explanation, seeming at the same time almost to rebuke his dullness,—"Wherefore didst thou marvel?" (ver. 7.) As if he had said, "Wherefore—having seen the rise of this power from the sea, originating in the craft of the Dragon; and having observed its antichristian, half spiritual, half secular, constitution,—
therefore didst thou marvel at its present aspect, the natural result of its worldliness and impieties?"

St. John is to be imagined as walking the celestial halls, wherein, in living forms,—for all in heaven is life (vide Ezek. i. 20, where “the spirit of the living creature” is even in the “wheels”)—are set forth the agencies that shall arise, and the spiritual changes that shall ensue in this fallen world, in the course of the ever-raging conflict between the Lamb and the beast,—the legitimate king to whom all power is given, and him who by usurpation at present reigns. We should imagine to ourselves the groups emblematic of the opponent forces in the contest to confront (as it were) each other, as if the better to exhibit by contrast the opposite results to which they tend: for we find that the same angel who, in this chapter (ver. 1) invites to the sight of the “great whore,” does also, and in the same words, (ch. xxi. 9) invite to the sight of the “Bride the Lamb’s wife.” The first seven verses are as follows:

“(1.) And there came one of the seven angels which had the seven vials, and talked with me, saying unto me, Come hither; I will shew unto thee the judgment of the great whore that sitteth upon many waters: (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 the wilderness: and I saw a woman sit 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 colour, and decked with gold, and precious stones, and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication: (5.) And upon her forehead 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 admiration. (7.) And the angel said unto me, Wherefore didst thou marvel? I will tell thee the mystery of the woman, and of the beast that carrieth her, which hath the seven heads and ten horns.”

“Come hither,” says the angel (ver. 1). We have in these words a proof that the prophet moved onwards in the heavenly gallery,—a point of great importance; indeed, in these condensed descriptions, what is not so? Now St. John cannot surely be understood to have moved onwards in space
excepting figuratively: more truly—or at least with equal truth—he moved onwards in time. He was “carried away in the spirit into the wilderness” (ver. 3)—relieved therefore from the trammels of space:—but the place mentioned—the wilderness, if a particular wilderness, and still more so if not at that time a wilderness at all—must clearly be intended as an index of time. The question then first to be decided (in all visions the first) is, to what point of time, as signified by the place mentioned, was the prophet carried? The very wilderness referred to can, it is much to be believed, be identified and named: it was the Campagna of Rome—the wilderness nearest to the city which was the chief subject of the vision; in like manner as he had stood on the “sand of the sea” (Rev. xiii. 1) being the nearest spot to that great emblem of the nations. Now, this wilderness did not exist when St. John wrote. For the remarkable history of this wide and once fruitful tract being reduced by the inundations of the Tiber to eternal barrenness, towards the end of the sixth century—a judicial barrenness, as we believe, similar to that of ancient Babylon,—the reader is referred to Dr. Cumming (1st Ser. 435). But the point we contend for is almost self-evident—that if St John was carried away into a wilderness that did not exist in his day, he must have been removed in time rather than in space. There is no proof, nor likelihood—that we can see, that St. John had changed his position, since the time when he “stood upon the sand of the sea” (Rev. xiii. 1). In the following chapter “he looked, and lo! a Lamb”—as if making his observations from the same place: and in the remaining vision before the present one, the same remark holds good. On this account, the expression “Come hither” is of very great importance: yet, unless it be received as referring to time, the writer must say that, to his ears, it has a very unmeaning sound.

At what point of time shall we place the prophet? The angel that came to him (ver. 1) was one of the seven that had “the seven golden vials full of the wrath of God” (xv. 7). The angel had received his vial, but had not poured it out (conf. xv. 7 and xvii. 1):—this we infer from the contents of the 17th chapter, his own communication, having
relation (as it is reasonable to suppose was the case) to the contents of his vial; and from these contents being yet future. Indeed, that neither it nor any of the vials were yet poured out, is plain from the consideration that the interview of the Angel with St. John was in "Heaven" (Rev. xv. 1), from whence, when the vials were to be poured out, the angels were bid "go their ways" (ch. xvi. 1). Here then is something of a tangible nature:—the angels had received their vials, but had not gone their ways to pour them out. Now it is very generally believed by commentators, that these vials—the "last plagues" (xv. 1) had begun to be poured out at the French Revolution:—thus Mr. Frere says, (p. 110), "The period of the pouring out of these vials falls immediately after the occurrence of the French Revolution of 1792":—and Dr. Cumming says (p. 331) "The contents of the first vial were poured out at the French Revolution, 1789." We venture to dissent from these dates,—which indeed may be regarded as but one date; but have a full persuasion,—the vials being the "seven last plagues," and the last times being undoubtedly now come—that the French Revolution has its place among them.

The command to go their ways (xvi. 1) addressed to all the seven angels at once, intimates that they were sent forth together; and although this is not proof that they proceeded to fulfil their errands of misery simultaneously, but admits of a sequence in the inflictions, yet it prepares the mind for the testimony of history, to the effect that the plagues at least overlap each other, falling upon the doomed empire without strictly the observance of a measured order in time. History seems to say that, although poured out very much together, there is a period of greatest intensity separately assigned to each of them. There is a significant observation in the fourth vial (xvi. 9) which throws light upon this point, opening to view a reserved use of these plagues contingent on circumstances,—it says "the name of God hath power over these plagues." The name of God is Jesus Christ; and we understand from the passage that the Lord—whom "the winds and the sea obey," retains in His own hands the government of these plagues, moderating, withdrawing,
recommissioning them; and assigning to each, contingently, its duration, intensity, and range.

It can scarcely be doubted that the angel who "came" to St. John was the seventh angel, as it is said in the description of the seventh angel's plague (xvi. 19) that "Great Babylon came in remembrance before God," and it is on the fall of Babylon that the angel conferred with the prophet. And it will be our endeavour to shew, as none of the angels had hitherto left the court of heaven on their dread mission, that this conference must have taken place about the middle of the eighteenth century. To that point of time, then, let us imagine St. John to be bidden by the angel to "come hither" to him, to see the judgment upon the Roman adulteress.

The subject of the vials is scarcely within the scope of the present dissertation. At the same time having endeavoured to profit by their testimony—(which, so interlaced are all parts of prophecy, it was impossible to avoid doing) the writer finds it expedient to express an opinion upon them, be it with no further view than to shew where we stand among them at the present day: and this he proposes to do, under guidance in a certain sense—however differing from them—of approved commentaries now before the world.

It really is high time that the learned shall have come to some agreement on the preliminary question, whether the Apocalypse requires to be interpreted, generally, in a spiritual or a physical sense. We have no doubt that all historical books, profane as well as sacred, are intended by an all-ruling Providence to yield a spiritual instruction; but no one would venture to say that that was their primary purpose:—in like manner it is difficult to believe of the prophecies, (which are in fact foreshadowed history) that they claim to be regarded primarily in a spiritual sense—as a sort of "Pilgrim's Progress"; or that the symbols employed are to be viewed primarily in a spiritual, as opposed to a physical signification. On comparing the views of Dr. Wordsworth, who is of the spiritual school, with those of several contemporaries of almost equal celebrity, but who see things diffe-
rently, it is in almost every page we have to regret the disadvantage to the cause of prophetic truth arising out of these differences. A particular instance among the vials which has given occasion for these remarks, connected with the most important of them to the present generation, as will be shewn, the writer cannot refrain from adducing. The fourth vial is thus described (Rev. xvi. 8) "And the fourth angel poured out his vial upon the sun; and power was given unto him to scorch men with fire, &c." Upon this Dr. Wordsworth observes (p. 429)—(having premised in p. 424 that "this empire (of the beast) being spiritual, these symbols must all receive a spiritual interpretation")—he observes, "The Sun of the Church is Christ. Hence the faithful Church is said, in the Apocalypse, to be clothed with the sun. It was given to the Sun to scorch men, and they blasphemed God. To all who believe, Christ is the fountain of grace: but to all who disobey Him, He is a consuming fire." Now if this—which is but a small portion of a long and fascinating exposition—would consist with that physical view which we humbly think the vial primarily demands, we should receive the lesson it conveys with gladness:—but now let us listen to Dr. Cumming, who belongs to a school who regard the spiritual application of the text—not as beyond its purpose, certainly; but—of secondary consequence. The sun, with him, is Napoleon Buonaparte (p. 357), "the most complete creator and extinguisher of political suns and stars, that ever appeared in the history of Europe." On the words "scorched with great heat" he says, "The very name given to Napoleon by the soldiers was that of the king of fire"; . . . "he brought into the field of battle an amount of artillery which had never been done before." Thus it happens, in this field of uncontrolled speculation, that the same text may be made to fix our meditations upon the attributes of the Giver of life eternal, and those of the most terrible angel of death that ever appeared in human form—Napoleon Buonaparte.

But among those who take the same general view of these Vials, let us see how much of agreement subsists. The following are short heads of exposition by Dr. Cumming and Mr. Frere.
1st Vial (Rev. xvi. 2).

"And the first (angel) went and poured out his vial upon the earth; and there fell a noisome and grievous sore upon the men which had the mark of the beast, and upon them which worshipped his image."

By Dr. C.

"The 'noisome and grievous sore' is the corruption of morals arising from the writings of such men as Rousseau; still more from the immorality and licentiousness of the Papal clergy. . . . Infidelity and Popery combined spread their influence far and wide, till the nation broke out into this moral sore."

By Mr. F. Much the same.

2d Vial.

"And the second angel poured out his vial upon the sea; and it became as the blood of a dead man: and every living soul died in the sea."

By Dr. C. This Vial—

"has its action restricted to the maritime power, commerce, and colonies, of the great Papal countries which had them: . . . . which were blasted or destroyed at the pouring out of the second vial."

By Mr. F.

"The sea denotes a turbulent state of society. This vial includes the sufferings of Infidel France during the reign of terror, following quickly upon their state of triumphant blasphemy."

3d Vial.

"And the third angel poured out his vial upon the rivers and fountains of water; and they became blood, &c., &c."

By Dr. C.

"This vial is explained by a reference to the third Trumpet, and the sanguinary victories of Attila the Hun, on the Danube, and the Rhine, and the Po; which gives the same locality for the action of the vial; and denotes the suffering of the nations inhabiting these regions, as a righteous retribution for the blood of the saints they had shed; Providence making that terrific period the means of punishing the national sins of the contending parties."

By Mr. F.

"'The rivers and fountains of waters,' the fountains of spiritual life and sources of religious instruction, point to that great and polluted ecclesiastical fountain of all Christendom, the city of Rome and kingdom of Italy, upon which, accordingly, the third vial is poured out."

4th Vial (ver. 8).

"And the fourth angel poured out his vial upon the sun; and power
was given unto him to scorch men with fire. And men were scorched with great heat, and blasphemed the name of God, which hath power over these plagues: and they repented not to give Him glory."

By Dr. C.

"During this vial, extending from 1806 to 1818, the kings of Westphalia, Holland, Spain, and Naples, were made; and more kings were made and unmade than ever in the whole history of Christendom before. The French that conquered, and their foes that fell, suffered most terrible things. The conscription drained France of the finest of her youth—its very life-blood. To refuse was to be covered with a dress of infamy. After the Russian campaign, females in France were nearly three times the number of men."

By Mr. F. Nearly the same.

"The sun, signifying the principal potentate on the earth at the time being, can be no other than Napoleon Buonaparte."

By "Apocal. popularly explained" p. 38.—

"By the mention of the sun, we are given to know that monarchical power is reconstituted."

5th Vial.

"And the fifth angel poured out his vial upon the seat of the beast; and his kingdom was full of darkness; and they gnawed their tongues for pain. And blasphemed the God of heaven because of their pains and their sores, and repented not of their deeds."

By Dr. C.

"The beast is the head of the great Western apostacy. The 'seat' of the beast is at Rome, where he sits in the temple of God. The 4th vial closed its action at the battle of Wagram, and the second subjugation of Austria. Just at that period Napoleon issued his memorable decrees from Schönbrunn, abolishing at one fell swoop the temporal power of the Pope, and incorporating the Roman States as part and parcel of the French empire. That portion of the 17th chapter which describes the conduct of the kings of the Roman earth (i.e., the 'burning of the whore with fire') was fulfilled under the operation of the fifth vial. (p. 368)." "The Pope's final destruction, however, was not yet come. After Napoleon's fall evidence of this was too plainly presented, in as much as Popery was again recognised in France." Yet, "throughout Europe, the fierce ecclesiastical despotism that reigned over the nations is crippled as a civil power."

By Mr. F.

"The judgment now returns in all its severity upon the principal seat of the apostacy of the period of infidelity, the kingdom of France. The
sun of the last vial has disappeared, and the kingdom is full of darkness. The description of these verses is that of extreme endurance, and of continued blasphemos revolution against God. The capital of France occupied by armies of England, Russia, Austria, and Prussia; the restoration of the pillage of the time of their glory enforced, in addition to the abandonment of all their conquests,—the suffering of spirit which the proud nation must have endured under this infliction, can hardly be overrated.”

6th Vial (ver. 12).

“And the sixth angel poured out his vial upon the great river Euphrates; and the water thereof was dried up, that the way of the kings of the East might be prepared,” &c., &c.

By Dr. C. Referring this vial to the gradual extinction of the Ottoman power, the Doctor makes it commence in 1820, and end in 1865. He refers it also to the numerous events connected with the East,—the restoration of the Jews, &c.

By Mr. F. The same, excepting as to dates—the main thing.

7th Vial (ver. 17).

“And the seventh angel poured out his vial into the air: and there came a great voice out of the temple of heaven, from the throne, saying, It is done,” &c., &c.

By Dr. C.

“This vial is not poured out, like the others, upon definite localities, but upon the air, or the atmosphere we breathe. If not already pouring out, we are upon the verge of its being so: it trembles in the hand of the angel. The action will be universal.”

By Mr. F. The same.

The differences of view here observable, wherein the truth oscillates (we think) between the expositors,—demonstrate only that this divine book, as “a land where there is gold,” may be expected to yield its treasure if not abundantly to all, yet some to all, the gold-diggers of the day. We should be sorry to accept either of these schemes in all its points of difference to the exclusion of the other, seeing that the language of the prophecy is applicable, with indulgence, under either of them, to the events of the last hundred years. We venture in a few words to apply these “plagues” to History as follows.
(Rev. xvi.). The first angel "poured out his vial on the earth," the second "upon the sea," the third "upon the rivers and fountains of waters," the fourth "upon the sun," the fifth "upon the seat of the beast," the sixth "upon the great river Euphrates," the seventh "into the air." Now in these expressions, it is first to be remarked, that several of them are so obviously of a symbolical nature, that consistency requires we should deem them all to be so.

Between the "earth" and the "sea" of the first and second vials there is a contrast intended; and in determining in what it may consist, we must be guided by the contents of the two vials taken conjointly: in which view, they seem to point respectively to the Roman empire in a settled and harmonious state of its parts, and to the same empire when, by intestine wars, it was thrown into a state of confusion and trouble. The "noisome and grievous sore" of the first plague are the infidel and revolutionary doctrines set on foot by Voltaire and his deadly crew—D'Alembert, Frederick of Prussia, &c., in the middle of the last century, when the imperial "earth" was comparatively at rest; and which took possession first of the higher classes, producing a "corruption of morals" (as says Cumming above), and eating into the vitals of Christian principle. A sore is that which is kept out of sight; and a moral sore works its pestilential way most readily under the fair exterior of high life, to which the "earth" lifted up, as contrasted with the "sea"—the rude multitudes of mankind, may possibly likewise point. Also, it spreads itself clandestinely in secret societies, such as those of the Illuminées and Sophisters of Germany, the Freemasons of France, and other hidden fabricators of sedition, with which in that age all the countries of the Beast were infected; their single bond of union being a sworn secrecy, and their common object the subversion of every altar and every throne. Voltaire was in the zenith of his glory just in the middle of the last century, and died a quarter of a century later:—on which account it is that we have fixed on the middle of the century, as the spot of time to which St. John was bidden by the angel to "come hither" to him. Voltaire we believe to have been a distinguished prophetic
Sign in relation to the "sore" predicted, as much as was
John the Baptist in his day on another account: he was the
vial itself in the angel's hand, and the vial was continually
being poured out from A.D. 1750, at the latest, to 1775.
How it is possible, in the face of these historical facts, to say
that this vial was poured out in 1789, or later, we cannot
imagine. What happened in that age of deep suffering was the effect of long, latent, and deeply working causes—infi-
delity, with its sure attendants pride and self-indulgence,
which had been sapping the foundations of society for at least
half a century before; and it is this "noisome sore"—an
entirely spiritual and moral cause, working concealedly,
which is the whole burthen of the first vial.

The first vial, like the first commandment of the decal-
logue, comprehends in itself, as a pregnant cause, the sub-
stance of all that follow. As the ten commandments are
reducible into two tables, and these again into the one
general command to do all to God's glory,—to have no other
"gods"—no other rests on which the affections may dwell,
than God; so the vials all spring from the one root of bitter-
ness—forgetfulness of God, amounting even (which in no
earlier age it did) to a denial of His Holy Son. This pesti-
ential sore, or irritating scab driving to madness, is therefore
an enduring evil, affecting deeply the innermost constitution
of the Beast:—it is the abiding cause of, and hence compre-
hends in itself, the whole history of the remaining vials.
Thus it is said to have fallen on the "men which had the
mark of the Beast and them which worshipped his Image,"—
that is to say, it breaks out continuously throughout the two
distinct ages, and the two distinct portions of the world,
which constitute together, in time and space, the wide king-
dom of the Beast. The penetrating eye of prophecy fore-
saw, that not only would a first outpouring be effected on
the original Beast, but also that a second would be necessary
in the days of his Image; which terms are therefore taken
to denote two separate epochs of the blasphemous Beast—
one now past, the other approaching. Thus the first vial, in
the continuance of its cause, becomes the earnest of all the
miseries of the latter days: it is to be accounted as rife now as it was a hundred years ago, and will be the plague of men to the end of prophetic time.

The second angel (ver. 3) "poured out his vial upon the sea"—the upheaving, tumultuous surges of the people. The consequences were all the bloody scenes of the French revolution, and all the desolating and paralysing wars ("as the blood of a dead man") which they engendered; so that, throughout all the countries of the Beast, the sword was the only arbiter of differences: and law and order—the life of states, "died." This vial seems to be as comprehensive as the preceding: it began, of course, in a later age than it, but we can see no reason why it should not be as lasting, being the general effect of a general cause: the contrast of "earth" and "sea" impresses on the two vials a general parallelism. Let us not be deceived by the short lull in the storm of the last forty years.

The third, fourth, and fifth vials are more particular in their application. The third is poured "upon the rivers and fountains of water"—the constituted sources (as we interpret) of spiritual instruction—the Clergy and religious Establishments of the empire. The fountains of (living) water, which should be the pleasant resort of all classes, ministering every where to the joy and charm of life, "become blood": that is—Upon the priestly orders, as into a soul cistern, is poured the rancour of the people; among whom they become the objects of cruel treatment, spoliation, and penalties. We recognise in this vial the doom of a righteous retribution (vers. 6, 7), which, in preparing the cup of affliction for this sanguinary class, gives them "blood to drink":—i.e., not so much that their own blood should be shed, as that they should partake of the miseries resulting from their numerous former murders and persecutions. Hence have followed the confiscation of tithes, and ecclesiastical property of every kind, and in every country of the Beast; the indignities and deprivations to which the hierarchy have been subjected, including the imprisonment of the Pope towards the end of the last century; sufferings
which the text, in its correspondence with the language of Rev. xix. 2, seems to say, will be increased in times approaching.

The fourth and fifth vials, between which there is a very close relation, claim our very particular attention. The fourth is poured upon the "sun" (ver. 8). The celestial sun was created on the fourth day of creation,—that is, on the central, and so the chief, day of the whole material system; and he is thus regarded as shedding his vitalizing rays on all the dependent works around him, that come into being on the other days. Similar to this is the operation of the fourth vial. It is poured—and therein a plague is inflicted—upon the sun itself; but at the same time "power was given him (the sun) to scorch men with fire"; that is—as the centre of the system, to hurl forth his fiery rays, war, spoil, and devastation, into all surrounding nations. Who, or what, then, is this sun? Regarding the empire as a system, the sun, its centre, must be that part of it, whose power—as the source of all social influences, is the greatest, which is unquestionably France. This baneful luminary, in the age alluded to, instead of beneficent sent forth "scorching rays," not only destroying the physical strength, but extirpating all the substantial means of prosperity, of the countries lying adjacent to it: not only annihilating their armies, but burning up with its deadly heat all the other sinews of their power. It might be expected with reference to the sun—the centre of a system, that its times would be marked and well-defined; and we believe that no other than the fourth vial admits of its beginning and ending being so clearly determined. It is the imperial reign of Napoleon: it began in 1804 and terminated in 1814. It is not a little significant that the years of this solar reign were, in number, ten,—the one among numbers which will be found to hold symbolically the place of the Multiplier: i. e., (in the present instance) the parent source of the influences that pervade the system. Thus in the ten years of its scorching mission—i. e., during the wars of the French empire alone, it is computed that there fell in the countries of the Beast no less than six millions of men (Apoc. Popul. Expl. 51); and (in the words
above quoted of Dr. Cumming) "the French that conquered, and their foes that fell, suffered most terrible things."

It is much to be observed that, just at this point, we find the notice (ver. 9) that "the name of God hath power over these plagues." It is in good keeping, and in conformity with other sacred history, that when the "furnace" is hottest, the Son of Man—the Name of God—should be seen among his people (Dan. iii. 25):—and as among the "holy children" He was seen as the "fourth," so here He is seen in the midst of the fourth, or central plague,—in each case the Director and Controller of the fiery system. The "power" He is said to retain over these plagues it is but reasonable to infer (as being here mentioned) was in the epoch alluded to brought into exercise; especially as the reason for its exercise is added—"they repented not to give him glory": but more on this point presently.

The fifth vial, at first contemporaneous with the fourth, but reaching further forward into time, was poured "upon the seat of the Beast." A "seat" (throne) points to a fixed locality, and the higher powers presumed to be always there stationed. It is not at first apparent whether the word should be regarded in a literal or symbolical sense: but a reason has been given why the latter is to be preferred. In a literal sense Germany, and Vienna in particular, would be the throne; but figuratively viewed it is the seven-hilled City, the capital of the "holy" empire, the ancient sedes imperii—whether the Head reside there or no. It is however certain that the "seat" is of the "Beast"; and that the expression points to secular rule, even were the ruler the Pope of Rome. And when we call to mind that the Imperial Head and the Pope divided the secular rule between them, we shall not be surprised to find that the temporal calamities of the vial fell equally, and almost simultaneously, on both seats alike. It would not much matter, then, were we to regard Vienna as well as Rome as the "seat of the Beast,"—the less so, as it is immediately added as the effect of the outpouring, that "his kingdom was full of darkness"; which unquestionably embraces all the countries forming the Roman "kingdom," and therefore both Germany and Italy.
THE SEVEN VIALS.

"His kingdom was full of darkness," for the great luminaries of the government, both Imperial and Papal, were quenched. The emperor resigned the ancient crown of the empire, which had been worn for a thousand years, in 1806—two years after the rising of the sun; and in 1809 the Papal lights were extinguished by the expatriation of the Pope, and of the lesser luminaries—the Cardinals, the one to the palatial prison of Fontainebleau, the others to the different cities of France, to draw out their lives in obscurity and penury. "And they gnawed their tongues for pain." They—the multitudinous beast, by reason of the sharp bridle of military tyranny which was fastened upon them, had to champ the iron and gnash the teeth, in the exchange from a sacro-secular rule to the dominion of "darkness" and atheism. They "blasphemed the God of heaven because of their pains and their sores, and repented not of their deeds" (ver. 11). These words continue the history of the vial beyond its contemporaneous flow with the one preceding:—they apply faithfully to the Papal and other states of the Beast after the fall of Napoleon, in the heedlessness they manifested of their late experiences, so soon as the hand of chastisement was withdrawn, and the scorching sun had descended into the abyss,—in complaining of their "pains and sores" as though they had been the results of other causes than the Divine visitation, and so in returning to their old "deeds." The deeds referred to are, of course, those of the old days,—the persecution and banishment of Protestant communities; the prohibition of religious discussion, and proscription of the word of Truth; not to forget the return to holy rags and relics, to holy coats of Trêves and cottages of Loretto, and all the other abominations by which the religion of the Gospel is still disgraced,—deeds to be requited by a recurrence of the times of violence, rapine, and oppression.

This vial commences (we see) within a couple of years of the one preceding—if at Vienna: but more truly it commences within five years—i.e., in 1809 (the vial being poured upon the seat of the beast—Rome), in the annexation of the Roman states to the empire by the decrees of Schönbrunn,
Rome being declared its second city—Paris its first. Hereby were abolished Rome’s ancient metropolitan claims and temporal independence. But thus commencing, the vial must be regarded as continuing very considerably beyond the fourth vial:—how far, will be a question to engage us presently. Mention is made that repentance did not follow the infliction of this plague,—a circumstance which determines a strong connexion between it and the preceding one, as in these only is this feature foreshewn. These notices of irrepentance will require to be further examined.

The sixth vial (ver. 12), which is poured out upon “the great river Euphrates,” is entirely a vial of preparation, the end being, that “a way for the kings of the East”—the British power (vid. “Kings of the East”) “may be prepared.” So soon as the Turkish nation and the Mahometan creed shall be sufficiently dried up, “three unclean spirits” will go forth (ver. 13) “out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet,” “unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them (still preparation) to the battle of the great day of God Almighty.” The earth is here put in contrast with the whole world; and we should receive the two expressions together, as denoting an extension of the figure “the beast and his image”; and as signifying the Roman empire (Beast and Image) together with a multitude of outlying nations beyond its boundaries. This vial, history being our informant, has been slightly in operation even from the commencement of the vials. Pestilence has been the chief means of the predicted drying; and this vial consequently has not participated in a certain lull which, during the last forty years, has arrested the course of the others: on the contrary, the calm has been found to favour the process of the evaporation. This state of tranquillity is in fact the state of intensity of this vial. When the Indo-British forces shall move westward, to take part in the great controversy in the Holy Land, it will be a sign that the evil spirits are at work, or be the immediate cause to call them forth; and we shall be assured that the “great day of God Almighty” is at hand. It will be our business to shew in a future vision
that the *beast* and the *false prophet* from whom two out of
the three evil spirits proceed, are, in a personal sense, the
French Head of the empire (the headship being transferred
to France), and the Roman pontiff; the spirit of the *dragon*,
the *first named*, being infused into them. The apostrophe
(VER. 15) "blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his
garments"—i. e., preserves the purity of his Christian faith,
seems to promise that some blessed land shall be found (may
it be our own!) which shall happily fail to be drawn within
the whirlpool of the all-encompassing calamities at that time
approaching.

The seventh angel "pours out his vial into the air." The
pure air typifies (we presume) the heavenly doctrine and
hope, in which the soul finds its life and well-being. The
wrath of God is poured into the air, to mingle with the im-
pure and poisonous ingredients introduced into it by the evil
spirits of the preceding vial;—to mingle (we say) on the one
hand with the deistical neology and sophistry, withering as
firestone to the tender roots of Christian truth; and on the
other hand, with the bigotry and superstition of Rome,
which, despite of Providential warnings, have been increasing
during the last forty years. In the first place, it is a *physical*
effect that follows, viz., the new diseases of cholera and
blight, so appropriately typical of the noxious speculations
which are gathering like dirty fungi within the Church;
while also the wide extension of the pestilence is a sign, and
perhaps a measure, of the wide prevalence of the spiritual
evil. The angel first held out this sign of his near approach
in the year 1831—the first year of the cholera. He had
lighted, in descending from the sky, on the banks of the
Ganges in the year 1817, and had taken fourteen years
to wend his way across the Asiatic continent,—a pledge,
perhaps, of the long-suffering of Him who "hath power over
these plagues." The deleterious quality imparted to the
natural air, so expressive of the blighting deistical doctrines
introduced into the spiritual atmosphere, is mentioned in but
few words (vid. the text), being intended, doubtless, as
a slight material sign, to warn the nations of the evil days
approaching,—of the thunders and lightnings, the earth-
quakes, the rending of the nations, the tripartite division of the Roman earth, the last wrath upon Babylon, and the Northern hail. "It is done" (ver. 17), i.e., all preparations are made, all needful signs given; the day of long-suffering is past; the nations must be gathered as they are to the scene of the last controversy, whether to assist in inflicting the judgment, or to abide the storm. The frequent returns of these diseases show the actual nearness of the angel; while in all likelihood the vast regions that have tasted of these droppings of the vial, are likewise those which are destined to take part in its more signal desolations.

In the endeavour to approximate to the spot of time in the course of the vials which the present day may occupy, the following remarks—offered with considerable diffidence—may yet be useful for others to improve upon. It has been seen that the infliction of these plagues is made contingent on circumstances, under the will of Him who retains "power over" them. Now it is said in the verses of the fourth and fifth vials (and in those only—be it particularly observed) that they—the sufferers "repented not": repentance then would have called into exercise the "power," and have at least modified the infliction. Repentance is clearly the object of the vials; and as this has not followed hitherto upon their outpouring, to the effect of taming the obdurate Beast; and as moreover they are yet in an unfulfilled condition (for in them is filled up the wrath of God (Rev. xv. 1), and we know and feel (1855) that this is not yet done), it is a necessary consequence that they are still impending, and ready to assert a more complete fulfilment. If God expects repentance, He will give time for repentance,—a sacred axiom which, when taken in connexion with the facts cited—that Christ hath "power over" these plagues, and that the sufferers repented not when they might have done so, makes it more than probable that there was in the original economy of the vials some marked period of cessation, during which repentance might have obviated the necessity of a renewal of them. Where in the scheme of the vials shall we discover this period?—where in History?

Let us speak of History first. There has been an almost
entire cessation of the principal vials,—certainly of the fourth and fifth, during the last forty years. Forty years is a very significant measure of time, as all readers of the Bible know. And the writer ventures to put forth the suggestion, that these forty years, dating from A.D. 1812—14, as regards the sun and the fourth vial, and 1808—9 as regards the "seat of the beast" and the fifth vial, do really constitute the historical period we seek. Counting from 1808—the decrees of Schœnbrunn (the first subversion, or threat of subversion, of Rome's temporal power)—forty years bring us to 1848—49—the year of its complete annihilation, when the "seat of the beast" was taken possession of by foreign troops, and its temporal power overthrown. Counting from 1812 for the sun and the empire, it happens that there elapsed just forty years between the edge of the sword first meeting the neck of the doomed Beast on the snows of Russia, and his rising again to imperial life and power. Counting from 1814 when the imperial sun was quenched in its orbit, we find that at the end of just forty years (1854) the Solar Eagle was to be seen again hovering over the battle field. In a prophecy such as this of the vials, which does not seem to affect precision of date, there is really more of latent precision in the occurrence of these events, than one might have expected to find.

Let us now turn to the scheme and construction of the prophecy,—it will require some patient reflection. Let us to this end consider the wording of the two notices of irrepentance on the part of the Beast. In the fourth vial (ver. 9) it is said, "men blasphemed the name of God which hath power over these plagues, and they repented not to give Him glory." In the fifth (ver. 11), "they blasphemed the God of heaven because of their pains and their sores, and repented not of their deeds." Now we should be sorry to be thought to look about cunningly, for the best means of introducing a preconceived opinion; but under the impression that every touch is significant in these pictorial writings, we profess to see a great and instructive difference in the manner in which, on these two occasions, the irrepentance is declared. To give glory to God in an act of repentance, is that which
is done when, the opportunity of offence no longer remaining, a simple and open confession is made,—as in the case of Achan (Jos. vii. 19); and as every malefactor is invited to do, previous to the irretrievable infliction of the last penalty of the law:—it follows that the first terms employed to declare the irrepentance of men—“they repented not to give him glory,” involve the declaration that the opportunity of further action was cut short,—that condign punishment was to be immediate,—that the Beast was fully brought into the slaughter house to be slain (Rev. xiii. 3), as was done at the close of the fourth vial in 1814. In contrast with this it is said in the fifth vial, “they repented not of their deeds.” Now this can only be said of a party, when the opportunity of action is continued or renewed. It would be unnatural to assert of a culprit, when brought to the gallows, that “he repented not of his deeds.” But if after punishment, unsoftened by sufferings, he should pursue his old career, the expression would be in exact keeping with his case. To repent of one’s former deeds is practical repentance, as opposed to the submission of a confessing faith, in which alone repentance can be manifested when time fails,—when the axe is uplifted for the “deadly wound.” We believe then, that the first description given of the irrepentance of men intimates the close of probation—the imminence of overwhelming punishment. Also that in the second case, the failure to “repent of their deeds” is evidence that a day of grace had been given—that probation had been prolonged; and further, that a bad use was being made of the Divine forbearance:—a condition of things which would be exhibited in symbol by a prolongation, but under temporary restraint, of the fifth vial. This is a remarkable instance of the nice wording of Prophecy: it serves sufficiently (we repeat) however slanderly, to shew, that while the fourth vial is brought to a sudden termination in 1814 in Napoleon’s hopeless overthrow—i. e., as Head of the Roman empire (which, in 1815 he failed to become)—the fifth, its contemporary up to A. D. 1814, is only stayed, under the forbearance of Him who thus exercises His restraining “power.” But if only “stayed,” where shall we look for its renewed pro-
gression? Of this presently. Observe that this arrest of the fifth vial is equivalent to a division in the general flow of the wrathful stream, analogous to that at the Red Sea; wherein, as then, the constituted Church are invited to strike into a path of safety. And now we would ask—on what other possible account than to introduce a prolongation under temporary cessation of the fifth vial; as well as to set forth the patience of God towards the Roman Church—if haply it might be induced to turn into the paths of the Gospel; can the distinction we have pointed out have been taken in the two cases, in the wording of an hypothetical repentance? And why otherwise, in these two vials only, is mention made of repentance, and under circumstances to shew that in one only of them it could stay, and might have stayed the arm of the Lord, who retains power over these plagues?

The writer would wish to observe, in passing, that he has no doubt a difference of offence is described in the two collateral expressions of these vials—"they blasphemed the name of God," and, "they blasphemed the God of heaven"; but it is not in his power to point it out.

Now, under the presumption that the exposition is correct which gives to the two vials—upon the sun, and upon the seat of the beast, respectively—a contemporaneous flow of some years, History adds her further testimony, that they offer in this their united state a complete picture, not only of the continental sufferings of the late revolutionary war, but also of its issues. If the sun was absolutely quenched, and its imperial dynasty overthrown—a day of the Divine patience having been denied, we may observe that, at the same epoch, a day of repentance was extended to the "seat of the beast," by the reconstitution of its temporal power and dignity. The true historical elucidation of these diverse results of irrepentence, are the decisions of the Congress of Vienna:—the discomfited Head of the Roman empire was hopelessly exiled to a distant island, and the whole sun brought in subjection to a government effete and unnatural—a "strangling yoke"; while in the seat of the beast, inclusive of all the capitals of his "kingdom," the ancient rule was resumed, and nothing was lost of dignity in the great
struggle but the imperial title; which also was seemingly placed in abeyance. But now, as we learn that the fifth vial is only restrained for a time—arrested in its career of judgment, and its times extended during the forty years from 1814 into a season of Divine forbearance (which season is otherwise to be accounted the times of the sixth vial—the vial of preparation, of which it has proved the period of greatest intensity)—and as in the nature of things after the sixth comes the seventh; we may infer that the “seventh vial” will either be, or will contain within its own proper substance, the renewal of the fifth vial. It is thus we arrive at the meaning of an important clause of the seventh vial, which says, that “great Babylon came in remembrance before God” (ver. 19). “Came in remembrance”! The words contain the plain intimation, that the fifth and seventh vials are one. God calls to mind that the judgment of a preceding vial upon Rome (the “seat of the beast”) is unfulfilled;—that there is a “remainder of wrath” reserved, for great Babylon’s final and everlasting portion.

The reader will not fail to have observed the parallelism we have assumed to exist, in character and in time, between this interregnum of mercy—the arrest of the fifth vial, and the period between the infliction and the healing of the “deadly wound” in chap. xiii. If we are right in supposing the “deadly wound” to be the fall of Napoleon, and the revival of the beast the restoration of the empire in Louis Napoleon—giving an interregnum of forty years of peace; and if, further, the seven vials commence their outpouring at an earlier epoch than that of Napoleon, and will continue their plagues to the end of prophetic time; it is clear that this interregnum of peace must be included in their times, whether expressed or no. Furthermore, the “wound” of the beast is the peace of the empire—that is certain; and any intimation we may search for of a corresponding break in the malignant history of the vials, must be of a nature to express this peace, or cessation of the bestial reign. We believe then that the infliction on the sun under judicial irrepentance in 1812—14, is equivalent, in symbolism, to the stroke of the “deadly wound”; and that the exercise of the Divine
patience, and arrest of judgment, in favour of the "seat of the beast" and the Roman church and government for its own forty years (ending in 1848—49)—i.e., during the days of the sixth vial of pause and preparation; which pause itself terminates in the resumption of the fifth vial in the flow of the seventh,—is responsive in time to the prevalence, and subsequent "healing," of the wound. Thus the "deadly wound" of chap. xiii. receives a considerable further elucidation, i.e., with regard to its continuance, and above all its purpose. And as the "healing of the wound" thus determines the period when the arrest is taken off from the stream of the vials, it may be expected that their malignant influences will recommence (indeed, have they not already (1855) recommenced?) in the outpouring of the seventh vial. It is then in the commencing days of the seventh vial (Rev. xvi. 18, et seq.)—that now we stand.

Looking at these vials as a series of seven, we should desire to find in its construction the same feature that so often has been seen in the several prophetic series,—that of the seven consisting of four and three distinctively; as if the prophetic spirit had in view to exhibit everywhere a sure and uniform stamp of system and design. May we not discern this mark in the coincidence of time, and even of material, between the fourth and fifth vials, whereby, when consubisting, they appear as if spliced together; and as if intended in this their own union to unite the four first and three last of the series?

The measure of forty years that we have ventured to apply to the Divine patience, is without any other warrant than what is supplied by the frequent recurrence of that measure in Scripture,—under the sanction, however, of late history. These years of tranquillity—this space for repentance—past, it is to be expected that the deluge of wrath to be poured upon the Papal "kingdom" will fulfil (not, "has fulfilled," as says Dr. Cumming above) the judicial decrees of the seventeenth chapter. To that chapter we now return, after our long digression.*

* It is a common belief that the seven vials spring out of the seventh trumpet:—thus Mr. Elliott says, "There were to be seven trumpets.
It is then, undoubtedly, the angel of the seventh vial who, with the words of the plague on his lips, came to St. John; and we behold them standing together in the middle of the last century.

In the midst of the desolation surrounding the "ever living"—ever lifeless city, the prophet saw "a woman sit upon a scarlet coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns. And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand, full of abominations, and filthiness of her fornication" (ver. 3, 4). This "woman"—the symbol being taken from humanity—has a spiritual sense; it signifies the Roman Church; as does the beast she bestrides the empire. There is no necessity to do more than allude to the well-known exterior adornment of this church, in explanation of "the gold, and precious stones, and pearls," here adduced in evidence of her carnal-mindedness and lust of worldly distinction: nor in explanation of the "cup of her abominations" is it necessary to dilate upon the deleterious draughts of will-worship and works of merit, which she ordains for the spiritual refreshment of the soul: nor any otherwise to unfold the "filthiness of her fornication" than by referring to the exceedingly gross and abandoned manner in which she surrenders herself to the joys of her idolatry (ver. 4): nor to say more of her superscription of "Mystery," than that it denotes her mystery of sin,—Satan impersonated in her

sounded, and under the seventh trumpet seven vials poured out" (i. 193).

Of this easy theory we accept only the obvious inference it leads to, that, in order to determine satisfactorily the commencement of the vials, it is necessary to be assured beforehand of at least the general times of the seventh trumpet;—a question which will occupy a future page of this book. This theory has its rise, we presume, in a supposed constructive resemblance, which requires that the vials should spring out of the seventh trumpet, in like manner as the seven trumpets spring, apparently, out of the seventh seal (Rev. viii. 1, 2). The position we assign in time to the "seventh trumpet" dissent entirely from this proposition; for it places the vials for the most part in the times of the sixth trumpet,—though continuing their desolating flow, especially of the three last, into the times of the triumphant seventh.
spiritual head (Rev. xiii. 2), in contrast with the mystery of godliness—God manifest in the flesh. We confine our attention to the entire figure of this woman "drunken with the blood of saints and martyrs" (ver. 6); respecting which last characteristic also we need to add nothing in confirmation.

This female is the Church of Rome in her territorial extent. In verse 18 she is called "that great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth"; i. e., whose secular power, or power in secular concerns, domineers over kings—the rightful temporal lords; for a "city" has reference to civil authority,—a point which was illustrated in a previous page, by a reference to the builders of Babel, who built "a city and a tower"—the "tower" having for its object their spiritual, and the "city" their temporal supremacy:—to the like effect, a plain distinction is observable in Rev. xvi. 19, between the words City and Babylon. "And the great city was divided into three parts; . . . . and great Babylon came in remembrance before God;" where, of the two words placed in contrast, Babylon carries assuredly the most spiritual, and City the most secular signification. Of the term "beast" in the vision, we are to conceive—though it always bears a territorial allusion, yet, in action—that it represents the governments generally of the countries composing the "beast," or the sovereign Head in particular. The woman sitting on this beast may be viewed either as holding the reins and the mastery, or—being drunken, as requiring the support of the animal she rides:—it would be more correct, perhaps, to say (as the figure is evidently one of long development—"full of abominations"), that it exhibits both these conditions in union.

The woman is arrayed in imperial purple, as well as regal scarlet (ver. 4); the beast only in regal scarlet (ver. 3), denoting the more exalted station and higher rule of the woman:—and this may remind us of the Dragon (the Pope) (Rev. xiii. 2) being the source of authority, and obtaining (ib. 4) a more exalted worship than the Beast. The "names of blasphemy," and the "seven heads and ten horns," will be better understood when the friendly angel
puts us in the right way to decipher them. Taken as a whole, the image commends itself as exquisitely descriptive of the idea it was intended to convey—that of the mixed tyrannical power, two-thirds ecclesiastical, proud, and sensual, and one-third civil and slavish, which domineered for so many ages over the Christian world. Well might John wonder with great admiration!

It is an evidence of the vast intellectual perception of the attendant angel, that from this image, provided no doubt for the exercise of heavenly faculties, he was able to read off at once the general outline of the history it portrayed. The angelic explanation commences at the seventh verse; and it is the opinion of the writer that it terminates at the fourteenth. This new speculation the reader will of course receive with discretion.

The seventh verse begins thus, "And the angel said unto me." What the angel said occupies the chapter (we repeat), without intermission, until the end of the fourteenth verse; when there is obviously a discontinuance of the narrative; and where the explanation as at first intended seems substantially to end. The fifteenth verse thus commences, "And he saith unto me,"—a responsive note to the "said unto me" of the seventh verse: the words express a resumption of the interpretation; and we consider what the angel then said, and from thence to the end of the chapter, to contain—in answer, apparently, to questions put to him—further elucidations of the subject he had otherwise brought to a close. Certain points appear not to have been clearly apprehended at first by St. John; and to these the additional verses have relation. In this view, they correspond with the verses 19 and forward, of the seventh chapter of Daniel; where it may be seen that the heavenly informant had already, in the two preceding verses (17 and 18) propounded as much as seemed to him requisite; but was induced, at the solicitation of the prophet, to add more. If the chapter before us be thus divided, and the first interpretation understood as ending with the fourteenth verse, the result will be, that this first portion announces at its close the victory of Christ and His saints—the "called, and chosen, and faithful," in like manner
as Daniel declares of the same, that they shall "possess the kingdom" (Dan. vii. 18).

There are three points spoken to in the verses which we suppose supplementary (15 to 18)—the "waters," the "doings of the ten horns," and the "woman." The "waters" it is natural should be first inquired into, having received no positive notice in the first exposition of the angel. With respect to the other two, they will serve by and bye—as most likely they did when first propounded—to throw light on the obscure points they relate to of the angel's communication. If we consider the first explanation of the angel (ver. 7 to 14) to be complete in itself, it would be represented numerically by the number "four"; and it is the opinion of the writer, amounting almost to conviction, that the three points referred to are contrived, and added as supplemental to the number "four," so as to make up the number "seven," as in so many cases we have observed.

Let us now consider in detail the explanation first offered by the Angel. It runs thus—

"And the angel said unto me, wherefore didst thou marvel? I will tell thee the mystery of the woman, and of the beast that carrieth her, which hath the seven heads and ten horns (ver. 7). The beast that thou sawest was and is not; and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit, and go into perdition:—and they that dwell on the earth shall wonder, whose names were not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world, when they behold the beast that was, and is not, and yet is (ver. 8). And here is the mind that hath wisdom. The seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth (ver. 9). And there are seven kings: five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come; and when he cometh, he must continue a short space (ver. 10). And the beast that was, and is not, even he is the eighth, and is of the seven, and goeth into perdition (ver. 11). And the ten horns which thou sawest are ten kings, which have received no kingdom as yet; but receive power as kings one hour with the beast (ver. 12). These have one mind, and shall give their power and strength unto the beast (ver. 13). These shall make war with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them: for He is Lord of lords, and King of kings: and they that are with him are called, and chosen, and faithful" (ver. 14).

The beast with seven heads and ten horns (we are to remember) had his scriptural origin in the time of Daniel; by whom the symbol is introduced under the semblance of
four beasts. By converting the four beasts into one, we
earn that the early life of the beast is brought forward
unchanged in character into his more advanced years. The
heads by which his years are counted drop off; but the
Beast lives as long as a head remains; as is expressed in
Dan. vii. 12, "As concerning the rest of the beasts, they had
their dominion taken away; yet their lives were prolonged
for a season and time";—that is to say—though losing sepa-
rately their ascendancy and headship, yet "a prolonging in
life was given them" (vid. margin). Of the fourth beast only
in Daniel it is said that "it had ten horns"—which have
been explained as more especially the ten horns of Napoleon.
But it has also been explained that, in reading of "a beast
with seven heads and ten horns" whose life, measured by
seven heads, extends over twenty-three or four centuries, it
would be incorrigible dulness not to be conscious of the
extravagance of a symbolism which should assign the "ten
horns"—so large a portion of the whole symbol—to one
Head only, and that for a space of only ten or a dozen years.
Accordingly, sufficient reasons have been given (as we trust)
for believing rather that the ten (many) horns have grown on
every one of the heads, and been a charactistic feature of
the Beast, from his first appearing on the stage of time. It
will be found that the "ten horns" of Daniel's fourth king-
dom, are mentioned in the verses under examination, not
only in the same stage, or stages, of their existence as in
Daniel, but also in a subsequent stage. But let us take the
prophetic notices as they occur.

"The beast that thou sawest was, and is not; and shall
ascend out of the bottomless pit, and go into perdition" (ver.
8); and in the latter part of the verse it is added, that
he "was, and is not, and yet is." This last very singular
expression seems to involve a contradiction; but we hope to
shew that it is not so, nor otherwise than a strictly logical
statement. Those who advocate the application of this verse
to our own immediate times, are beguiled by the very appro-
priate account the words seem to give of the disappearance of
the great Napoleon, and his reappearance in him who is his
true successor, Louis Napoleon. He "was" (say they) in all
his glory; he "is not," because passed away; and "yet is," for his spirit still animates the beast, and reascends to power in his rightful heir. But let us examine this scheme attentively as set forth in the following extracts from Mr. Frere's "Brief Interpretation of the Apocalypse, 1850." "The beast that was, and is not—an enigma partly fulfilled in Napoleon; the rising of the beast an awful manifestation of infidelity" (p. 125). Now to this we reply in the more complete words of the text—"The beast that thou sawest was, and is not": the angel appeals to what John saw; and when John saw the beast, he was bestridden by a drunken, glittering harlot. But when was Napoleon ever ridden in the manner thus seen in the vision? From the beginning to the end of his career, he was a persecutor of the Roman Church, and especially of her dignitaries. His hard treatment of the Pope, as Talleyrand said to Lord Holland, when conversing on the generally excellent judgment of the emperor, "was one of two great faults in judgment which he committed." It cannot be said with the least semblance of truth, either that Napoleon was at any time ridden—in the sense of being directed, by the "whore"; or that he lent her his friendly support. The beast who "was, and is not" is, then, not Napoleon.

But let us continue the extracts. "When the angel says of the 'Beast,' or infidel Antichrist, in his future last manifestation as the 'eighth head' (ver. 11), that he formerly 'was,' he must necessarily refer to Antichrist in his first manifestation, . . . in one individual, . . . the person of Napoleon the Great." Again, "when the angel says 'he is not,' or for a time shall cease to be, we cannot but refer the expression to the disappearance of the character in the person of Napoleon Buonaparte." Thirdly—"when it is farther stated by the angel that he 'yet is,' we can assign no other possible meaning to the words than that the character shall reappear in the person of some other individual, who, being the eighth and last Head of the Western Roman empire, shall aptly represent the deceased emperor Napoleon the Great" (p. 129). These observations are really most remarkable, when it is considered that they were first printed in A.D. 1833, and when examined under the
light of recent events:—the writer is much beholden to them (as he has stated in his Address)—having by them entirely been led to the discovery of the name of the Beast. We have however on all points objections to make.

With regard to the first point "he was," we object to the expression, "Antichrist in his first manifestation," as if there were more than one occasion of his appearing. This is a different idea, and more difficult to receive, than that of a Papal succession of Antichrists. Antichrist, as we hold, is either an individual, or a long succession of functionaries; or both united, if he be the "man of sin." But if we put aside this notion of a "first" manifestation of Antichrist (i.e., out of two), no reason remains why the beast that "was,"—who became the "eighth head," but "of the seven" (ver. 11)—might not just as well have been, in his first manifestation, the first Head, or the sixth Head, as the seventh; and one of these at least we shall find him to have been. As to the second point, when the angel says he "is not," we refer the expression of course to the "disappearance" for the time being, of the character, of whom it had been previously said "he was"; and this (we have shewn) was not Napoleon Buonaparte. Thirdly, when it is farther stated that he "yet is" we do not mean that the character "shall reappear," but that he really "is," even at the very time that he "is not."

There remains the following considerable objection to be stated. In the text we read, "The beast ... was, and is not, and shall ascend" (ver. 8). Now if the beast that "was and is not" be Napoleon, of course the one that ascends is Louis Napoleon; and it is said of him that "he shall go into perdition." Again it is said (ver. 11) of the same beast that "was and is not" that, as "the eighth," (i.e., L. Napoleon) he "goeth into perdition." So that the one individual, L. Napoleon, according to this scheme, is doubly doomed to perdition, and without any variety in the words of the sentence. Now of course we cannot prove that the angel would at all times avoid a repetition of this sort; but the idea is so exceedingly opposed to the condensed character both of the narrative and the symbolism of this book, that we cannot for
a moment entertain it:—an interpretation that would make the same individual or power in both texts—texts so near together—the subject of their separate denunciations, is (we humbly think) at once to be rejected.

On the 9th and 10th verses our author writes, "The city of Rome, in classical language denominated the seven-hilled, is here clearly pointed out as the city of the mystic Babylon." Again, "As the city of Rome was built on seven hills, so also six distinct forms of sovereignty had been assigned to it in the days of the Apostle, and a seventh was foretold,—Kings, Consuls, Decemvirs, Tribunes, &c.; ... and the Imperial was that of which the angel says 'and one is.' This sixth head was wounded for a period unto death by the sword of the barbarians when Augustulus was defeated; and was restored in the person of Charlemagne." "The seventh headship began to be formed when, in 1809, Napoleon united the city of Rome to his empire, ordaining that in rank it should be second only to Paris. ... And the headship may be considered as completed when, in 1811, he gave to his newborn son the title of 'King of Rome.' This headship, according to the words of the prophecy, continued but a "short space." On the 11th verse he says "Napoleon's reign, forming the seventh head, has ceased; he has continued a 'short space,' and the present point of history lies between him, and the appearance or recognition of the eighth and infidel head, in whom he is apparently to reappear" (p. 180-1). In the ultimate conclusion this Gentleman arrives at—that the "eighth head" will be the successor of Buonaparte in the Roman empire, and that he is the predicted "man of sin," we most cordially concur; but his means of getting at the fact, we do not hesitate to say, will not stand a moment's examination. To minds in an expectant state as regards the approach of the "last days," and of that fearful character by whose rising they will be introduced, the very numerous signs around us will have permitted of a long season but little doubt of their being near at hand; and a strong expectation makes us active in overlapping difficulties. Let us examine the above exposition—it amounts to what follows:—
The angel is so anxious it should be known that "Babylon" is Rome (as if that were not sufficiently seen from the last verse of the chapter)—that he describes the city pointed at as seven-hilled. And further, lest there should be so great a decline of classical learning in after ages, as that this distinction should be forgotten, he points to still another mark of the city, viz., that it should have seven forms of government. Even to this day these seven forms are problematical in the extreme, and from being counted differently by different learned persons, are totally unworthy of trust. What, for instance, are we to think of the "sixth head," as hereby expounded, commencing with Augustus Caesar, and ending with the resignation of the Germanic crown in A.D. 1806; as compared with "the seventh," which (in the above words) "began to be formed when, in 1806, Napoleon united the city of Rome to his empire, . . . and was completed when, in 1811, he gave to his new-born son the title of 'King of Rome'"? But what form prevailed between the years 1806, and 1809?—for that there was some form is granted in the very nature of the position assumed:—and thus the "seventh" head becomes an "eighth," and the "eighth" a "ninth." Also, how can it be said that this "kingship" of the young King of Rome was an additional form of government, when the very first of the forms cited is that of "kings"? This enigma is ushered in with the words "Here is the mind that hath wisdom":—now we say (we hope without irreverence) that if the above be the sum total of the secret intended,—if to describe the site of Rome as a school-boy would describe it, and employ three different methods in the course of eighteen verses of placing the "eternal city" before the imagination of the reader, be the full account of the mystery these verses contain, they might as well have been introduced with somewhat less of pomp; for though it be expected (people say) that there will be soon a decline of classical education in the eager age we live in, our schools will scarcely fail to teach the facts, as facts, that are here alluded to. The interpretation we have now to offer, whatever its pretension, will be found at least to be strictly in unison with all that has been before set forth:—it is indeed an
essential requisite of interpretation, that every separate scene
be found to harmonize in an united view of the whole, and
lend its aid to the completion of a single system.

St. John was left in company with the angel of the seventh
vial, whose commission had a direct reference to "great
Babylon" (xvi. 9); and the words of the angel would
naturally have reference, in the main, to the future times of
his own vial. We may presume that the astounding figure
placed before him, which was a figure of the Roman empire
under its sacro-secular government, was intended to portray
the state it was then in—ripe for judgment, and the vial of
judgment ready; and we have shewn this period to have been
towards the middle (or perhaps so late as the year 75) of
the last century. The beast we are told (ver. 3) was "full
of names of blasphemy,"—that is, of usurpations on the
supreme dignity and mild rule of the Saviour, manifested
especially in unholy restraints on the consciences of men (for
the carrying into effect these abominations was, we are to
remember, the work of the secular beast)—thus prostituting
to the cause of evil the power God had placed in his hands
for His own ends—the protection and free circulation of His
truth, the great object of the institution of human govern-
ment. These blasphemies had been accumulating for nigh
a thousand years—ever since the beast "rose out of the sea"
(Rev. xiii. 1); and we learn from the expression of "fulness,"
that he was not called to judgment until his iniquities "were
at the full." Now this beast is spoken of as an old acquaint-
ance of St. John; for the Angel proposes (ver. 7) to tell the
history of the beast "which hath the seven heads, and the ten
horns" (vide the Greek)—referring, it appears, to an earlier
knowledge of him; and that must have been on "the sand of
the sea." Nothing then is more natural than that the angel
should wish, in the first instance, to explain the time of life,
and the genealogical progress of the beast, in reference to the
change that had in these matters supervened, since the
prophet "stood on the sand" in the day of Charlemagne.

If then we prolong a little his words, we may imagine him to
say, "Wherefore didst thou marvel, I will tell thee the history
of this hideous compound figure: but first, as I have made
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thee leave the seashore and come up hither, I must explain the beast with reference to this change of position. "The beast that thou sawest was, and is not, and yet is":—he was in the sea scene as Charlemagne—this very same beast: he is not;—i. e., scarcely preserves his identity, so greatly is he changed in magnitude and character: and yet is, for he still holds his place in the same abiding kingdom. The reader will not fail to call to mind the territorial losses that occurred to the empire of Charlemagne, so illustrative of the words "is not,"—that at his first rising he was possessed of all his natural limbs, not excepting France—(his fore-paw as it were)—the chief weapon of his might; and was seen at once in the plenitude and perfection of his being, on receiving from the "dragon" his "power and great authority" (Rev. xiii. 2); but that in later ages he had lost much of his substantial being—whole nations having been torn from off him; whereby also he had been much reduced in dignity. We may suppose the angel to speak, moreover, of the change in disposition of the beast,—"he was, and is not, and yet is":—he was, at his rising from the sea, the cringing, slavish beast thou sawest him, crouching down on his vast belly—covering therewith the wide empire of Rome—to receive his drunken load: he is not, for his spirit is entirely changed towards the "woman," whom now he "hates," and supports only through policy and statecraft—believing, though pretending the contrary, none of her lies: he yet is, for he still puts on the chains of her bondage when it suits his purpose; that is—when he would step forth with authority to abridge the liberty of the children of light.

This Vision counts the times by "heads." Charlemagne we found to be the sixth head, and his designation here is —"he was, and is not,"—to which we add, as afterwards apparently does the text, "and yet is." The next "head," or stage of being of the same beast, is "he was, and is not, and shall ascend" &c.,—this is Napoleon. He is soon (says the angel) about to ascend (μετάκει αναβαίνει) from the 'bottomless pit' of the insane populace, where the Marasts and Robespierres will be found;—not from the subsiding sea, but from amidst the surges of revolution and the crash and
chaos of nations. He ascends from the "bottomless pit" in
the midst of Christendom—a citizen not of France (as is
pretended) but of Papal Rome, to whom Corsica belongs by
the gift of Charlemagne. He is heaved up in the rage of the
times to the surface of those "waters where the whore
sitteth" (ver. 15); will be the idol, or visible expression, of
their universal suffrage—the "wonder" of the infidel world
whose "names were not written in the book of life";—of
all (that is) who confess not the name of Christ. But he
"goeth into perdition": like a blazing meteor he drops into
the ocean, and is no more.

We must not omit to mention a criticism of Griesbach's
upon the expression "and yet is"—in Greek καίτερ εστίν.
For this he gives two various readings, viz., καί παρεστίν
(and is close at hand), and καί παρεσται (and shall soon make his
appearance); and the latter he finds so well authenticated, as to
induce him to take it into the text, instead of the ordinary read-
ing. It cannot but be admitted that both of these expressions
(and there is no difference in sense) are in perfect harmony with
the description at the beginning of the verse—"was, and is
not, and shall ascend"; while the received text cannot be so re-
garded, excepting with the apology of its being a very quaint
enigma. It results that we are enabled to view the latter
clause of this verse (varying the text) as appertaining to
either Charlemagne or Napoleon; whereby the disagreeable
impression is obviated, which otherwise must needs arise
from a portion of Charlemagne's description being found later
in the text, than the notice ("shall ascend") of Napoleon.

Another somewhat different interpretation of the words
"was, and is not" offers itself: it is suggested by a con-
sideration of the testimony of history to the spiritual degra-
dation of the "woman"; which, it is notorious, much
preceded in date the days of Charlemagne; that is, preceded
the commencement of the "kingdom" in which—and in a
very advanced part of it—the colloquy took place. It is
presumable that it would be the wish of the angel to carry
back his description of the "beast that carried" the woman,
to the earliest possible days of her drunkenness, consistent
with the presidency of the same Head,—i.e., consistent with
the being in headship on the part of Charlemagne. Now
under the influence of this desire, he would call to mind the remarkable feature to which we have more than once given attention, in the position of Charlemagne’s headship in two different kingdoms—those of “brass” and of “iron.” In allusion then to this feature the angel may be supposed retrospectively to say—“the beast that thou sawest was, and is not, and yet is.” The beast that thou sawest laden with the drunken woman, “was” a Head of empire in Charlemagne, when first she began to indulge in her fornications, for he was a head of the “leopard,” or earlier Roman kingdom; “is not” a head in the kingdom in which we stand; and “yet (in the sense of being its initiator) is”—i.e., has headship in it; “is not, and shall soon appear” as the true head in Napoleon:—that is to say, “is not” the head of this kingdom as of the original seven, and yet shall soon appear as such in another form,—ascending from the bottomless pit in Napoleon.

Lastly, from the very precise manner in which the words “was and is not” are introduced in vers. 8 and 14, one might imagine that they were received in the celestial halls as an accustomed designation, to signify the imperial Head who held so remarkable and important a post in the general system; being as a gate to divide the two cognate kingdoms of ancient and modern Rome. As head of empire, he “was” (we repeat) a head of the leopard kingdom, “is not” the head of the kingdom of iron, and “yet is” a head in it,—because in him is continued the line of heads, and that the beast cannot at any time be seen in the vision without one; and because, further, he is symbolically identical with the later head now about to arise, but who is “not yet come” (ver. 10). From these last words, “not yet come,” but on the point of coming, it is manifest that, if this be Napoleon, we have determined aight the scene of the colloquy in the middle of the last century, the point of time to which the prophet had been bidden “to come up”:—by this introductory eighth verse (we say) the hint on this subject, received at the giving of the vials, is confirmed.

We have now determined the genealogical point of time: let us proceed to the inner mystery of the vision. “And here is the mind that hath wisdom” (ver. 9). This is a responsive note to the words “Here is wisdom” (Rev. xiii. 18) and calls
to an examination of the same mystery,—the "name of the beast" in one case, and so close a description of him in the other case as is equivalent to the written name. These corresponding sounds, like the knocker and doorbell of a house, announce but one individual; and we may liken the remainder of the 9th verse, and the 10th verse, to long passages, through which our visitor's approach to the saloon of the 11th lies:—they are as follows. "The seven heads are seven mountains on which the woman sitteth. And there are seven kings; five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come; and when he cometh he must continue a short space." Looking at the admonition that precedes these words, and not devoid we trust of that diffidence which they would prescribe, we yet approach them with a full persuasion that,—under the circumstances of the present times, there is no presumption in attempting their solution.

With the hope of getting into the right path of the angel's explanation, perhaps the first step should be—to inquire what was most likely, antecedently, to have become the topic of his discourse at this time, had he preferred—putting aside all reference to the symbolical figure before him—to communicate with the Apostle in ordinary language; recollecting that he had originally proposed to inform him of the approaching doom of the "great whore"? Was it not most likely, so soon as the astonishment of the Apostle should have subsided, and so soon as the right point of view in time had been determined, that he would draw his attention to the indictment against the woman? This indictment is best understood from the thirteenth chapter, to be read in the source, and the constitution, of the "Holy Roman empire," and in the malignant and cruel rule—partly and predominantly ecclesiastical, partly secular, it had engendered. The actual disgusting condition of this politico-religious rule, steeped in the blood of saints and revelling in blasphemies, is the declared cause—declared first, in exhibition to the eye—of the impending judgment; what then more natural than that the angel's words also should, in due unison, refer to the original root of the evil?—and that before he should proceed to describe either the instruments
of judgment (ver. 13), or the results (ver 16), he should declare the deep-seated cause of the spiritual disease, which, at the time of the vision, had been working its deadly way in the body politic for so many ages of misrule. We shall endeavour to apply this view of the case.

"The seven heads are seven mountains on which the woman sitteth. And there are seven kings: five are fallen, and one is;" The "seven heads" are, without question, our old friends Cyrus, Alexander, Augustus, &c., the heads of the seven-headed beast, who began his life in Daniel's day, and lives on continually, measuring his life by his heads; so that, taking the heads consecutively, we have never to do with more than one head at a time. Which of these heads was on, or was paramount in, the beast that carried the woman? A hasty imagination would pronounce that it must have been the sixth in order, because of the words "five (that is, five kings) are fallen, and one is," viz., the sixth. Now, this conclusion, even if correct, would be founded in error: it takes for granted that "head" and "king" in this narrative carry the same meaning. But this is not the case; and here is the essence of the difficulty that surrounds the whole passage; and from this difficulty we shall only escape by further endeavouring—even after all that has been said on the subject—to obtain the most clear conception we may be able, of what is intended by the symbol—a **Head** of empire.

A "head" of empire, in an **individual** sense, is the supreme ruler for the time being, having **all estates of men under him**; but there must needs be so little of individuality in a "head" whose name (his shadow, so to speak) extends over many centuries of time; and which is particularly exemplified in the words "five are fallen"—these having taken more than two thousand years to fall; that it is in the symbolic sense—in respect of the many ages, the territory, and the power it expresses—we must chiefly regard the expression. In this sense then a Head of empire represents a whole **division of imperial rule**, regarded (we say) in **time, in extent of territory and population**, and in **the governing authority**. The "head" is used synonymously with
the "beast"—which strictly is the head's body: it comprehends therefore necessarily in itself all the ideas we have just expressed—the essential properties and proportions of a bestial "kingdom": or (to put the definition into a binomial form, conformably with the idea of the two essential parts—body and head—of an animal) a Head consists (if the expression be not too quaint) of populated territory and governing authority. In fine—whereas the "Beast," in his utmost magnitude, is the imperial measure of time from Cyrus to the last day of prophecy, a "Head" is a portion, in all respects of that measure. The "seven heads" are then as pyramids in the vast plain of history; in passing one of which, we travel in its long shadow until the next is attained. So little of individuality belongs to them, that Alexander, as one of the "seven," does not even stand at the entrance of the "kingdom" he represents; and thus it happens that, as the Head of a particular "kingdom," his existence began before the individual Alexander was born. Charlemagne, as one of these "seven" lived a thousand years. Notwithstanding this, the "Beast," who ever lives, is never without a living head: so that if it be asked, Who was the visible Head of the Beast at a particular epoch—say, at the Diet of Augsburg?—it was the person of Charles V.:—or, Who in the first years of the ninth century?—it was the individual Charlemagne;—both equally belonging to the prophetic "kingdom" and headship of Charlemagne.

Now, seeing that a Head is a portion, or chronological section of the Great Beast; expressing both the populated territory and the governing authority of which it is composed; the question is—In what does a "king" (such as we read of in the text before us) differ from this symbol? The answer is extremely simple; while also it is all-important to the interpretation,—it is this:—of the two parts of a Head (territory, and governing authority) a "king" is the latter only. A "king" is the visible humanity of the appointed "head of the beast," divested of the head's adjuncts of long duration and territory. A "king" is strictly a single person—his life not transmigrating, and pervading many generations, as does that of a "head"; and he is to be viewed as impersonating
in his day the authority, not the sphere of action, of the "Head" his principal. Now this distinction between what we have called populated territory and governing authority is observed in the prophecy, in the designations "mountains" and "kings."

Furthermore, a Head of empire, regarded as an individual ruler (that is, in point of fact, a "king"), is unquestionably one who is head over all things spiritual and temporal; whose power therefore is supreme in the appointment of spiritual functionaries, and in questions regarding as well the right government of the Clergy, as of all other orders of men. Such is a genuine individual Head;—he is the depository and spring of all rule. But if a "head," under some influence of falsehood or superstition, should consent to divide itself (as it were), and have its right eye at Rome, and its left eye at Vienna—its spiritual eye in the head of the Pope, and its secular eye in that of the Emperor, as was the case when the angel explained to John the living representation before them, his explanation would assuredly embrace such a peculiarity. "The seven heads (says the angel) are seven mountains upon which the woman sitteth. And there are seven kings."

Before proceeding, let us correct the manifestly false punctuation of this sentence. If there is rightly a full-stop after the word "sitteth," as in our translation, then have the translators rightly used the word "there" in the following part of the sentence: but if after "sitteth" comes a comma, then the word "there" takes the sense of "they." Now we find in Professor Scholefield's (of Cambridge) lately published Greek and English Testament, that he uses a comma after "sitteth" in the Greek; though in the English he retains the full-stop—this probably in deference to what is "appointed." Again, in the Latin Vulgate, the ninth verse takes part of the tenth, and runs thus, "Septem capita septem montes sunt, super quos mulier sedet, et reges septem sunt." From these premises we feel entitled to consider the "kings" as holding the same grammatical relation to the "seven heads" as do the "mountains"; and hence (purging the sentence of what is superfluous) we may read as follows—
"The seven Heads are seven mountains and seven kings."
That is to say, it is not that the seven Heads are at one time
seven mountains, and at another time, and under a different
point of view, seven kings: no—it is this, that the seven
Heads comprise essentially in their own constitution, as
coeexisting portions of their very being, seven mountains and
seven kings.

But we have never to do with more than one Head at a
time, according to the rule of consecutiveness; the term
seven expressing only the continuance of life in the Beast,
and corresponding with the necessity under which, in looking
at a friend, we are obliged to view him with all his years
upon him. When, then, it is said above—"the seven heads
are seven mountains and seven kings," it is effectively said
(restricting the sense to the particular time of the prophecy)
—"the one existing Head is seven mountains and one king."

But here it will be asked—why not apply the rule of con-
secutiveness to the mountains, as well as to the kings? Why
not say one mountain, as well as one king? The reason is
this,—The seven mountains are the body of the Beast, and
the body never changes. Of the two essential parts of a
prophetic Head (or Beast) the body and the ruler,—otherwise
called the populated territory and the one king; and here
seven mountains and one king,—it is evident that the first of
these terms in each formula requires a different treatment
from the other, being a perpetual quantity, descending the
same through all generations; whereas the other undergoes
a sevenfold change. In agreement with this view the text
says—"five (kings) are fallen," i.e., passed away; but not so
of the mountains. Hence the seven mountains—the unchang-
ing body of the Beast, do not follow the law of consecutiv-
ness;—"unchanging," for the further reason that the symbol-
ism of the Revelation, presents only one beast descending all
the way from Cyrus; so that there can be but one body—the
sum of the four beasts of Daniel.

Now, the word "mountain" in this prophecy is to be
taken in the sense of the text, "The mountain of the Lord's
house shall be established on the top of the mountains"
(Is. ii. 2), i.e., as meaning a Church:—so that "the seven
mountains upon which the woman sitteth" is to be interpreted as signifying—the seven (i.e., the full number of) Churches, over which the Roman whore spreads the "filthiness of her fornication." But these seven mountains, or churches, are commensurate, and conterminous, indeed identical, with the territories of the "beast." Hence we learn that the vast territories of the beast are declared to be, in respect of government, a number of ecclesiastical states; rendering a quasi allegiance to the secular "head"—one of the "seven kings"; but being in a much greater degree under spiritual domination:—on these mountains "the woman sitteth" (i.e., has her seat, or throne) at her ease, and in all her tinsel grandeur and glory.

Turning now back to the formula we proposed—"The seven heads are seven mountains and seven kings," we may understand the angel as signifying—not (as in the natural constitution of things he ought to have been able to do) "the seven Heads are seven kings, with their territories:" or (making the time special) "the Head you behold is a king, with his hereditary imperial territories"; but—"the Head you behold is a secular ruler, called a king; and, as to his territories—the rightful body of a king, they are nothing else than seven mountains on which the Roman harlot sitteth—ecclesiastical states over which she holds supreme dominion."

If it should be objected here that a "mountain" does not always mean a church (as we have assumed) but a government of any sort; for that, looking at the surface of the earth as an emblem of society, the mountain, far elevated above the rest, will denote the ruling powers; we reply that, in the instances we have adduced, it must needs mean spiritual government; for first, in the passage quoted from Isaiah, it is "the mountain of the Lord's house" to which attention is called, where the latter words determine its spiritual nature; and in the text under consideration, it is "the seven mountains upon which the woman sitteth"—the "woman" being essentially a spiritual symbol; whereby these mountains are equally determined to be the subjects of spiritual rule.

Again, ver. 1, we read of a "great whore that sitteth upon
many waters’; which waters are interpreted, in ver. 15, as ‘people, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues.’ But in the text under consideration (ver. 9) ‘the woman sitteth’ upon ‘seven mountains.’ It is granted, we presume, that the ‘woman’ and the ‘whore’ are one person. Compare then the two texts (verses 9 and 15) which speak of the same sovereign power, and it results that the ‘seven mountains’ of ver. 9 are the ‘people, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues,’ of ver. 15; the first of these symbols (the ‘mountains’) taking a spiritual view, and the second (the ‘people and multitudes’) a physical view, of the same populations precisely, over which the woman presideth. Whatever may be thought of this interpretation, it hence results, at least—that the old idea of the ‘seven mountains’ signifying the seven hills on which Rome is built, is altogether vain.*

If what we have said be—as we firmly believe, and commend accordingly to the consideration of others—the true interpretation of this much-ved passage, the words of the angel are found to bear the meaning which, when undertaking to explain the hideous spectacle before him, they might have been expected to bear: it is an interpretation in accord with the general purpose of the prophecy, which is, to describe what Babylon constitutionally and historically has been, and is, previous to her final overthrow. It is highly probable that the well-known description of Rome—the ‘septem

* If the reader should object to the change of punctuation on which this exposition rests, let him consider whether the authorized punctuation will not bring out the same result. Let him consider the term ‘seven heads’ (i.e., the subsisting headship) as expressing a particular sphere of the bestial rule—the word ‘sphere’ referring, of course, to the measurements of both space (i.e., territory) and time. Let him also consider the word ‘king,’ as signifying the ruling power in this sphere, or as the one royal index of the sphere. What then does the angel say?—‘The seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth.’ That is to say—During the sphere of rule in which we now stand, the territory of the beast is oppressed with an ecclesiastical domination—a sacro-secular rule. ‘And there are seven kings:’—that is to say—there is, notwithstanding, a legitimate sovereign during this sphere of rule:—or, there is a legitimate index of the sovereignty. The Angel then further adds, that the actual sovereign power, or royal index, is the sixth of the original series of seven.
urbs alta jugis," might have suggested to the angel, perhaps
given a zest to, the use of the words "seven mountains,"
when condescending to propound an enigma to a mortal
man; but there is nothing in this circumstance to mislead.
Under this interpretation, the prophetic statement is seen in
perfect agreement with that of the 13th chapter, wherein the
"dragon" (the Pope) becomes the chief object of the
worshipful homage of the empire, and the rightful "head"
descends to a secondary authority (Rev. xiii. 4).*

Let us proceed. "Five are fallen, and one is, and the other
is not yet come" (ver. 10). He who "is," is Charlemagne
—Charlemagne in his division of imperial time. He is the

* We should not consider the reproof conveyed in this prophecy, as
affecting only the united rule of Pope and Emperor: it applies to the high
authorities everywhere throughout Christendom, in whom is exhibited the
unholy combination of spiritual and secular power. It points (e. g.) to
Cardinal Legates, commissioned as such to preside over temporal govern-
ments; to the great Bishoprics which are in their constitution Principali-
ties, where regal splendour and worldly enterprise naturally follow upon
the acquisition of regal power. It reflects upon the high ambassadors of
Christ in whatever country, who condescend in that capacity to the
administration of worldly interests; thus degrading their sacred office by
a repetition of the offence of Babel (the first spiritual offence in the
new world)—the lust of a terrestrial "name" (Gen. xi. 4). It cannot be
questioned but that we may recognise, unhappily, this spiritual fornication
even in our own country, in the position of our Bishops in the House of
Lords;—it is a regular rag of the old Roman harlot, and which preserves
(odd enough to say) its original "purple" colour (Rev. xvii. 4). There are
eclergymen who will tell you that it is the way in which their order partakes
of the right of representation. But what social claim has a class separated
to God for the general benefit, whose duties preclude the due consideration
of the secular interests of the nation, to be represented at all as a class in
its general assemblies? Is it not an order of men who claim of right, in
respect of their secular concerns, the interest and solicitude of all other
classes—all others being their constituents? Was not this truth set forth
of old in the institution of Tithes (a tenth as well of the labour as of
the profits of all other classes)—determining a right on the part of the
sacred body to have their secular interests regarded as a public concern?
What do Bishops know of navigation laws (†)—the government of India
—peace and war! Are these things to be considered naturally, or most
unnaturally, a part of their "holy calling"? Being "ambassadors for
Christ"—and therein representatives of Him, are these occupations in
accordance with the declaration, "My kingdom is not of this world"!
same with him who "yet is," in ver. 8—if that text is to stand. The "five fallen" are Cyrus, Alexander, Augustus, Constantine, and another; so that Charlemagne here, as in all the preceding visions, is the sixth. This fact—that Charlemagne is ever the sixth—is the key-stone of our arch of interpretation. "The other is not yet come; and when he cometh he must continue a short space;" a description which—regarding the angel as speaking about the year 1750 (or it may be, in 1775, when Voltaire died) and when Napoleon—"the other" Head to complete the "seven," was about to ascend, but was "not yet come"; and who, when he did attain to be Head, remained so (i.e., his whole dynasty remained so) only the short space of ten years—requires no further elucidation.

The door of the saloon (ver. 11) opens, and we behold the Antichrist. "And the beast that was, and is not, even he is the eighth, and is of the seven, and goeth into perdition." This is the "beast" (or "king") to the recognition of whom when he should appear, the whole prophecy appears intended, as in the 13th chapter, to lead,—indeed, who is almost proclaimed as the object and end of all these prophecies. It is Louis Napoleon;—but we speak (it is most necessary here to observe) of L. Napoleon in his "kingdom." As the beast that "was and is not" was Charlemagne in his kingdom of a thousand years; and as the beast that "continued a short space" was Napoleon in his kingdom of ten years; so the "eighth king" (called a "beast") is L. Napoleon in his "kingdom,"—of the duration of which it is not in this chapter that the slightest hint is given. This "eighth king" is said to be the same as Charlemagne—the "beast that was, and is not." And so also the first Napoleon is said to be; for it is written (ver. 8) "the beast that was, and is not, shall ascend, &c." But with how much greater force is this identity proclaimed of L. Napoleon! Charlemagne received his crown as a donation from the Church: the great Napoleon delighted to say that, having picked up the crown from the dust, he had put it on his own head: L. Napoleon is altogether a protegé and minion of the Roman clergy.
The first Napoleon was Charlemagne as a conqueror: the second as the beast whom the whore rides.

The truth of the interpretation that Charlemagne, though the sixth, is also the "eighth" head, will more plainly appear in an examination of the text. The original is as follows—"Καὶ τὸ θρήνον τοῦ ἐν, καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶ, καὶ ἄντος οὐδοὺς ἐστι, καὶ εἴ των ἐπιτα ἐστὶ." On this text, the question we wish to put is—Upon what ground is "καὶ ἄντος οὐδοὺς ἐστὶ" rendered "even he is the eighth"? The reason that has been suggested to the writer by a good scholar is, that the translators were obliged to say something; and perhaps, as they did not perceive the interpretation, it was as near the truth as they could be expected to come. But we say with confidence that καὶ means something else: it means "and"—under some form of that conjunction; for instance, "moreover"; still better, "in addition to." Not that under this new sense it signifies "he is also an eighth"—as the writer has seen it somewhere written; for then the original would run, "καὶ υδοὺς ἄντος ἐστὶ." Now this word "καὶ" joins what follows it, to what is said of the "ο ἐν, καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶ" in the eighth verse. The reader must convince himself of this, or we cannot proceed any longer together,—it is almost the most important word in the chapter. So that, to put our translation right, we should understand it in extenso as saying—"And the beast that was and is not, in addition to what has been already said of him—(or—in addition to his having appeared as the seventh king) is an eighth." The value of this amended reading will appear on the following consideration. In the ordinary text ("even he is the eighth") there is no help but to regard the "was and is not" of the eighth verse, as the "eighth king," and the eighth king only; whereas he is, first of all, the sixth beast or king, and then (as said above) the seventh, before becoming the "eighth." In truth the word καὶ, in the position it occupies, can be understood only, when viewed as a link of connection, as connecting with something in a preceding verse,—what verse, is placed by the context beyond all doubt. It asserts too, unequivocally, that the "eighth" king had been
described by some other title or token before; we mean, by a token intermediate between the first appellation ("the beast that was, and is not"—ver. 8), and what was then (ver. 11) to be said further of him. By what token? By—
that "he ascendeth" (ver. 8); wherein he becomes the seventh. The placing of Charlemagne, Napoleon, and L. Napoleon, on the same basis of identity, is a confirmation of what has been already said, that this vision (as well as Rev. xiii.) refers essentially, in its times, to Daniel's fourth kingdom; for these chiefs constitute, thus united, the headship of that kingdom, in reference to its several parts—the "legs of iron, the feet part of iron and part of clay" (wherein are three conditions of existence)—being the sixth, seventh, and supplementary eighth portions of the great Image.

Again, the expression "is of the seven" requires elucidation: it means—is part of the prophetic "seven;"—is either one of the seven by recurrence—as in the octave of music, whereby he becomes one with the first; or part of one of the seven; and in either case equally, is necessary to the completion of the series. Confining ourselves here to the latter view, the assertion is made that the two Napoleons are one in the eye of prophecy, in a more intimate union than has been seen to obtain between them and the "was and is not" just discussed. The reader will recognise in this enigma a repetition of what is said of the same personages in chapter xiii., where the "beast" receives a mortal wound, and himself is restored to life. The whole sentence "He is the eighth and is of the seven" is as though the angel had said, "I have another Head to speak of, whom you may regard either as an eighth—i.e., supernumerary to the perfect number seven, in the sense of being a repetition of, or springing out of, one of them; or, as if six and a half had gone before, and he comes to complete the seven: for consider—it is necessary he should be a supernumerary, in conformity with the symbolism in the prophet Daniel's vision of the Beasts (vii. 8); and of the seven, in conformity with his Image" (ii. 41).*

* In further identification of the fearful personage here foretold, we would wish, even at the risk of a little repetition, to fix attention on the two following points in his description. Daniel speaks of a "little horn"
The career of the first Napoleon was brief; he was cut short, apparently, to introduce a period allowed for repentance (—see the fourth vial). Repentance is not the result. He revives;—but the little finger of the revived king is as big as the loins of him who was slain (1 Kings xii. 10). It is mentioned lastly—we presume as an encouragement to the true Protesting Church—that "he (the eighth) goeth into perdition":—it would be presumptuous to imagine of this any other sort of perdition, than what befell the first moiety of his being—the annihilation of his power.

Let us proceed. "And the ten horns which thou sawest are ten kings, which have received no kingdom as yet; but receive power as kings one hour with the beast" (ver. 12). The general subject of the "ten horns" there is no need again to enter upon: whether found or not in Daniel's earlier "kingdoms," they at least constitute an important feature of the whole fourth kingdom. But as we are now engaged essentially with the fourth kingdom, what can mean the words "ten kings which have received no kingdom as yet"? This enigma—if first the reader has received our argument respecting the position in time of the angel and the prophet, rising up behind, or after, ten other horns (vii. 24), who, in his personal capacity, is believed to be the same with St. John's "eighth king." The two symbols are extremely dissimilar; and one is inclined to doubt whether, in the ordinary course of things, it were possible that the same character could respond to both of them; that he could be "a horn"—a subordinate potentate, also "a king" holding supreme rule. Now, L. Napoleon is a horn, coming up after the "ten," for he springs from Louis, King of Holland—a veritable horn; and, as like begets like, L. Napoleon must by nature be a horn. He is also a king, and "of the seven"; for he is the representative—nay, the grandson—of Napoleon the great, inasmuch as he springs from Josephine who, being Napoleon's wife, is one with him. Is not this man rightly named Louis Napoleon—the "horn" and the "head" in one! He is also rightly seen as the eighth king, being the imitator and supplanter of our Lord; for the number eight is, in numerical symbolism, the mark of salvation. Eight souls were saved from the ark: the outer man was cast away to corruption, in circumcision, on the eighth day: on the eighth day—which also was "of the seven"—the Lord burst the bonds of death. It is fitting therefore that he, the pseudo-saviour, in whom is recovery from the "deadly wound" inflicted on tyranny and impiety (Rev. xiii.), should be seen numerically, as in every other wise, in the false colours of sanctity.
as being in the latter half of the last century—becomes of easy solution. The words "as yet" carry a direct reference to the words "not yet come" of ver. 10, applicable to the seventh head—the great Napoleon; and they shew that the "ten horns" are those of his particular headship and lifetime. We are to observe it is said "thou sawest" these horns, which "not yet" have received their kingdom:—from the words "thou sawest" we learn that the horns were in existence at the time of the vision, whether endowed with power or not; and further, from the words "not yet," we infer that they were speedily about to receive it. By "kingdom" in this passage we are to understand "kingly power"; for βασιλεία has not here a territorial sense, as may be seen from the sense it bears, in a similar employment of the word, in vers. 17 and 18.

Now, soon after the Beast rose out of the sea in Charlemagne, he became possessed not only of "ten horns," but of "ten crowns on his horns"; and History testifies that these engines of power—constituent elements of his kingdom, were not, at the time of the present vision, lost to the beast; even their crowns they maintained. And yet it is said "they had received as yet no kingdom." What do we learn from this aspect of the imagery? It is this—that these horns, now represented in a state of expectancy, were the same in substance as the horns that had adorned the whole headship of Charlemagne:—indeed they must needs have been, in some sense, the actual property of the head they were seen upon—which was Charlemagne. The state of expectancy is explained by the events:—the convulsive earth was now beginning to heave with the elements of Revolution, and the imperial power of Charlemagne—still holding a nominal life—to totter to its fall. Hence it will happen (the angel may be supposed to say) there will speedily be a transference of the strength ("kingly power") of these horns to another head of empire:—though remaining physically the same, their greater name will be built upon the head "not yet come." This removal of the efficiency of the "ten horns" from the sixth head to the seventh establishes a remarkable agreement of this prophecy with that of Daniel
(vii. 7), which gives the "ten horns" pre-eminently to the Napoleonic kingdom, by mentioning them at the very end of his fourth kingdom.

The ten horns "receive power as kings one hour with the beast." The expression one hour responds to the brief career permitted to the "beast" himself, of whom it is said (ver. 10) that he "shall continue a short space." The passage may be viewed as a cutting taunt on Buonaparte's kings; from whom they "receive"—as they would their daily rations—their "power"; and receive it "as"—i.e., in the likeness of—"kings"; deriving from him individually their dignity and their very being. It is satisfactory to have recognised these horns as having been the "ten (ancient) horns" of the Roman kingdom, however effete their power; and to find that so magnificent a symbol does not seek its entire solution in the twinkling stars of the late war; who held the crowns they had seized upon in the scramble of the times, entirely in dependence upon the Head of their troop; and for the space of "one hour" (ten years) only.

With the next clause of the prophecy we arrive at the most difficult point of our interpretation,—one which requires, for its reception, that the imagination of the reader shall have been all along in perfect unison with that of him who addresses him. The two next verses run thus:—

(13) "These have one mind, and shall give their power and strength unto the beast. (14) These shall make war with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them; for he is Lord of lords and King of kings: and they that are with him are called, and chosen, and faithful."

Now it is to be borne in mind that, in the preceding verse, in the history of the "ten horns"—now exhausted in strength, but about to receive "kingly power"—we have been able clearly to recognise notices of the two first stages of the kingdom of iron—those of Charlemagne and Napoleon: but there is a third stage of this kingdom—that of L. Napoleon. We have found this leading truth set forth in both the great visions of Daniel we have examined, and in that of the "Beast from the sea"; but in a most marked manner in the vision actually under review, under the title of the "eighth king." Immediately after this last notice (ver. 11)
of the third stage of the kingdom, comes the allusion to the "ten horns" (ver. 12); and they are recognised immediately (we repeat) as appertaining to two stages out of the three of the "kingdom": the natural question is—indeed the essential question—where is the notice of their existence in the third or final stage?—for it is needless to shew again, that "ten horns" belong to the final stage equally with the preceding two; as may at once be demonstrated from the famous expression of Daniel, "before whom (the Antichrist) three of the first horns are plucked up by the roots"—the whole "ten" being therefore necessarily subsisting: indeed these "horns" are the chiefest actors in the concluding events of prophetic time, being the independent "toes" of the Image. We repeat then the question—where is the notice, in the present vision, of the "horns" of the final stage of the kingdom of iron? Let us seek this notice, as it is natural we should, in the verses before us.

What we require is some verbal or other mark, in the present reference to "horns," which may amount to a real notice of them in the last phase of the "kingdom." We conceive then, that while ver. 13 alludes (as without question it does) to the times of the first Napoleon; ver. 14 leads forward the allusion to those of the restored empire; but the mark itself of this arrangement is found in the use of the same word "these" (ευροϊ) in the beginning of both verses. It is not written "These are of one mind, . . . . and they shall make war with the Lamb, &c.," as in the usual order of a narrative; and we conceive that, in this repetition of the word "these," a distinction is intended to be instituted between the parties thus severally referred to. It is easy to say, that it is more in accordance with grammar to regard the parties as the same in both verses, and to consider the repetition as merely a matter of style. We cannot deny it. But to this pedantic remark we consider it sufficient to reply, that if indeed the reference be to the same parties in both verses, it may yet be so only—in strict accordance with the manner of Prophecy—after a long intervening period of time:—of which manner of Prophecy, the case of the prospective kings in the preceding verse may be considered an instance. This,
if admitted, will suit our purpose just as well—so far as regards the fact we contend for of a distinction in the parties of the two verses. But this is but a meagre suggestion after all: it by no means explains the form, nor offers any vindication of the language, of the prophecy; which assuredly conveys the notion (whether designedly or not is the question) of there being but one party, while in reality two are intended. Now this feature (of there being apparently but one party) is in exact accordance with other figures of the same Napoleonic dynasty that have come before us—the “division” of the one kingdom—the “wound and its healing” in the same head; where the quality of identity enters pointedly into the symbolism. There ought then, in consistency of construction, to be found here this quasi-identity in a real diversity; for it is the true symbolic mark of the “seventh-cum-eighth” Headship of empire; and we consider it is nothing less than wantonly to put out of sight, and ignore, a beautiful specimen of prophetic harmony, to explain the secondly-mentioned “horns” in any such jejeune manner as we have ourselves above suggested. The “horns” of ver. 14 are specifically those, still future, of the restored head. They, as well as the head they grow upon, are necessarily included in the times of this, as well as of every other analogous prophecy, of the latter days,—a truth so unimpeachable, that we are naturally led to seek in the present prophecy some trace of them;—we find it in the repetition of the word “these,” distinguishing them from, instead of asserting for them an identity with, the horns of the verse preceding. There is, indeed, a hint to be gathered from the very ordinary, and seemingly unnecessary observation of the 13th verse—“These shall have one mind, and shall give their power and strength unto the beast.” However descriptive these words may be of Buonaparte’s kings, might it not have been taken for granted that “horns,” receiving their power from the beast himself, would be of “one mind” with their employer, and devote their “strength” to his service? We confess to the belief that this very ordinary clause was introduced entirely, as a foundation for the contrast we have described.
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But we have a better foundation—an argument less assailable, on which to rest the important fact we are contending for; and we do not hesitate to say, that it must of necessity be that the "ten horns" of ver. 14 are those of the "eighth head" of ver. 11. In the first place "The beast that thou sawest" (ver. 8), and "the ten horns which thou sawest" (ver. 12), evidently go together: they both endure "one hour" (vers. 10 and 12). And these horns, in the following verse (ver. 13) are said to "give their power unto the beast"—i. e., for the same one hour. But how does this "one (short) hour" comport with the notion of the "war with the Lamb" of ver. 14? This war with the Lamb is not an affair of "one hour." Nor is it treated by Daniel in such a manner (vid. ii. 44, et seq., and vii. 26, et seq.) as to admit of its being imagined of so short a duration. This simple collation of the verses we consider to set at rest the question:—we are hereby led to the certain conclusion, that ver. 14, in describing a stage of existence posterior to that wherein the same "horns" are seen in ver. 13, describes them in their third stage, and under the third headship of the Beast in his kingdom of iron. As to the import of the 14th verse, which is altogether of future time, we do not intend to venture any other remark upon it, than that it requires to be read in company with the passages of Daniel ii. 44: and vii. 27. To make war "with the Lamb" means, of course, with the people who shall range themselves under the Lamb's banner. The united testimony of the three passages foreshadows a kingdom, the laws and institutions of which, founded in Christian truth and righteousness, shall lead to a (so to speak) universal dominion; to whom shall be committed the honourable task of "preparing the way of the Lord, and making His paths straight," and perhaps of receiving Him suitably "at his coming"; but only as the sequel of a desperate struggle in defence of true religion (Dan. vii. 25), and in maintenance of the claim—as belonging to Christ alone, of being "Lord of lords and King of kings" (Rev. xvi. 14).

At this point of the investigation the words of Daniel are applicable "Hitherto is the end of the matter" (vii. 28)—i. e., of the "word pronounced" (Lat. and Gr.). The prophecy does not proceed in time to a later period than that of the
events last mentioned. "The kingdom under the whole heaven" is given to the "people of the saints of the most high," and this vein of prophecy becomes exhausted: it terminates in Christ's millennial reign. It hence follows that whatever may be propounded in the remaining verses of the chapter, must terminate in respect of time with, or before, the period here noted.

In the structure of the prophecy these remaining verses seem to bear a complementary character, holding—when applied to the ancient scale of numbers—the place of the three; and adduced solely with a view to complete (by adding them to that which would numerically be expressed as four—or entire) the sacred seven. This opinion the writer can do no more than commend to the reader's consideration; but he begs to point out how completely the passage thus viewed is in accord, as a specimen of construction, with that of the three last verses of chap. xii.; where three historical points combine to frame the seriatic number "three": which circumstance (by the bye) demonstrates the truth of the view we took of the two great scenes of that chapter, as being essential parts one of the other; for viewed in unity they constitute the number "four"—or body of the vision.

The text is as follows:

(15.) "And he saith unto me, The waters which thou sawest, where the whore sitteth, are peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues. (Ver. 16.) And the ten horns which thou sawest upon the beast, these shall hate the whore, and shall make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and burn her with fire. (Ver. 17.) For God hath put in their hearts to fulfil his will, and to agree, and give their kingdom unto the beast, until the words of God shall be fulfilled. (Ver. 18.) And the woman which thou sawest is that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth."

In these verses there is an enumeration of the agencies, and main results of the whole scene. The subjects they contain are three in number—the "waters" (ver. 15)—the "ten horns" (vers. 16, 17)—the woman (ver. 18). They may be considered as suggested by the following questions of an inquirer, What do the waters signify?—Where is the promised judgment of the whore?—Who is the woman?—The first and third of these have come already under our
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notice—the "waters" are the "beast" (comp. vers. 1 and 3) in his multitudinous form; and the "woman" is Rome in her politico-ecclesiastical aspect:—and really, unless it were with the design of obtaining materials for the complementary three, as above suggested, it is beyond our conception why these two important explanations should have been thus deferred, and detached from the general course of the prophecy. The middle subject—that of the "ten kings," has new and important matter in it: indeed it is the only matter in the chapter referring directly to what was announced at the first as the main subject of the prophecy,—the "judgment of the great whore." Here and in ver. 14, but here chiefly, the execution of the sentence is declared. This brevity is very remarkable; but it warrants the view that all that precedes in the vision is but as a bridge, to conduct from St. John's days to that very distant age, in which it was intended the dread prediction should be accomplished.

It is observable that the Angel speaks of the operation of the "ten horns" against the "whore," pointedly in the future tense: we have no right therefore to search for a fulfilment of these transactions in earlier history than when he was addressing the prophet—about from 1750 to 1775. But we have lived since then to see the "horns" of ver. 13 run their brief allotted course, and pass away from the scene: consequently, the horns that "shall hate the whore, and shall make her desolate," and shall continue their persecution until the words of God shall be fulfilled" (vers. 16, 17) (the words of God, that is, relating to the woman's punishment—things obviously belonging to the future) must be the same as those of ver. 14, that "shall make war with the Lamb,"—another proof that these latter are diverse from Buonaparte's horns of ver. 13, of whom so ephemeral an existence is declared.

But although we have no right to look into earlier history than the date "1750" for the doings of the "horns" before us,—unless it be on account of having seen ("thou sawest") the horns of Charlemagne, which is scarcely a sufficient reason—it will yet be granted that the nature of expected judgments is best understood from that which is gone by; especially when it can be shewn that that which is gone by
has itself come under the notice of prophecy. It will be profitable then (we think) to turn to the earliest page of history which records the persecution of the "whore" by the "ten horns," as affording the best foreshadowings of that to come, and the best illustration of the terms in which the chastisements of the future are made known to us. With this view we turn to the events of the Great Reformation—the earliest issues of that wrath which overhangs the great adulteress; the efficient causes of which we have found to be noticed in the two preceding chapters—xii. and xiii.—of the Revelation.

It is in the time of the Great Reformation that history first testifies to the "horns" hating the "whore." By "hating" may be understood protesting against her impious fornications. Then it was, for the first time, that she was made to disgorge the accumulations of her greedy rapacity, and in various ways to walk on the hot coals of retributive sufferings. In our own country, at this moment, every ruined abbey and ivy-mantled aisle witnesses to the steps of her predetermined doom. Every lay rector witnesses to her having been despoiled of the means of her finery; and the highest of our aristocracy have been for many generations fattening on her substance—the "flesh" that has been mercilessly torn from off her. (Ver. 16.)

• From the following small sample of the whore's "flesh," from Bishop Jewell, it may be judged how great have been her losses in this kingdom alone. "The Archbishop of Canterbury paid unto the Pope for his Annuities or First fruits at every vacation 10,000 florins, besides other 5,000 florins for the use and right of his Pall. The Archbishop of York paid 10,000 florins, and as it is thought other 5,000 florins for his Pall. The Bishop of Ely, for first fruits 7,000 florins. The Bishop of London 3,000 florins. The Bishop of Winchester 12,000 florins. The Bishop of Exeter 6,000 florins. The Bishop of Lincoln 5,000 florins. The Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry 3,000 florins. The Bishop of Hereford 1,800 florins. The Bishop of Salisbury 4,500 florins." The author adds to the effect that the whole value of the Pope's first fruits throughout Europe ariseth to the sum of 2,246,843 florins; and that to this sum may be added 900,000 florins for the yearly perquisites of his elections, dispensations, pluralities, triallities, totquot; for his bulls, his seals, his signatures, for eating flesh, for eggs, for white meat, for priests' concubines, and for other like merchandise. (Dr. Moberly's Ser., Nov. 5, 1850.)
from a comparison of the notices which speak, first, of the kings (all of them) "committing fornication" with the woman (ver. 2), and then "agreeing" to aid the beast to her destruction (ver. 17)—that there takes place a separation of interests among them; some adhering to, and some breaking off from, her communion; but all uniting to effect her ruin. To agree for such an end is proof of spiritual disagreement. Thus it happens that her tormentors will be, under every point of view, those of her own household: for the horns which protest against her evil ways remain, nevertheless, portions territorially of the Roman empire; and may be regarded as children of the family "hating" the mother that bore them. The "ten horns" are all allied, then, to carry out the drunken harlot's doom: for "God hath put in their hearts to agree (pro tanto) and give their kingdom unto the beast"—an expression, and an arrangement, which have certainly not yet received an adequate fulfilment, and which consequently direct the eye to the future and last division of the "iron" kingdom.

It may be that the visible evidence of the disruption of some of the "horns" from the "head"—ruined abbeys, and overthrown towers—do not so much abound on the Continent as with us, because of the disagreeing "horns" being there so compacted together, as to prevent the continuance of this species of testimony. The records of History are not so transient; and—as an excellent instance of the several "horns" agreeing to the end of carrying out the predicted chastisements, we may adduce that of the famous sack of Rome, in the time of the emperor Charles V., executed by the Conétable de Bourbon. To this step—sacrilegious on the part of him who commanded it, as being himself among the foremost of Roman zealots—the emperor was provoked by the alliances formed against him at the instigation of the Pope, called the "Holy League"; and to rightly appreciate the comment of history upon the prophecy, it must be borne in mind that Charles had just before been on the point of directing the storm of his armies upon the Protestant interests of Germany, when his wrath was diverted in the manner alluded to.
“Never (says Russell) did Rome experience in any age so many calamities, even from the barbarians by whom she was successively subdued—from the followers of Alaric, Genseric, or Odoacer—as now from the subjects of a Christian and Catholic monarch. Whatever was respectable in modesty, or sacred in religion, seemed only the more to provoke the rage of the soldiery.”

“It was the will of the Almighty (says D'Aubigné), that the Reformation should be exalted, and the Papacy abased.” “The puissant Charles, instead of marching with the Pope against the Reformation, as he had threatened at Seville, marches with the Reformation against the Pope. A few days had sufficed to produce this change of direction; there are few periods of history in which the hand of God is more plainly manifested.”

“Now began that terrible campaign during which the storm burst on Rome and the Papacy that had been destined to fall on Germany and the Gospel. By the violence of the blows inflicted on the pontifical city, we may judge of the severity of those that would have dashed in pieces the Reformed Churches. While retracing such scenes of horror, we have constant need of calling to mind that the chastisement of the seven-hilled city had been predicted by the Holy Scriptures.” “The Spaniards were filled with the desire of avenging Charles V., and the Germans (Lutherans) were overflowing with hatred against the Pope; all exulted in the hope of their labours being richly repaid by those treasures of Christendom that Rome had been accumulating for ages.” “The Spaniards, faithful Catholics, put the prelates to death in the midst of horrible cruelties, destined to extort their treasures from them: they spared neither rank, sex, nor age. It was not until the sack had lasted ten days, and a body of ten millions of golden crowns had been collected, and from five to eight thousand victims had perished, that quiet began in some degree to be restored.”

Thus the storm that burst upon the “eternal city” was gathered within her own horizon; and its elements consisted equally of German Lutherans who “hated” her spiritually, and of “faithful” Spaniards who believed her the fountain of all grace.

History does not record in the fiery times of the Reformation another so pointed example of what we may believe to have been the avenging wrath of God on the woman “drunk with the blood of saints”: and as if to complete the prophetic picture, even in this its precursive outpouring, we learn from history that Charles, the instigator of the whole movement, put his court into mourning on the occasion (Russell, I., 550); and he whose single word would have effected all he desired, appointed public processions to
petition heaven for the deliverance of the Pope from prison (Univ. Hist., XXVI., 379). Compare this statement with Rev. xviii. 9.

But this was rather a vial poured upon the seat of empire: it will be well to cast a look upon the more extensive outpouring, in those ages of religious strife, upon the empire at large. Where shall we find in the annals of the human race a story of such protracted misery, devastation, and suffering, as that of the nations under the Roman rule, during the first half of the seventeenth century, including the period of the thirty years' war. The sword would seem to have set to itself the terrible task of abrogating for ever the hope of the primeval decree being fulfilled, to multiply and fill the earth. The following passage from the “Edinburgh Review” (May, 1853, p. 5), on the subject of the failure of the Austrian Reformation, and the thirty years' war, is a fearful and no doubt faithful account of those dreary years:

"It was an era of almost unequalled misery to a large portion of Christendom. It seemed as if the ordinary restraints of civilized warfare had become obsolete, and the combatants were bent on destroying all that neither could finally wrest from the other. The populous North became a desert;—we can scarcely believe, what some writers seriously allege, that the whole population of Germany, east of the Rhine, sank during the Thirty-years' war from sixteen to four millions; but never had any Christian kingdom presented such an aspect of desolation, since the age of the Huns. We read of cultivated provinces relapsing into forest; cities which had shrunk until the houses of whole deserted quarters were burnt for fire-wood by the scanty inhabitants of the remainder. Men began in their despair, to cease from those common labours on which the maintenance of society depends. To the starving remnant of mankind which listened to the trumpeters proclaiming the peace of Westphalia, the name of peace was almost unknown except in their prayers."

Perhaps it will be said that the subjects of the political whore who "hated" her—the Protestants, suffered as much as they who wished her well. True! the children of Truth do not escape tribulation. The same battle-field is for those whose names, as martyrs, shall be written in heaven; and for those who, in its miseries, drink the cup of final indignation.

But to bring the illustrations of the Divine wrath down to our own times—the Napoleonic division of the iron kingdom, we have ourselves witnessed, under the fifth vial (the first
infliction and earnest of the seventh)—to sufferings in the Roman world, such as a decree of the Divine judgment can alone explain. In A.D. 1798, the "Holy Father" was carried off by rude hands—not of those who professedly "hated," but of those who were ostensibly on his side, across snows and mountains, to die in exile; and the gaudy hierarchy of Rome had to eke out their days on the alms of those who pitied them. In addition—in every country of the Roman faith, even in Catholic Spain, the harlot has been of late years denuded of her civil appendages, plundered of her ill-gotten wealth, and brought everywhere more or less into contempt. But above all, it was during the wars of the French empire, and ever within the confines of the " many waters " upon which the " woman " was seated, that insatiable death relieved the infidel State of no less than six millions of those who drew the sword. These (we say) may be regarded as specimens of that fuller volume of wrath, which is to come upon her in the not distant day of the third division of the iron kingdom; when the cup she has already quaffed will be found, in all probability, predictive in its quality, of that to be put again into her hands.

Such then has been, and will be the "judgment" of the woman "drunken with the blood of saints"; receiving back from time to time the stripes she has been permitted, for purposes of wisdom inscrutable, to inflict. Her tormentors will be her children, who by their own sufferings (to some appointed for the purpose of purgation—Dan. xi. 35, and to others of the punishment of their infidelity) will be the more confirmed, the former in their "protestations" against, and both in their "hatred" of her from whom they alike descend. This remarkable result, legitimately deduced (as we believe) from the expectation raised of a combined instrumentality of the "ten horns,"—if it does not promise on the one hand a great extension of vital Christianity, seems to threaten on the other a fearful defection from the profession of the Faith. And this agrees with the denunciation of Rev. xviii. 21, "with violence shall that great city Babylon be thrown down, and shall be found no more at all"—none shall adhere to her cause; all will be either protestant or infidel; all will equally hate the mother who bore them.
REV. CAP. XVII.

The "ten horns," i.e., the seven remaining after the three shall have been "plucked up by the roots" (Dan. vii. 8), (but still called "ten" for the general reason that they are many; as likewise because they are all in alliance with the beast)—these "ten horns," we say, "agree and give their kingdom unto the beast until the words of God shall be fulfilled" (ver. 17).

The word "until" is ominous of change:—here, as everywhere in Scripture, it denotes a change of action or other leading circumstance, when the period shall have arrived to which it looks forward. It denotes that when the prophecy shall be accomplished in the punishment of the Whore, the horns will no longer "agree" to aid the Beast. The woman being "burnt" (ver. 16: conf. Lev. xxi. 9) interests diverge; which, if the horns are rightly divided into protestant and infidel, is easy to believe. In agreement herewith will now commence (we imagine) the tremendous war spoken of in the 14th verse—the last of the direct prophecy, when the horns "shall make war with the Lamb." This verse clearly divides the "horns" into two parties; for in it there are those who attack the Lamb—the infidel host, adverse to His dignity as "Lord of lords and King of kings"; and there are those who are "with Him," and are "called, and chosen, and faithful." It appears then, that the band is quickly dissevered wherewith, by Providential arrangement, the whole "ten horns" are united for the suppression of the idolatrous church; and that, the restraint being removed which she—regarded by courtesy as a "holy" thing, a "king's daughter" (2 Kings ix. 34)—exercised, the repulsion naturally existing among them will be manifested: and they will be gathered only the more densely, in adverse ranks, into the field of war. Satan will fight in the person of the Antichrist; and the Lamb will be victorious in the great struggle, of which the object will have been to extirpate at once His followers, His doctrine, and His name.

It may be that the seven horns will all withdraw together from the alliance of the Beast—himself retaining the three he had swallowed up;—and this leads us to venture upon one further thought, before finishing this chapter. In Rev. v. 6, it is written that the Lamb has "seven horns, and seven
eyes, which are the seven spirits of God sent forth into all the earth." The "seven spirits sent forth"—the "seven eyes"—express (we presume) the holy hierarchical agencies commissioned in the Lord's service, and employed in the spiritual government of His universal Church; and may not by "seven horns" be intended the secular powers of earth employed in the like service—those authorities who lend the sanction and help of human Government to the maintenance of true religion and the free course of the Gospel? Regarding these "horns" as communities existing in every age, they will have been seen in the ancient Church in the "seven thousand" who would not bow the knee to Baal; and it may happen in a fast approaching day—the "great day of God Almighty," that they will be the "seven horns" unabordered into the beast (Dan. vii. 8), who in the final struggle shall be "called" to support His holy cause, and to bring Him triumphant over His enemies. Thus the anti-types of Christ's "seven horns," in the great day of Armageddon, would be the Protestant "faithful" nations.

DANIEL CAP. XI.

In the course of the preceding investigation the writer has appropriated to Louis Napoleon the character of the "vile person," in Dan. xi. 21; and as this is an altogether new interpretation, it is incumbent on him to defend it. This will necessarily lead to a survey—however general, of the whole vision in which the expression occurs;—the verse itself together with the text of the one preceding it, runs thus:

(20) "There shall stand up in his estate a raiser of taxes in the glory of the kingdom: but within few days he shall be destroyed, neither in anger nor in battle. (21) And in his estate shall stand up a vile person, to whom they shall not give the honour of the kingdom: but he shall come in peaceably, and obtain the kingdom by flatteries."

By the general consent of almost all writers, the first
nineteen verses of this chapter admit but of one interpretation. They contain, first, a short allusion to certain Persian kings; secondly, a somewhat longer notice of Alexander the Great; and thirdly, a considerable detail of wars between the kings of the South and North—i.e., the Kings of Egypt and Syria respectively, two of the four great powers that sprang from Alexander, to the South and the North of the Holy Land; the story being brought down with sufficient clearness to the death of Antiochus the Great, A.C. 187. Antiochus had two sons, Seleucus Philopater, and Antiochus Epiphanes, who reigned in succession; and by those writers who read the character and proceedings of the "vile person" (v. 21) in the history of that terrific persecutor Antiochus Epiphanes, the description given in the verse preceding is found to apply in a very satisfactory manner to his fraternal predecessor. Seleucus reigned twelve years; and it may be called the chief feature in his hereditary position, that he inherited from his father the galling burthen of a subsidy due to the Romans of twelve thousand talents, to be paid a thousand talents a-year—a debt which, consequently, he lived just long enough to liquidate. In his distress to collect the money, he had recourse to various dishonest means, and (as Bishop Newton says—2. 125), "was little more than a raiser of taxes all his days." Among other proceedings, he sent his treasurer to seize the money that was deposited in the Temple of Jerusalem; and thus verified more particularly the prophecy, in the sense given in the margin, "There shall stand up one that causeth an exactor to pass over the glory of the kingdom,"—basely plundering "that temple which even kings did honour and magnify with their best gifts; and where Seleucus himself, of his own revenues, bare all the costs belonging to the service of the sacrifices" (ib. 126). The "bearing of the costs of the sacrifices" was, no doubt, in continuation of the appointment of his father, the great Antiochus, who was renowned for his beneficence to the Jewish nation, and his restoration to them of many valuable privileges that—originally granted by Alexander the Great—had in course of time fallen into decay. The reader's special attention is
requested to this circumstance—of the favourable disposition towards dependent Israel of the great Antiochus, as it will be found in the sequel materially to help the elucidation of the prophecy.

With the 21st verse commences, according to Bishop Newton, the history of Antiochus Epiphanes; and the question of all others the most desirable to solve is this—whether from this verse to the end of the chapter is the history of one individual, or of a succession?—and again (if the latter) whether of a succession of individuals, or of great and mighty powers that have come upon the scene in the course of descending ages, as almost all modern commentators hold. It would be an unreal objection to the first of these positions (be the character intended either Antiochus Epiphanes, or one similar to him to appear in the "latter days," of whom he has been very generally considered a type) that a description so lengthened of a single person—or even were it of a single dynasty—is so unusual in the prophetic writings, as to be without a parallel: for it should be remembered that to call attention to some portentous individual, or power, that should immediately precede the establishment of the kingdom of the saints, was found to be the main object of the two other prophecies of Daniel we have had before us; and that the times of all three—almost in their several openings, and quite so in their terminations—are seen to correspond. In pursuance of this main object, the Holy Spirit has been pleased—in the lengthened notice of the "divided kingdom" (Dan. ii. 41, &c.), and of the "little horn" (Dan. vii. 8, &c.)—to enter into such details, as manifestly to shew, that the preceding portions of the visions were framed entirely with the view of introducing and conducting towards it: and consequently, it must with increasing reason be expected—in a later prophecy embodying the same elements of time and action, the last of a series, and the last to be imparted to the aged prophet—that this leading object, referring to the "time of the end," would receive a still more lengthened attention, and be presented still more conspicuously as the chief burden of the prophetic
narrative. Daniel (it is said) "would know the truth" (i.e., wished to know it more particularly) regarding the last "kingdom," and the latter end of that kingdom (vii. 19, et seq.); and this great desire on his part may be considered an invitation to those who would study his inspired book, to concentrate their attention upon the same subject; and surely that which he was so anxious to be informed of, it is reasonable to suppose the Divine messenger would be led to expatiate upon with increased earnestness, and in larger detail.

Now Porphyry, the learned enemy of Christianity (and his learning is the chief thing for us) was able to read with conviction in his mind from ver. 21 to the end, the whole history of Antiochus Epiphanes; which led him to assert that the whole thing was a fraud, and had been written after the events had happened; that in fact it was not the work of Daniel at all. The value of this opinion consists in an ancient writer's regarding the whole account as referring to one man. But the most valuable commentator of antiquity on this subject is Jerome, who seems to have looked with a peculiar attention into it; and his opinion was, that the passage refers to Antiochus Epiphanes partially, and in a typical sense; but that its principal object was the individual Antichrist of the last days:—

"St. Jerome (says Mr. Frere)* agrees with the ecclesiastical writers, his predecessors, in considering the whole of this prophecy as relating to the individual Antichrist of the last days, but was yet induced erroneously (qu.) to admit, to a certain extent, the application of it to Antiochus Epiphanes; observing that, 'as Solomon and the rest of the saints were types and forerunners of Christ, so that most wicked king who persecuted the saints and defiled the sanctuary was, it is to be believed, a type of Antichrist.'"

Geierus also, on Dan. xi. 21—45, observes, that,—

"As Porphyry understood this prophecy as concerning Antiochus Epiphanes alone, so all the ecclesiastical writers previous to St. Jerome understood it concerning Antichrist alone; but it was the common opinion of the Fathers subsequent to St. Jerome, that these things related partly to Epiphanes, partly to Antichrist; or that Antichrist was shadowed forth in this Epiphanes."—Ib. 33.

In Pole's "Synopsis," it is thus stated:—

* "Three Letters," p. 32.
"St. Jerome witnesses that all his predecessors thought the prophecy
to concern Antichrist alone; but St. Jerome, Theodoret, and others,
understand it partly concerning Antiochus, as a type, and partly concerning
Antichrist."—Ib. 33.

It may be granted from these premises, that the events of
the life of Antiochus Epiphanes will stand the test of a close
comparison with the terms of the prophecy; and that they
may be held to be—whether by Providential design or not—
a primary fulfilment of them. The writer himself accepts
the view that the events were pre-arranged for this end, by
Him who determines the relative aspect and bearing of all
things; and without entering into an examination of them,
which would be to enter upon an already well-trodden path,
he commends at once to his readers the opinion of Jerome,
that Antiochus Epiphanes was a forerunner and type of him
who was to come in the latter days. He considers, further,
the lofty allusions and the great details of the prophecy, to
be very insufficiently reflected in the incidents of the life of
Antiochus Epiphanes; and consequently the whole narrative
—if already become historical, to retain notwithstanding its
prophetic character, and to point to him in the last days, for
the recognition of whom, at his coming, the pen of prophecy
so much and so variously labours.

We may observe that the circumstance of the Antichrist
being set forth in historical type, is in accordance with his
character as known to the Church, of being the counterfeit,
and striving to be the supplanter of our Lord; and as
requiring hereby, as a false pretender, that he should be
presented to the imagination under all similar figures and
methods, with the Son of God. The perception of this
prophetic rule is constantly arising;—for instance, as com-
peting in brilliancy with the bright day-star of our hope, the
Antichrist is Lucifer the son of the morning (Is. xiv. 12):
and in like symphony we have heard of him, in the character
of the Beast, as slain and restored to life (Rev. xiii. 12) in
imitation of our Lord’s death and resurrection. And thus it
is—under guidance of this necessary parallelism, that he is
provided with an historical forerunner Ant. Epiphanes, who
holds the same relation to the Antichrist, as does David and other saints to our Lord.

However, after all that may be said, there is very little profit (as we think) to be gleaned from typical history. It may prepare the minds of a contemplative section of the Church for the sort of events that may be approaching, but it is questionable if it has ever yielded a morsel of direct knowledge in anticipation. Its events, like those of our youth, are best appreciated in retrospect, as an evidence of an early and a continuing Providence. The 22nd Psalm, descriptive of the sorrowful experience of David, raised no proportionate ideas beforehand of the sufferings of the true "Man of sorrows," to whom the language chiefly applies. Even the types and figures of the Mosaic law were more calculated to prepare and discipline men's minds for the reception of the Gospel scheme, than to impart information respecting it. "The sense of the types (says Mr. Davison) was a latent one: it was not disclosed to the Hebrew worshipper. It is Christ who holds the key of the types, not Moses: the Law, as delivered, furnished no exposition of them: they were a covered mystery in their institution." How much more obscure must necessarily be the typical evidence of more ordinary events! We shall dismiss, then, all further notice of a primary sense supposed to be enfolded in this prophecy, and confine our attention to that fearful career prepared for the latter days, which we believe it is more surely destined to foreshow.

So many, and so discordant, are the views of the best writers regarding this portion (ver. 20 to end) of the prophecy, that the Rev. Mr. Birks has been induced to collect them into the following agreeable table. If we include (says he) the widest varieties of opinion, they extend from ver. 20 to the close of the chapter. It consists of four parts, each distinct in itself, and which occupy respectively eleven, five, four, and six verses. The various interpretations may be thus classified:—

* Disc on Prophecy, p. 146.
Now with none of these schemes does the writer at all agree,—his belief being (putting aside precursive fulfilment) that ver. 20 alludes to the late emperor Napoleon, and from verse 21 to the end to his successor—the Antichrist—Louis Napoleon. The reader will observe that, in several of these schemes, a place is given to the Saracens and Turks, under the designations of “kings of the south and north”; and it will assist our exposition to refer to the principle given by Bishop Newton, to determine who, in different periods of history, the kings of the south and north may be. He says:—

“These powers are to be taken and explained according to the times of which the prophet is speaking. As long as the kingdoms of Egypt and Syria were subsisting on either side of Palestine, so long the Egyptian and Syrian kings were the kings of the South and the North: but when these kingdoms were swallowed up in the Roman empire, then other powers became the kings of the South and the North: ”

And these the Bishop makes out to have been—that of the South, the Saracens in their times; and that of the North, the Turks—originally Scythians;—which last “over-
flowed, and passed over” (ver. 40), and totally destroyed the Greek empire.

As the opinion now to be hazarded agrees more nearly, than with any other the writer has seen, with that of Mr. Frere, as set forth in his “Three Letters on Prophecy, 1833,”—indeed has been suggested by it; he shall take the liberty of building considerably, as regards references, on that excellent commentator’s foundation. The short outline of Mr. Frere’s opinions is as follows:—he says,—

“The whole narrative of Dan. xi. 21—45, was justly understood by the earliest fathers of the Church to refer alone to the individual Antichrist of the last days; and I propose here, in vindication of this most ancient interpretation, to inquire into the causes which have led to some of these verses, viz., 21 to 30, being now by every commentator considered to relate to Antiochus Epiphanes, king of Syria, an oppressor and persecutor of the Jewish nation.”

This long-expected Antichrist Mr. Frere supposes, and has with great confidence undertaken to prove, was Napoleon Buonaparte. He found it necessary, however, at a subsequent period, to modify the opinion that the whole narrative applies to him, and now regards the last six verses (40 to 45) as unfulfilled—but to be fulfilled in a very immediate future. He speaks, for instance, (p. 16) of “the eighth head of the Roman empire, who is also the subject of Dan. xi. 40—45.”

Now this ancient opinion, that the whole passage (ver. 21 to 45) describes the Antichrist alone, is of necessity, but very unnaturally, connected with the explanation of the 20th verse given above, which ascribes that verse to Seleucus, the elder brother and predecessor of Ant. Epiphanes:—and it seemed to Mr. Frere, (holding the opinion of the ancients regarding the 21st and following verses,) that as so long a course of ages had passed away since the Syrian kingdom fell; and further that, as in applying the passage to Napoleon, his Antichrist—there was an omission much to be deprecated of all mention of the fourth kingdom of Daniel; it seemed (we say) to be in accordance with the general structure of prophecy, to regard this 20th verse as introduced expressly, to supply the otherwise missing link, and as a notice consequently of
this "fourth kingdom." He finds therefore the fulfilment of verse 20 in Louis XVI. of France—the immediate predecessor of his Antichrist. He says,—

"In this history of the Roman empire, as before in that of the Persian, the actions of a single king only are narrated, Louis XVI, the immediate predecessor of the great object of the prophhecy, and here strikingly designated as one who from his exaction of taxes, or financial embarrassments, should cause the glory of his kingdom to pass away; and (accommodating the words of the text) should himself shortly be destroyed; but not fall as other kings, gloriously, at the head of his armies, and in the fury of battle" (p. 11).

It is beyond a doubt that the financial embarrassments of France were the great cause of the Revolution, and of "the glory of the kingdom passing away." Thus our author quotes the speech of a French Deputy in 1816, as follows, "The finances are so intimately connected with the destiny of empires, that their situation is the first object to which statesmen turn their attention. The origin of our troubles proceeded from financial derangements" (p. 71). And inasmuch as mention is made in the prophecy of exaction; and that it is notorious the people of France were first urged to revolt by the very unequal taxation to which they were subjected before the Revolution; it is a plausible speculation, certainly,—when viewed in connexion with the supposed necessity that the Antichrist (said to be Napoleon Buonaparte) should have a herald (as it were) in his immediate predecessor; or (as Mr. Frere would propound) that in this forerunner should be represented the "fourth kingdom";—it is a plausible theory, we say, that the prophetic text meets with its solution in the tyrannical exactions of Louis XVI.'s time. But here arises the great question—not certainly to be determined by this prophecy alone, Who is the Antichrist? In the ancient belief that the prophecy relates to the "Individual Antichrist of the last days," the writer entirely concurs; but this personage has been presumed hitherto, in these investigations, to be, not the Napoleon who is passed away, but he who is with us in the present scene; and by all he reads in the eleventh chapter of Daniel, he finds himself only the more strengthened in this position.
It is not to be forgotten that Louis Napoleon, considered as the Antichrist, has been represented always hitherto as a supplemental being—a sort of duplicate,—something beyond the usual range of "seven"; and that he is never found separated from the root from which he springs. And so universally has this peculiarity appeared in the specula of no less than four great prophecies, that the writer would feel an unconquerable repugnance to any scheme, which should propose to introduce him anywhere separately and independently. It was under the influence of this consideration that he proposed to himself the question—whether it were possible to read in the 20th verse the description of the first Napoleon. The result is—and he says it without any unbecoming doubt, that he finds the verse to fail wholly in describing Louis XVI., and to describe in the most emphatic manner the first Napoleon; and further, that the 21st verse fails to describe Napoleon, and holds up to view with surprising clearness his successor, the "man of sin." These two points, and these only, he undertakes to prove: and to this end it will be necessary to examine more in detail the grounds of Mr. Frere's interpretation, to which the one now to be offered is proposed as an amendment.

It has been observed that the reason with this commentator for affixing the 20th verse on Louis XVI., is the necessity of having, in the chain of royal indices, a representative of Daniel's fourth kingdom. With respect to this "fourth kingdom," we have shewn (we venture to think successfully) that the world has been in error; and consequently, if a representative be necessary of every "kingdom," it is not for the fourth that one is most needed;—but let that pass. We have no objection to urge against the tremendous hiatus of 2,000 years here made to intervene, between Antiochus the Great and Louis XVI., provided the proposition rest on some rational ground. The ground set up by Mr. Frere is the precedent that occurs in the third verse of the chapter, where, after Xerxes, more than half-a-dozen kings of the Persian calendar are passed over,—the prophetic Spirit clearing with a bound the space of about 160 years, and alighting at once on Alexander the Great. In the present instance,
the space so cleared is upwards of 2,000 years and no further warrant for the proceeding is proposed, than the one mentioned. The copy (to say the least of it) is extravagant:—we are tempted to ask, does it satisfy the mind? We think not! Without at all rejecting the idea of this enormous interval probably finding its place in the construction of the prophecy, whether a better reason may not be suggested for it will be soon submitted to the reader's decision.

The 20th verse reads thus in our version, "There shall stand up in his estate a raiser of taxes in" (or as in the margin, "one that causeth an exactor to pass over") "the glory of the kingdom: but within few days he shall be destroyed, neither in anger nor in battle." The literal interpretation of the original, says Mr. Frere, is as follows—"Then shall stand up in his own place" (or "station"—super basi suâ) "an exactor of money, causing the glory of the kingdom to pass away; but within few days he shall be destroyed, not in the fury of battle" (p. 23). Now however well reflected these words may be thought to be in the career and death of Louis XVI., there arises in limine an objection to the application of the prophecy to this monarch, which, to the writer's mind, is insurmountable; it is this—that the events supposed to be alluded to were enacted entirely within the kingdom of France, in complete disconnection from any other country; whereas it is the "Roman empire"—the "Beast"—Daniel's "fourth kingdom," which, according to the hypothesis itself, they should universally affect. Even Austria, the place of its throne, has no part in the exposition. There really has been no more reason given as yet for looking to France singly for a solution of this verse, than to the empire of the Brazils; nor to Louis XVI. than to Genghis-Khan. France, Mr. Frere says elsewhere, is "the tenth part of the city"; and it is difficult to imagine that, in selecting a sign for an age so fraught with consequences to the whole tenten-ths, one so limited in its immediate application would be chosen.

The only satisfactory method of investigating this prophecy is by a close examination of its very terms. Perhaps no passage in Holy Writ more exhibits evidence of distortion
than do the two verses before us. If we compare the Greek with the Latin, and both with the English—all professing to be faithful reflections of the original Hebrew, we find among them only the most general resemblance; which is the more remarkable, as the verses preceding and following them correspond exceedingly well in the three languages. Thus in endeavouring to thread our way through the maze, we have need continually to call to mind that, however successful the author of falsehood may have been in mutilating the text—and it is well to observe that he had a very obvious and especial interest in the exercise of his art in this place—it yet contains, undoubtedly, the means by which its mystery may be unveiled in the day of God's appointment; for “the words (of this prophecy) are closed up and sealed till (i. e., only until) the time of the end” (Dan. xii. 9). The disjointed words will doubtless serve the same end as the remaining fragments of arch and pillar in a ruined abbey, to tell the original plan of the structure. Let us then endeavour to seek our way through the present entanglement, weighing the sense of every word, if haply it may be that the “time of the end” is close at hand. The following seems a full and exact translation of verses 20, 21:

“And there shall stand up from its (very) root, a sprig of royalty (the της is omitted by Grabius) upon its base, (or “place prepared”) one causing to pass over, exacting taxes, the glory of the kingdom: and in few days he shall be shattered (or “broken”) neither in anger, nor in battle. He shall stand upon his base, he had been despised, and they gave him not the glory of kingly rule. And he shall come in peaceably (or “at a prosperous, or fortunate, juncture”), and shall obtain the kingdom by flatteries (or “by fraudulent,” or rather—“orring behaviour”)."

The charactristick of the opening passage in these verses is a remarkable intermixture of metaphors. To “stand up on its base,” or “pedestal,” is the position of a statue,—to which the phrase, we presume, alludes. The words “from

* 20. Καὶ αὐτοῦ φυτὸν τῆς βασιλείας εἰς τὴν εν τῆς καταστράφησαν τῇ συντριβήσεται, καὶ οὐκ ἐν προσωποῖς, οὐδὲ ἐν πολέμοις. 21. Έτσι εἰς τὴν εν τῇ συντριβήσει αὐτοῦ, ἐξουδετερώθη, καὶ οὐκ ἐδοκεῖ εἰς αὐτῷ βασιλείας, ήξε τῇ εὐθυμίᾳ, καὶ προστάτωσε τῇ βασιλείας εἰς ἀλοιπόματα.
his root a sprig of royalty" allude to the growth of a plant. "One causing to pass over, &c.," is in a direct sense the person previously described metaphorically; which is indicated by the participle (παραβίβαζον) taking the masculine form, instead of the neuter to agree with the substantive (ϕυτόν). But this series of transitions, though perhaps uncommon, cannot be said to obscure the sense. Now, in Mr. Frere's "Three Letters" (p. 65, &c.), there is a learned disquisition on the first of these phrases, "Then shall stand up upon its base" (or "in his estate," Ang.)—being an examination of certain objections of Mr. Faber's to his (Mr. Frere's) interpretation of them. The words occur in both the 20th and 21st verses; and the controversy turns on the meaning of the word "his,"—whether it should be considered as used in a reflective or demonstrative sense;—"in his own estate," or, "in his (i.e., his predecessor's) estate";—(Latinice) "in suo imperio," or, "in ejus imperio." It appears there is the same ambiguity in this respect in the original Hebrew, as in the English.* The learned Geierus (Frere, p. 68) "invariably translates the phrase thus, 'super basi sud,' i.e., on his own base"; as if the "raiser of taxes" stood up in a place prepared especially for him, or said to belong to him without reference to the source of his right. This author repudiates the words "in loco ejus" (in the place of a predecessor) as found in the Latin Vulgate, "which (he observes) no one in the least skilled in the Hebrew language can fail to see is quite irregular, &c." Now upon the ground here attained that the words ("shall stand up in his estate") do not denote a succession, but means—"in an estate belonging of right otherwise accruing (may we not venture to add—in an estate of his own raising?) it is manifest that the sons of Antiochus the Great are excluded; and thus an opening is made (the first

* The following remarks on this subject are from "Todd's Discourses," p. 152. "The difficulties of this prophecy are greatly increased by the ambiguity of some of the pronouns, whose antecedents it is sometimes not easy to determine" (Examples are mentioned in verses 5, 7, 10, 11, 17, 18, 20, &c.). "The Hebrew seems to make the 'raiser of taxes' (ver. 20), and the 'vile person' (ver. 21) two different agents, and so the Latin Vulgate, and Syriac. But Theodotion makes them one and the same."
requisite) for the introduction of the interval proposed of 2,000 years. As between the claims of Louis XVI. and Napoleon to be here described, the words "in suo imperio," or "super basi sua," befit them equally; yet under a very different force of meaning, in each, of the word "suo." As applied to Louis, "suo" may signify a right descending to him, as befits his case, though not descending from a presumed and forementioned predecessor. As applied to Napoleon, the word assumes a more emphatic tone—a right of his own acquiring. A very prominent sense having been ascribed to this phrase, we have thought fit to express the notion, that it was intended probably to carry a more emphatic signification—one more interesting to the world at large, than simply to denote the right of property. And it will be admitted that an "estate of his own creating"—a "base of his own constructing"—are terms which describe faithfully the new and irregular uprising of the power of Napoleon; while also they give a preference to him over Louis XVI. in the appropriation of the text,—there being nothing in the history of the latter which imparts the least force to the expression.

The preceding words of the passage—"from his root a sprig of royalty," admit of the like observations:—"his" must refer either to the predecessor of the "sprig"—Antiochus, or to himself. If it be assumed to mean his predecessor, we are at a loss to shew from history either the fact or probability (nor can we believe it was intended by the spirit of prophecy that it ever should be shewn—which is equivalent to saying that the idea finds no place in prophecy) that Napoleon descended from Antiochus the Great. But the difficulty is equal in the case of Louis XVI.† We are of opinion, that άνατομεν refers to φυτών,† carrying the sense of

* We are strangely reminded, nevertheless, that the Antichrist has ever been expected to descend from the tribe of Dan (Bishop Newton i. 471);—also that another expectation derivable from Scripture says, that he will be an Assyrian (Is. x. 12)—both pointing to an Eastern origin,—a passing thought for the ethnologists.

† It is true the word is not aspirated in this place, as it should have been if intended to signify his own; but the chapter abounds with
"suns"; indeed it is an irresistible conclusion, that the same is the case in both instances the passage supplies:—it means his own root, and his own estate. The sense of the passage will be most apparent, if an emphasis be laid upon the word "root," as in the translation proposed above, viz., "There shall arise from his (very) root." In the metaphor which speaks of human society as a tree, with roots, stem, and branches, the roots are the lower orders labouring in the earth literally; and "a sprout from its very root," though indicating a rise in society, may yet be put in humiliating contrast with the expression "a branch springing out of a stem"—setting forth a much higher position. So applied, this latter figure, spoken by Isaiah of our Lord—"Then shall come a rod (or branch) out of the stem of Jesse"—may be thought to supply a suitable contrast between the Holy One, and him of the latter days whom we are supposing the former figure to depict, and who will spring (Dan. ii. 43) from the earth born masses—the "miry clay" of mankind. Here again we cannot but be conscious of the text being more naturally applicable to Napoleon, than to Louis XVI.

Hitherto, on the authority of the above eminent critics, we have assumed the words "upon its own base" to be a right translation of the original,—rendered by the LXX., "ἐπὶ τὴν εὐομασίαν αὐτοῦ": but it must be manifest that the word εὐομασία signifies rather a preparation of any kind, e.g., a spot of ground prepared for any particular purpose:—we are inclined to go further, and say (on the strength of the αὐτοῦ)—prepared by oneself for a particular purpose. Jones, in explanation of the word, quotes Eph. vi. 15, "Your feet shod with the preparation (ἐν εὐομασίᾳ) of the Gospel of peace"; where the expression is manifestly associated with the idea of self exertion. Thus, then, the "sprig" (φυτοῦ) may have prepared "for himself"—or at least, (if the criticism be not admitted) may have found prepared for him, anomalies of this kind, as was mentioned a page or two back in a note from Dr. Todd. The sense must not be allowed to depend upon small circumstances of this sort, but rather on the acceptation demanded for the single terms by the general bearing of the prophecy, in its presumed harmony with other prophecies.
something more suitable for a "sprig" than a pedestal, viz., a prepared spot of ground to spring from. Such would be, at the time of Napoleon's rising to imperial power, the kingdom of France well-harrowed and well-weeded by the Revolution; and brought certainly into this necessary state of preparation, chiefly by himself.

The consequence of this remark, if admitted, will be, that we get rid of the incongruous medley of metaphors (sprig and pedestal), and have no other transition than from the first of these (φυτων) to the antitype enfolded in the word παραβιβαζων. The translation will then stand thus—"Then shall spring up from its very root a sprout of royalty, on a spot duly prepared,—one causing, &c." We are sorry to say that, building on the researches of others, it is without the power of further debating the matter that we have hazarded these remarks; our only object being to shew by the help of common sense, as we think has been done, that in the comparative claims of Louis XVI., and Napoleon, to have been in the view of the prophet, even hitherto the balance is wholly in favour of the latter. But we arrive now at the more important charactersticks the verse supplies.

The next word to be considered is παραβιβαζων of the LXX. With the context it reads thus—"παραβιβαζων, πρασσων δοξαν βασιλειας"—rendered in the English text "a raiser of taxes in the glory of the kingdom," and in the margin, "one that causeth an exactor to pass over the glory of the kingdom." A more correct translation of the words ought to express (according to Mr. Frere and others) that there would arise "a raiser of taxes, causing the glory of the kingdom to pass away." Now, παραβιβαζω does not signify "to cause to pass away"; but "to cause to pass over"; "to carry away"—(Liddell and Scott); "to put away," or "transfer";—as in the text, 2 Kings xii. 3, "And Nathan said unto David, the Lord also hath put away (transnstit) thy sin." This is a very important difference. If the glory of the kingdom be made to "pass away," it is dissipated and lost; but if to "pass over," it still retains its existence; and then the sign may be thus read, "making to pass over the glory of the kingdom." Let us now reflect on the expression
in this sense. If the career of Napoleon be attentively considered, in its relation to the broad arena of the Roman empire wherein it ran its course, and to the broad surface of those ages with which, representatively as Head of empire, he stands connected;—if (we say) this remarkable career be so examined, and its most salient points be put in array, (as we may imagine to have been done by the angelic modeller of the prophecy) to the end of seizing upon some one or two of them as signs of this terrible chieftain's coming; we ask the question—which of these salient points would have been the most likely one, above all others, to have engaged the angel's attention? In seeking an answer to this question, some persons would turn their thoughts, perhaps, to his "glorious victories"—his ensanguined fields of suffering, and agony, and death, and all evils:—but no! such things are the undistinguishing marks of all the "bestial" aspirants to fame and glory—the ruffian tribe of sovereign conquerors, who "do according to their will" (Dan. xi. 36). There is a remarkable instance of the Spirit's indifference to this universal sign, in the portraiture given in this very prophecy of Antiochus the Great. By the defeat he sustained near the city of Magnesia, when the Roman army under Scipio destroyed no less than 50,000 infantry and 4,000 horse, his kingdom became tributary, and the Eastern ascendancy of Rome began. The consequences of the battle were so important, as to merit its being regarded, like the battle of Waterloo, as a pivot or turning-point of history; on which account it has received the notice of prophecy, in the detail of the wars of the kings of the south and north of those ages. But what notice? This only (ver. 18), "but a prince (i.e., of the isles—the State of Rome) on his own behalf shall cause the reproach offered by him (Antiochus) to cease": that is, the reproach of the invasion of the Roman territories. Withdrawing then our eyes from fields of glorious murder, in what event (we again ask) shall we seek the verification of the remarkable sign—"making to pass over the glory of the kingdom"? It is in that most important event, the termination of the "Holy Roman Empire," in 1806, after a duration of a thousand years; and the "passing
over" to France and her ruler of the chief rank in dignity and power of the Roman world. This may be truly called a leading and distinguishing feature of the age, affecting the whole Roman world, and the structure of its history,—a notable and enduring landmark in the wide field of time, well worthy of the prophetical notice of Him, at whose bidding the sovereignties of the world flourish and decay. Although at this epoch the title of Holy is said to have ceased, the Roman empire itself has, even yet, not run its course; it has only "transferred" to another "head" the honour of its sovereignty, and has "passed over" its crown to its "eldest son."

The next word to be considered is πρασσων, and the idea it conveys of "exacting taxes."* The English margin speaks of "causing an exactor to pass over;" Mr. Frere, of "an exactor causing to pass away." The question is—what is the right connexion of πρασσων (one exacting, or, an exactor) with the context? The authorized English text treats the word as not possessing a transitive power; for it speaks of "a raiser of taxes in the glory of the kingdom." The "in" looks very like a makeshift, dictated by a desire to impart some sense where none appeared without it. Or, if it be more decorous, remembering the admitted faithfulness of our translators, to consider this particle an evidence of their great solicitude to be exact in the translation, even at the expense of sense (which they leave to shift for itself)—it is at any rate certain that the sentence as it stands, in the ordinary acceptation of the word "in," is destitute of meaning; and under these circumstances it is necessary to assume a sense (some one of which the word is capable)

* Were it not that we are under the imperative correction of the English version which speaks of "exacting taxes," and had no other guide than a good lexicon, we should be much inclined to think that πρασσων claims in this place a more literal interpretation; and that "exact taxes," which is a merely metaphorical view of the word, was not at all in the mind of the prophet. The Latin Vulgate certainly does not countenance the idea. We should have given to the passage the following simple interpretation—"making to pass over to himself, and unworthily affecting (or putting on) the glory of the kingdom"—but we do not pretend to propose it.

A A
under the best guidance we can find. If, then, the word \( \pi\rho\alpha\sigma\omicron\omega\nu \) is to be received in the sense of *exact*ing, we are inclined to think that "*in*" may express the sense of *for*, in *promotion of*, with a view to; in fine, much the same as it does in Latin when used with an accusative; and as if it were written "*in gloriam regni*" (in promotion of the glory of the kingdom).* The amended reading will then be—"making to pass over, (and) levying tribute *in aid of*, the glory of the kingdom." Thus the Greek and English versions are brought into complete harmony, and found to present—if not a verbally similar, yet—a strictly homologous sense. In the former, Δοξαν βασιλειας may be called the subject both of \( \pi\rho\alpha\beta\iota\beta\alpha\xi\omega\nu \) and \( \pi\rho\alpha\sigma\sigma\omicron\omega\nu \): of \( \pi\rho\alpha\beta\iota\beta\alpha\xi\omega\nu \) in a direct manner—of \( \pi\rho\alpha\sigma\sigma\omicron\omega\nu \), because tribute is the means taken to *exalt* the glory spoken of:—and thus it falls out that a direct translation of the Greek presents a reading in English exactly corresponding with the one above given. Or (using the marginal text, and placing the words "an exactor" between commas, we may read the English as follows—"one that causeth, an exactor, to pass over (to himself) the glory of the kingdom." Let us now see how far the history of Napoleon's method of "*carrying away and transferring* to France the glory of the kingdom," *i.e.*, the *glory of the Roman imperial rule* will countenance this view of the passage.

The principle that directed all Napoleon's wars was the necessity of providing by the spoil of his enemies against the ever-recurring evil of an exhausted treasury—an evil which was continually leading to the verge of national bankruptcy: and not only was his habitual system to throw upon the invaded countries the cost of his armaments, but also miserably to provide by his enormous exactions, limited only by the means of the vanquished, for the exigencies of his Home government, relying upon the bounty not of nature but of

* In the sentence—"he shall plant the tabernacle of his palace between the seas, in the glorious holy mountain" (ver. 45), Dr. Lee changes the "*in*" into *for*, thus:—"*for* (i.e., to be) a holy mount Sabaim": (Lee on Prophecy, 196)—a sense of "*in*" scarcely at all differing from the one we advocate.
victory, for the very continuance of the national existence. Count Mollien, his finance-minister, has recorded, that in the autumn of 1805, the state of the treasury was such, that there was an absolute necessity for some desperate measures, to stem off the evils that menaced the nation: and undisputed history testifies that this was the great and only motive for breaking up the camp at Boulogne, and proceeding, with the sheer intent of robbery (πραξικτικ), to invade the Austrian dominions. At Vienna, Alison speaks of "the enormous contributions the Emperor directed to be levied upon the inhabitants" (Epitome, 257); and he further says, that his hasty return to Paris after the battle of Austerlitz was caused by "a financial crisis, which, if the issue of the campaign had been different, might have led to ruinous results"; . . . . . for that "had the war continued a few months longer, a national bankruptcy must have taken place."

"There were in fact no longer any resources in France whence extraordinary funds could be obtained; and the expedient of loans (as in Great Britain) being impossible in a country the commerce of which was ruined, the system of continual foreign conquest and spoliation became indispensable, and continued so throughout the Empire, as the only means of maintaining the costly fabric of Government, and the enormous military establishment, the burden of which was almost wholly borne by the tributary establishment, and conquered states." (Epit. 245).

After the battle of Jena (1806),—

"Napoleon publicly threatened that he would impoverish the Prussian nobles 'till they should beg their bread.' The execution of this last menace was speedily commenced by the levy of a war contribution (πραξικτικ) of 6,200,000l. (equivalent to double the sum in Great Britain), which was enforced with ruthless severity." (Epit. 257).

Of 1807 we read of the Hanse towns being visited unrelentingly with the scourge of military contributions:—

"But it was on the people of Prussia that the hand of conquest fell heaviest. Hard as were the ostensible conditions of the treaty of Tilsit, they were greatly aggravated in the course of the execution. Besides the war contribution of 24,000,000l., fresh claims to the amount of 5,800,000l. were brought forward after the peace by Daru, the French Receiver-general for North Germany; the principal fortresses were retained in pledge for these payments; while 150,000 men were quartered on the territory, and maintained at its expense." (Ib. 284).
Here we behold the *Exactor* with a vengeance:—the following passage peculiarly illustrates the words, "with a view to the glory of the kingdom":—

"The manufacturers, freed from all foreign competition, were roused into more than former activity by the vast public expenditure, in which must be included the enormous sums levied from half Europe, in the shape of subsidies and contributions, all of which were laid out for the benefit of the French people. On his return from Austerlitz, the Emperor had found the treasury empty, and the bank nearly insolvent; but the plunder of the next campaign gave him a year's revenue in advance in the state coffers, besides a large reserved treasure in the vaults of the Tuileries. . . . . . So long as the rule of Napoleon endured over foreign nations, no want of money was ever felt at head-quarters. Hence were derived the funds for the execution of the magnificent public works which illustrate this era. Roads, bridges, canals, and dockyards—colleges for instruction in all branches—and public monuments, commemorative of the glorious deeds of this brilliant period, were seen rising on all sides; and the people at large, dazzled by the splendour of the spectacle, yielded to the illusion that the Revolution, nursed in violence and baptized in blood, was now to shine forth in a blaze of unprecedented glory." (Ib. 281).

Add to these acts of extortion, the pillage of all the great works of art in Spain and Italy, and the aggregation in Paris by the imperial robber of all that constitutes the external magnificence of nations, and we behold a still more full reflection of the words of the prophecy,—"providing by extortion and plunder for the glory of the kingdom." The following observations of Mr. Frere (p. 47), intended to illustrate the 24th verse, are surely a good deal more applicable to the one before us:—

"It was the particular boast of Buonaparte, that finding his army destitute of everything at the beginning of this war (in Italy) he not only amply provided for its maintenance for two years by the spoils of the conquered country, but moreover sent 30 millions of livres to Paris, for the use of the government; and thus by combining the lust of plunder which influenced the barbarians of the north, in their ancient invasion of the Roman empire, with a degree of skill and science in war which could only have been found in a society in its most advanced state; as well as by the recklessness with which he seized and transferred (sic!—σαραβησαται) to the metropolis of France those wonders of art which the triumph of the Roman arms had in still earlier ages brought from Greece, he satisfied the strong language of the prophecy, which says that he shall do in these respects 'as his fathers have not done, nor his fathers' fathers.'"
We really have not the imagination to perceive how these observations elucidate the 24th verse; but, as applicable to the 20th, the reader cannot fail to discern their value. The sign προσων, (we would lastly observe) is a sign affecting the whole beast—the Roman empire; and on this account, like the sign παραβαλαξων, is entitled to a consideration, such as (we repeat) it can in no wise claim when applied to the times of Louis XVI.,—in whose case it could at the utmost have related to the financial administration of a single kingdom.

But the verse before us contains another sign, than which even the very portrait of Napoleon would scarcely present a stronger evidence of the man designed; while (we venture to say) it is totally irrelevant when applied to the unhappy Louis XVI.: it is said, “within few days he shall be destroyed, neither in anger nor in battle.”

“This king (says Mr. Frere—meaning Louis XVI.) shall shortly be destroyed, but not fall as other kings, gloriously, at the head of his armies, and in the fury of battle.” (P. 12.) Glorious privilege certainly!! “Morte peribit infaustâ, quam nulla tamen comitabitur gloria bellica” (Geierus, ib. 25):—would an inhabitant of heaven have talked about “gloria bellica”! There is an ambiguity in the use of the word “destroyed” (συνηκιβησεται, LXX.,—conteretur, Vul.) fatal, if not exposed, to the right view of what it here expresses. The meaning has no affinity with that sort of destruction which befell Louis XVI. Literally, and precisely, it means—“shall be crushed”—“shall be broken.” The reader will at once perceive how faithfully the word describes—first the annihilation of Napoleon’s power, and ultimately his death in the place of his banishment. But what says the context?—“he shall be destroyed neither in anger nor in battle.” Surely this must be spoken of some one who, from the nature of his career, or of his position, was liable to fall in the heat of battle. It is not to be mentioned as a distinguishing mark of a peaceful monarch, that he shall not fall by the sword:—what wonder is there in that!—one is tempted to exclaim. But to say of one who was to be “a man of war from his youth” who was to com-
mand probably in twenty general actions, that he should not fall by the sword, is to draw attention to a peculiarity. Of Louis XVI., the peaceful king, the prophet would rather have written, that he shall die by violence, or that he shall not die of gout—the natural end of French kings. But of Napoleon he writes—"he shall not die in anger"—which he was on the point of doing; for (as Blackwood says, Aug. 1853, p. 176) "If he had fallen into Blucher's hands, that officer proposed to have him shot in the ditch of Vincennes, in the very spot where the Duc d’Enghien was murdered; a proposal which was ineffectual only through the generous objections of the Duke of Wellington": "nor in battle"—which it is equally notorious he avoided on more than one occasion, on the principle of "sauve qui peut," and the pretended ground of state necessity. The "few days" of the text is another sign—in length they were just ten years. The expression answers to, and is probably the original of, the "short space" of Rev. xvii. 10;—which last is, consequently, a valuable echo of John to Daniel. With much confidence do we now ask of the reflecting reader, whether the 20th verse is not a mirror in which he beholds Napoleon; and whether every word and syllable of it is not a reflection of some well known feature of that successful and ruthless chief.

We now proceed to the 21st verse; in which the comparison is between Napoleon and L. Napoleon. According to the most ancient belief, says Mr. Frere, the personage described is the Antichrist of the last days:—that Antichrist he pronounces to be the great Napoleon. On the ground we have throughout maintained that Louis Napoleon is the true Antichrist, we say the verse refers to him. In English the text runs thus—"And in his estate shall stand up a vile person, to whom they shall not give the honour of the kingdom: but he shall come in peaceably, and obtain the kingdom by flatteries."

The symbol of identity in diversity between the two Napoleons, in the book of Revelation, may be considered to be the words—"I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed" (Rev. xiii. 3);—
and so impressed are we with the fact of the unvarying presence however concealed, and of the unvarying character of this prophetic sign—which treats these individuals as two portions of a whole, that (as we said just now) we should indispensably require to recognise it, in every passage of the sacred text which was imagined to treat of them. Now, in the English version, there is no particular sign to remind one of this identity; nor indeed in the Latin; but in the Greek there is. It is observable that at the commencement of every one of the twelve verses preceding the 21st, and of the seven following it, stands the word "καὶ"; and throughout the chapter this conjunction is ever at hand to head the verses where new subjects begin: but in proceeding from the 20th to the 21st verse, there is an exception. The obvious consequence of this absence is, that the subject is continued into this 21st verse from the one preceding it. And in unison herewith, the first word of the verse is—not αὐανωτη σταται (he shall stand up), but—στη σταται (he shall stand). To assist the apprehension of this important difference, the following case may be supposed:—we say to a riotous boy in a schoolroom, in a twofold command—"stand up on that form; stand at the further end of it":—where the first word describes the act of rising, the second, the position taken. The words exactly set forth (as we believe) the difference of position, relatively to each other, of the two Napoleons. Again, the latter of these "shall stand up" (or, as just said, "shall stand") "in his estate." Here, as in the previous verse, the "estate" spoken of is either that of his predecessor, or his own;—but it happens in the present instance, that the result is the same under either view. He stands in the estate of his predecessor—as being represented in a condition of identity with him: he stands in his own estate (super basi suâ—a base of his own erecting) as is attested by recent history.

The same individual is designated "a vile person":—now, in reference to the hypothesis that the great Napoleon is meant, we ask—in what possible sense can it be said, that he was a "vile person"? Is it that he was not noble by birth? The thought is trivial:—it would go to compromise
as vile more than half the great men of all ages. Nor does the expression allude to immoral and infamous habits; for then he would not have been the object (as the text intimates the "vile person" was) of the free choice of a Christian people. "Vile" means of small known value in the community to which he belongs—recommended by no personal services—destitute of public merit. As a soldier, or a ruler, in no part of Napoleon's life will the epithet "vile" apply: it could only do so in his juvenile years, before he had given tokens of his superiority. And among a people where la gloire—that which raises ideas the most opposite to what is vile—is the chiefest good, no "bestial" conqueror (Dan. vii. 7) ever deserved better of his country.

Again, how does Napoleon's history respond to the words—"to whom they shall not give the honour of the kingdom"? These words suppose, of necessity, that the supreme authority of the realm was to be "given" away; that a "vile person"—one unknown to fame, presents himself opportunely; and that the people, accepting him, determine upon investing him with a dignity inferior to that of royalty. The only portion of Buonaparte's history to which we could look for the application of these words, is when he was made Consul. A few extracts from Alison will shew the absurdity of the notion:

"The progress of the conqueror of Egypt from Frejus to Paris was one continued triumph: all the day the people flocked in crowds to see the hero who was to save the Republic." . . . . . "He was presented in state to the Directory: splendid encomiums were pronounced on his victories." . . . . . "So general had the conviction become of the impossibility of longer maintaining the Republican form of government, that intrigues were far advanced for restoring monarchy:—Buonaparte, though convinced that the moment had arrived for seizing (seizing!) supreme power, had as yet no fixed plan of operations; and his conduct at this critical juncture is a memorable instance of his profound knowledge of human nature, &c., &c." (Epit. 159). "The legislature was now to deliberate under the bayonets of the soldiery." (11). . . . . "Presenting himself at the bar of the Ancients, Buonaparte, regaining his energy, denounced the repeated violations of the Constitution of which the Directors had been guilty, and concluded by threatening the vengeance of his followers against any one who should dare to propose putting him hors-la-loi:" . . . "A furious crowd exclaimed—'Death to the Dictator; no Cromwell!'"
In fine, this famous struggle ended with the abolition of the Directory, and the appointment of three Consuls; of whom it was determined that "one alone should possess real authority, the other two being only his advisers." (Ib. 160-1.)

Alison continues:

"All ranks of the people, worn out with past convulsions, felt that repose could be obtained only under the shadow of military authority, and joyously acquiesced in the change." . . . . . "Thus ended the changes of the French revolution, in the establishment, by universal consent, of a Government, which swept away every remnant of freedom, and consigned the State to the tranquillity of military despotism." (!)

Is it possible in the face of these extracts to imagine, that the words "to whom they shall not give the honour of the kingdom"—implying an unconstained appointment on the part of the people, and who make choice of a "vile person"—apply in the least degree to the establishment of the Consulate!

Again, with reference to the Empire, the text says (or, is supposed to say), "but he shall come in peaceably, and obtain the kingdom by flatteries":—and here we say with equal confidence, that the manner of Napoleon's obtaining the kingdom will in no wise countenance the appropriation of these words to him,—calling to mind, as we should ever do, the terseness and exactness of the prophetic expressions. Listen again to Alison:

"It would be well for the memory of Napoleon Buonaparte if, after recounting his matchless military glories, and the admirable wisdom of his civil administration, the historian could stop short, and be spared the narration of the dark and bloody deeds which ushered in the Empire. Up to the beginning of 1804, both the army and the people were either reconciled to the Consulate for life, or submitted in silence to an authority which they could not resist." (Ib. 218.)

After reciting the murder of the Duc d'Enghien, that of Pichegru, and of Captain Wright, the arrest and trial of Moreau, &c., the historian says,—

"It was in the midst of these bloody events that Buonaparte assumed the imperial crown. The project had been first broached by himself to the Senate, shortly after the death of the Duc d'Enghien; and as that obsequious body immediately entered into his views, it was resolved that it should be brought forward in the Tribunate, an equally facile instrument of his will."

It was there urged that "it was only by placing the
crown on the head of the First Consul, that the dignity, the
independence, and the territory of the French people could
be preserved"; and concluded their harangue by proposing
that,—

"We lay before the Senate the wish of the nation that Napoleon
Buonaparte, now First Consul, be declared Emperor, and in that quality
remain charged with the government of the French Republic, and that
the imperial dignity be declared hereditary in his family." . . . . "The
hereditary succession was referred to the people, and the result of the
registers was 3,572,329 affirmative votes, and only 2,569 in the negative.
History affords no instance of a nation so unanimously taking refuge in
the stillness of despotism."

The ceremony of the coronation was deferred till the
autumn; and,—

"To recall, as Napoleon was anxious to do on every occasion, the
memory of Charlemagne, the first French Emperor of the West (remark-
able words—in their connexion with what we have called the key-stone
of our exposition), the Pope had been invited to be present. His
participation, however, extended only to the benediction; and it was
by the hand of Napoleon himself that the crowns were placed on his own
head and that of Josephine. The multitude, though dazzled by the
spectacle, shewed little of the enthusiasm evinced on former occasions;
but this was amply atoned for by the fervent acclamations of the troops
on the following day, when Napoleon, in the Champ de Mars, distributed
to the regiments the eagles which were thenceforth to form the standards
of the army." (Ib. 221-2.)

Now, where are the predicted "flatteries" in all this? The
flattered, rather than the flatterer (we should say), was
the rising chief, when what Alison calls the "celebrated
eulogium" was pronounced on the occasion by a Minister of
the day,—"The first place was vacant; the most worthy
was called to fill it: he has only dethroned anarchy."
"Peaceably," and "by flatteries"!—Can it seriously be pro-
pounded that either sign applies! Peaceably is translated in the Greek "ἐν ἐνθημα"—in the flourishing state of a
thing: as if allusion was made to a lucky opportunity—a
fortunate cast of circumstances,—no possible allusion here to
the event of 1804. The "flatteries" of the prophecy is met
on that occasion by the audacity of history.

Now, if the features here portrayed are not those of the
great Emperor, it will occur to every one in the habit of
reading a daily newspaper, how fully every clause and every word of the description is reflected in the remarkable uprising of Louis Napoleon. The best possible comment on his right to be considered the "vile person" of the text he has himself supplied, in the public avowal that he was a "parvenu." What other merit recommended his election but his name!—a name of which, notwithstanding, the first portion descends from a source but little illustrious—his father, determining him to be but a "little horn," however great an Emperor. He was called first to supreme power under the title of President—not to "the honour of the kingdom." But the text requires that the "vile person," while still "vile"—still unrecommended by public (in his case martial) merit, should obtain the kingdom by "flatteries." And so it happened. At the end of the short space of four years (a significant measure of time, however)—during which he had omitted no occasion of shows, festivals, and reviews—the most grateful pabulum of French vanity, he enacted the famous farce of his tour through the provinces, in the autumn of 1852; and is it not (we ask) most precisely true, that through the dirt knee-deep of the most ridiculous adulation, caresses, and flatteries,—largesses to towns, villages, and institutions,—building a cathedral or two,—immense increase of salaries,—distributing eagles, and cartloads of decorations,—romping with fishwomen, and putting on the white breeches and jack-boots of his uncle at Strasbourg,—attending hospitals, and most humbly saluting Church dignitaries,—talking of a "French lake," and promising withal peace ("coming in peaceably") he got himself promoted to the imperial throne. The cost of this month's tour exceeded thirty-one millions of francs, or a million and a-quarter sterling. The most wary or the most enthusiastic student of prophecy could not propose a more complete fulfilment.

But we doubt if we have yet exhausted the meaning of the word "flatteries." When in the conduct of an individual it is given as a prophetic sign, it would seem not lightly to reflect upon the age or country wherein such a means is resorted to; and to denote a depravity of mind and sentiment in its regard—even more base on its part, than on that of him.
of whom it is spoken. An age where much thieving goes on carries proof in itself, not only of the ingenuity of its thieves, but of the neglected state of its bolts and bars. The best evidence of this depravity in the case before us, would be found in the language employed by public functionaries on the occasion;—let us select some specimens from the records of the day. M. de Persigny, Minister of the Interior, writes thus to the Prefects of Departments,—

"The act (that of the journey of the Prince President) is so great in itself, and accomplished under circumstances so gloriously exceptional, that every fact connected with it becomes significative; and it is the duty of the Government to enregister them with the most scrupulous exactness, and to possess itself of the most complete documents, in order to write and deliver to the memory of the people one of the finest pages of our history. (!) . . . . You must make known to me the names of the mayors, councillors, manufacturers, artists, farmers, old soldiers, and without exception, of all those who shall have had the honour of having had relations with the Prince, in order that the names of all who have taken any part, however humble, in the events of this glorious journey, shall not be lost to history. It is wished that all these documents, full of national interest, shall form a complete whole, which will remain in each department as one of the most valuable documents in its archives. You will be happy, Mons. le Prefet, to take part in this idea."

The Prefect of Toulouse thus addresses the public:—

"As soon as you shall hear this cannon, which thundered at Austerlitz and at Wagram at the time the European world cowered under the hand of France and the genius of the Emperor, announce the coming of the heir of his name and of his power, the coming of the saviour of Christian society, of the restorer of the principles of authority and of national grandeur, of him who, by his wisdom and his profound love for the people, has raised himself to the height of the first of his race, arise, leave your workshops and your houses, run before him, shout to the very heavens with all France this cry of glory, which drove our fathers to the battle-fields, where they immortalized our eagles."

The Mayor of Sèvres proclaims the empire in his own bailiwick in this style:—

"Inhabitants, Paris, the heart of France, proclaimed on the 10th of May for its Emperor him whose Divine mission is every day revealed in such a striking and dazzling manner. At this moment, it is the whole of France electrified which salutes her saviour, the elect of God, by this new title which clothes him with sovereign power. 'God wills it,' is repeated with one voice—Vox populi vox Dei. It is the marriage of France with the envoy of God which is contracted in the face of the
universe, under the auspices of all the constituted bodies, and of all the people."

The following address was presented to the Prince at Montpellier:—

"Our Prince, who art in power by right of birth and the acclamation of the people, glorified be thy name; thy kingdom come, and may it be perpetuated by the immediate acceptance of the imperial crown of the great Napoleon; thy will, firm and sage, be done, in France as abroad; give us this day our daily bread, by diminishing duties on the necessaries of life; forgive us our trespasses, when assured of our repentance and our improvement; lead us not into the temptation of cupidity and place-hunting, but deliver us from evil—that is to say, the evil of secret societies, the vices of teaching, and the errors of the press, and from all kinds of elections," &c., &c. "Amen."

The Bishop of Chalons, in a circular letter, calls the Prince "the man of God"! Is it not true, then, in every point of view, that "flatteries" were the steps of Louis Napoleon's throne! Let us here add—though not a part of this sign, that he looks forward with earnestness to being consecrated in his kingdom by the Roman Pontiff:—

"He presents himself (says the 'Times,' March 15, 1853) as the successor of Charlemagne and Napoleon, who were both consecrated emperors by the Pope; and believes that the same ceremony performed at Notre Dame, will confirm his pretensions, and ratify his accession to the imperial throne."

Let us further add our impression, that in the late creation of the Order of St. Helena, Louis Napoleon may be viewed as resuscitating his Uncle (i.e., his NAME); while also he himself is seen to spring out of that name by "flattery"; it is a stage in the "healing of the wound."

It now becomes necessary to inquire why the two verses we have examined—the essence of the whole chapter in its relation to the present age, are separated from the verse preceding them, which undoubtedly treats of Antiochus the Great, by so enormous a gap of time:—with this inquiry we shall conjoin the question, whether the subject of these verses—the united reign of the two Napoleons, does not hold a position in the construction of the prophecy, very similar to what we have observed it to hold in the septenary series of other prophecies; and whether the inspired word is
not—here as universally elsewhere, impressed with this sacred stamp. It may be presumed, in contriving the prophetic narrative, that the heavenly Author proceeded upon some plan,—whether invented for the occasion, or adopted from former precedents. It would be profane to suppose He spoke after the wild and random manner of Delphic vaticination; such a notion could spring only from our own dulness. And to say the least, it is only the opposite persuasion, pursued in reverence and in despite of appearances, that can lead to a probable view of the plan. It may further be presumed, after the numerous instances we have witnessed of the mystic relation, first certified from Daniel, that subsists between the numbers 4 and 7—sometimes manifesting itself by "four" being expanded into "seven," at other times by the "four" taking to itself "three" of a different nature or of altered intensity,—that this peculiar rule has again, in the present instance, come into operation:—let us at least try whether its presence may not be discovered.

The seven steps, or signs, of this purely historical though prophetic narrative, it is obvious must be sought for on a different principle from what has guided us in the vision of the "Image" of the second chapter, and in that of the "four beasts" of the seventh. We do not here find a single mystical object as in the first of these instances, nor a quadruple one as in the second, resolvable into seven parts: in the present vision the objects accord with nature throughout, and are in fact the ordinary characters of human history. Consequently, the signs must be of the human nature,—must be seven of the characters alluded to in the scene, selected under guidance of some predetermined principle. Now, the essential purpose of this prophecy was to inform Daniel, and through him the Church, of the proposed restoration of his people (i.e., the Jews) in the "latter days," to the permanent enjoyment of the high distinctions they had forfeited:—"I am come (says the Angel, chap. x. 14, where the prophecy begins) to make thee understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days." But it is a remarkable fact that, in the long course of the 11th chap., not a word of allusion is made expressly to the Jews; and
even in the 12th chap., into which the prophecy continues, the allusions are extremely scanty and indirect. Notwithstanding this, knowing that the thread of gold which runs through the whole piece is the future, and the returning welfare of Israel, it is presumable that the principle we are in quest of will have its foundation in this purpose; and that the human signs selected from history to divide the intervening times, and lead expectation onwards to the happy age foretold, would, in their own nature and temperament be in unison with the subject they are thus called to assist in developing. What artisan would think of dividing a measuring-rod of ivory with points of iron! What Christian minister of dividing the seasons of the year with the names of ancient heroes, rather than the saints of his holy religion! Prophets, no less than poets, must be observant of good keeping; and it would have been no greater offence against propriety to have sent home the account of the battle of the Alma by a Muscovite officer who might have fallen into our hands, than that the prophet should have handed forward the happy purpose of the restoration of Israel through the names of Antiochus Epiphanes, of Herod, or of Titus—the persecutors and destroyers of their commonwealth. We believe, then, the basis upon which this prophecy is constructed, and the essential condition of being admitted into its series of "seven" regal signs, to be a friendly feeling at the least towards the Jewish nation, or some important benefit rendered to them—the better if in itself illustrative of their final peace.

Before proceeding to test this principle, we must observe upon certain peculiarities in the construction of the chapter, which seem—but only at the first view—to preclude its application.

In every scheme of interpretation that is worthy of notice (as Mr. Birks has shewn in his Table) this chapter is seen to extend the whole length of time from "the first year of Darius the Mede" (ver. 1) to the destruction of Antichrist. It assuredly does not halt at any nearer point of time. Furthermore, that point of time, notwithstanding the claim
set up for Napoleon Buonaparte to be the Antichrist, is still future—for the following reason. In ver. 1 of chap. xii. it is said "At that time Michael shall stand up for his people"—that is, shall bare his mighty arm for the restitution of their temporal polity. At what time? Of course the time last mentioned—which is the "time of the end" (xi. 40),—the time when the Antichrist is represented as only proceeding to his destruction. Now as Michael has not yet "stood up," the fall of the Antichrist must be future. And further, if it be true that the portion of the chapter from ver. 21 to the end is a detail of the career of the Antichrist (an opinion to which the writer has signified his adhesion), and with whose fall the chapter terminates; it is clear that—it having been shewn that the Antichrist, Louis Napoleon, is the eighth, or supplemental "Head" in these septenary measurements—the whole of our series of seven must be found antecedently to the 21st verse. And not only so, but as the seventh Head—the Great Napoleon—has been recognised in the 20th verse, it follows that the six first Heads must find their places within the first nineteen verses. Again, inasmuch as it is agreed on all hands that with the 19th verse closes the career of Antiochus the Great; and as (according to our theory) with the 20th verse opens that of Napoleon the Great, there lies between these royal signs a tremendous gap of time, of some two thousand years, to be accounted for,—a stone of stumbling (we may truly call it) to be removed, and some reason suggested why the prophecy does (as it were) ignore the very existence of this enormous period. These are the peculiar difficulties to which—if it be true that our plan of interpretation has to contend against them—it is likewise true that it owes its existence.

The historical signs would of course be taken from among sovereign princes, who have either included the state of Judea in their dominions, or in their public acts have been brought into close relation with its people,—thus deriving to themselves the opportunity of shewing kindness to them. Now, in the second verse of the chapter appear, at once, the four first signs of the seven. "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 Greece." The angel does not say, there shall stand up ten or twelve kings in Persia, in conformity with history:—but why not? It is in obedience to the plan referred to: he resorts to the catalogue of Persian kings for an expression of the enigmatical "four"—the first portion of the "seven." Especial care is taken that Xerxes, (the fourth) shall be recognised; the reason of which we believe to be, that the reader's attention should be confined to the first "four" kings of the dynasty, and not suppose that any four would suffice to fulfil the great condition of the signs. Now, in enquiring as to the disposition of these Kings towards the Jews—the essence of the sign, we are glad to meet with the following most appropriate observations of Mr. Davison (Disc. on Prophecy, p. 326). Speaking of the famous Edict of Cyrus "in the first year of his reign," he says—

"There was a supernatural direction upon him, a direction which prompted his mind, and incited his act; God so expediting the fulfilment of His word, wherein He had said—'he is my shepherd, and shall fulfil all my pleasure.' Accordingly, the restoration (i. e., of the Jews) was instant; . . . as though his conquest had been given to him only that he might fulfil the prophecy, when God 'opened before him the two-leaved gates of brass,' and he through those gates let go the captive people, redeemed into freedom; and that 'not for price or reward.' . . . His solemn proclamation setting forth the prophecy was a public recognition of it to his empire."

The author proceeds thus:—

"But one certain and important use of this Edict of Cyrus, founded upon the prophecy, was in securing the favour of succeeding kings of Persia to the Hebrew people, for the safety of their affairs, and the complete restitution of their city and temple. (See Ezra v. 13, 17; vi. 1, 2, 14; ix. 9.) It is well-known what great reverence and honour was paid to the memory of the founder of their empire, and to all his acts, by the Persian princes who came after him; in which hereditary reverence to Cyrus, the 'appointed shepherd' of God, that people had for some time their best security and protection, when miracles were withdrawn, and their reviving condition had to struggle its way through much trouble and danger. And thus this part of prophecy may be traced, in the disposition of things under God's ordinary providence, advancing to its fulfilment: that fulfilment taking its rise from the original act of Cyrus,
who left to his successors a reason and an example for promoting the same purpose of the Divine command. Hence Prophecy may be truly said to have governed the kings of Persia towards the resettlement of the Hebrew people."

See on this latter point Ezra vi. 14. Now an hereditary policy of this sort—an established leniency of rule originating in a principle of dynastic piety, and descending through a long line of kings, is of course of greater intensity the nearer to the source from whence it springs; and hence arises the propriety of the four first, rather than any other four, of the Persian monarchs being taken as the Signs of the prophecy.

At the first view of the case of Xerxes, there might be a doubt of his qualification to appear in the list of Signs. Xerxes, Dr. Milman has shewn satisfactorily (Hist. of Jews, ii. 16) to be the Ahasuerus of Scripture; in whose reign occurred the matter of Esther and Mordecai; when at the instigation of Haman a decree went forth from the king, for the utter extirpation of all the Jews throughout the empire. A careful perusal, however, of the book of Esther will shew, that the king was altogether deceived by the device of Haman, and astonished when better informed at the anticipated effects of his own decree (see Esther vii. 5—7). And this is farther shewn by the alacrity with which he entered into the project of revenge upon the Jews' enemies, though these were his own Persian subjects; and the willingness with which, after one day of savage slaughter, he consented to, and promoted, the further work of carnage, even after five hundred of his people had been slain within the precincts of his own palace (Est. ix. 12). This was a most signal deliverance to the Jewish people, and from the most imminent calamity that had ever menaced them: it has been celebrated as such at the feast of Purim by all succeeding generations. With great propriety therefore this deliverance holds the place of honour, in the fourth, or central, portion of a series, which sets forth in practical type the successive steps and instalments of the great deliverance to come; when—not in the hundred and twenty-seven provinces of Persia only, but in all the countries of the earth, the seed of
Abraham shall be recalled to God's service, and advantage be given them over their enemies, in the "latter days."

The secret is not at all times alike impenetrable, regarding the peculiar relation which subsists between the two parts—the "four" and the "three"—which make up the "seven":—in the present instance we think it may be thus stated. The first part—the four Signs already mentioned, are merely in natural agreement and harmony with the general design of the prophecy,—at best they are permissive of good to the favoured people: the latter part—the three Signs to follow, are active rehearsals of its ultimate fulfilment,—open demonstrations of its scope, purpose, and measure, when the fulness (abundance) of the Gentiles shall be poured in upon them. It will be found, we say, that these latter Signs, each in its day, sets forth in practical type that overflowing mercy and grace to Israel in the latter days, which the prophecy, in words however few, pronounces.

Of these Signs the two first—i. e., the fifth and sixth of the series,—are Alexander the Great, and Antiochus the Great. The allusions to Alexander are easily recognised, in verses 3 and 4. In making good this sign, a brief reference will be sufficient to the generous treatment the Jews received from the Macedonian conqueror, and to its well-known cause—the vision he saw in his own country, before starting on his Asiatic expedition, of the High Priest of the Jews in his glorious apparel. The writer is weak enough to put faith in this wonderful piece of history, notwithstanding that Dr. Milman calls it "a romantic and picturesque story": we consider that, by this premonitory vision, Alexander was especially called, like Cyrus, to the service of God. It is certain at least that he was an eminent benefactor of the Jewish nation. Bishop Newton, in his defence of the above story, says, that without the supposition of its truth—

"It will be extremely difficult to account for Alexander's granting so many privileges and favours to the Jews. He allowed them the free exercise of their religion; he exempted their land from tribute every seventh, or the sabbatical year; he settled many thousands of them at Alexandria with privileges and immunities equal to those of the Macedonians themselves; and when the Samaritans had revolted and murdered the governor whom he had set over them, he assigned their country to
the Jews, and exempted it in the same manner as Judea from tribute.\footnote{Bishop Newton, ii. 46.}

Also it is mentioned by other writers that Alexander took upon himself the \textit{whole expense of the temple-service and sacrifices}. This may remind us of the earlier sign in the history of the chosen nation, when the Gentile Pharaoh, through the mediation of Joseph—the type of Christ (thereby a spiritual light being shed upon the transaction) furnished support to the famishing family of Israel. And thus the Gentile Alexander provides for the divinely-appointed worship of the Most High. And thus it is typically seen that on the "fat things" of the Gentiles the Jews will spiritually feed in the latter days.

Between the age of Alexander and that of Antiochus the Great, the lot of the Jews was diversified. They did not escape the sufferings incident to the wars around them, between the kings of the South and North, though as the bush of Sinai remaining unconsumed. Many were deported into slavery. On the whole, however, they were well-treated by the Ptolemies, under whose dominion they chiefly fell. On this account we presume it is that Prophecy \textit{continues} the history between the two \textit{great} signs, in verses 5 to 10,—intimating (as it were) that the stream of blessing did not fail;—a better reason (as we think) than it would have been to urge the \textit{historical necessity} of continuing the links between the fifth and sixth signs. These brief intermediate notices are not such (the least reflection will point out) as to create a competing claim on the part of any of the sovereigns referred to in them, to be taken as the sixth Sign instead of Antiochus. The utmost that can be said in commendation of the Ptolemies is, that they granted \textit{protection}, and did not molest the religious profession of the Jews; but history records no especial benefits,—nothing to evince their being called by Providence to that higher office, more effectual than good-will, which should fit them to appear among the \textit{living symbols} of the Divine love.

With the 10th verse, at the word "one," (Bishop Newton, ii. 103) commences the history of Antiochus the Great, and it is continued without intermission to the 19th verse. The
question occurs—If no ostensible cause presents itself, can no actuating one be imagined, for this lengthened notice—so greatly out of proportion with all the other notices bestowed on the "kings of the South and North"? We believe it to be the one that has been mentioned. This long detail is intended as an honourable distinction,—the Holy Spirit thus signifying a peculiar interest in the history of Antiochus, and a general approval of his treatment of the chosen people—the true theme of His pen. Of all the potentates of these early ages, no one was so distinguished in the meritorious work of giving support to, and strengthening with privileges, the ancient people of God's choice, as Antiochus the Great. In Bishop Newton's report of him, from Josephus, we read,—"he gave order that their city should be repaired, and the dispersed Jews return and inhabit it; that they should be supplied with cattle and other provisions for sacrifices, should be furnished with timber and other materials for finishing and adorning the temple, and should live all according to the laws of their country; that the priests and elders, the scribes and Levites, should be exempted from the capitation and other taxes; . . . that as many as had been taken and forced into servitude should be released, and their substance and goods restored to them" (ii. 117). Another author says:—"he repaired their city, and restored them all the privileges originally granted by Alexander" (Pinnock's Mangnall, 220),—which privileges, consequently (be it observed), must have been somewhat on the decline and ready to perish under the unproductive sun of Ptolemaic favour. It is no slight confirmation of the view here taken, that this beneficence of Antiochus has received an honourable mention in the text of the prophecy:—it is said of him (ver. 16), "he shall stand in the glorious land, which by his hand shall be consumed." (LXX. "perfected")—that is (says Bishop Newton) "shall prosper, or flourish, in his hand." "What is said" (i.e., in a letter of Antiochus preserved by Josephus) "about finishing and completing the temple, answers exactly to the word perfected, or consummated, in the Hebrew" (ii. 116, 18).

It appears then that between the two great benefactors we
have named, there "stood up" no one to befriend, in any material sense, the elect but dependent people of Israel; yet that the allusion made to the sovereigns of the intervening period should be considered of avail, as an acknowledgment of their not unfriendly dispositions; not to mention that it helped somewhat to secure the recognition of the last of the Signs, when he should come upon the scene.\footnote{Farneworth, speaking of the precise ages of our first six signs, says, "Under the first kings of Persia they (the Jews) were still very weak, envied by the Samaritans and exposed to their insults. . . . . By little and little they were established again; the country was repeopled, the towns new built, and the lands better cultivated than ever. And there was such a profound peace and tranquillity, that, for near three hundred years, there happened no commotions, nor anything that marks the common subject of histories; and from thence proceeds that great void that we find betwixt the times of Nehemiah and the Maccabees. The temple was honoured even by strangers, who brought thither their offerings." (History of Israelites, p. 202, &c.)}

To Alexander and Antiochus alone, of those ages, did the praise belong of building up, and providing of their own substance, for the sacred worship of the Most High established at Jerusalem; and of contributing the elements of worldly abundance and magnificence to the instituted material of the Divine service. By these signs we are prepared for beholding Israel in the latter day receiving gladly of the goodly stores of the Gentiles:—may we not even observe an ascending progression in the typical favours bestowed upon them, illustrative of what may come to pass at their final restoration? The Persian kings favour a return of those who will to their own land: Alexander provides in addition for the worship of the true God: Antiochus in addition sets about re-establishing their temporal polity.

We have made good our six first signs. And being now arrived at the edge of the great hiatus which separates the sixth from the seventh Sign, the question presses—what plank of reason can be found, on which our plan of interpretation can be conducted in safety to the other side? Co-ordinate with this is the question,—why were not the seven signs distributed equally over the whole domain of time, as in the antecedent visions of the "Image," and the "Four
beasts”? For example—why, instead of taking four kings of Persia at a single stroke of the pen, was not the first considered sufficient; whereby an opportunity would have arisen of adding to the list such names as Antiochus Epiphanes, Herod the Great, and Titus; and so of at once obtaining a more extended field of time, and of advancing (as suggested by Mr. Frere) into the age of the Roman dominion? Now, after what has been said, there can be no mistake on this question. Would there have been a due regard to good-keeping, in sending down the promise of a full restoration to their lost country to the distant generations of Israel—(we say “full restoration”: for it is well known that not even the tribe of Judah half returned to their own land, under the auspices of Cyrus, Darius, and Artaxerxes; as is demonstrated by the fact, that among the petitions to Alexander when at Jerusalem, upwards of two hundred years after the last of these Persian monarchs, it is stated that “they requested the freedom of their brethren in Media and Babylonia,”—(Milman, ii. 30);—in sending forward (we say) this gracious promise, through names held by all Jews in so just abhorrence, as the names of Epiphanes, who first reared the abomination of desolation in their temple; of Herod the oppressor, and would-be heathenizer of the nation; and of Titus the subverter of their commonwealth! And here we are prepared further to assert, that since the days of Titus, indeed of Antiochus the Great, there has arisen in the whole world no systematic and effective benefactor to Israel, until history brings us to the age we live in,—no one therefore on whom the sacred sign of the “seven” could be stamped.

Another equally imperative consideration it is, that from the days of Antiochus the Great to those of Titus,—that is, from the last living Sign in the prophecy to the day when the Jews ceased (as it were) to be a nation, there was not an individual among the “kings of the South and North,” whose royal position was such as to allow him to appear among the seven royal signs;—for the reason that freedom of rule is an essential ingredient of fitness for the glorious work, of which it is said that “kings shall be thy nursing fathers,
and their queens thy nursing mothers” (Is. xlix. 23). Under Antiochus the Great, towards the end of his reign, as the result of his invasion of the Roman territories, the kings of Syria became tributary to the Romans:—and thenceforward, neither in Syria nor in Egypt, the two adjacent Macedonian kingdoms, did a single sovereign arise whose power was not dependent on Roman protection:—and the utmost that Eastern native sovereignty was thereafter suited for, in the preparation of the Divine imagery, was (as in the case of the two sons of the last-mentioned monarch) to fore- shadow in the events of their respective reigns the predetermined courses of the remaining imperial signs, to arise in a remote futurity—in the glorious day when Michael “shall stand up for his people.” The sons of Antiochus the Great, as brothers in succession, fitly represented the close connexion, and asserted unity, between those remaining signs—the two Napoleons. The great point of resemblance between the eldest of these (Seleucus Philopator) and the first Napoleon seems to have been, that each of them sustained, and at the same time pillaged, the Church, in order to maintain his royal state; for Seleucus (as mentioned already) continued to bear the costs of the temple-service at Jerusalem, while yet he sent an officer to seize upon its treasures:—in like manner Napoleon restored the fallen religion of his country after a ten years’ prostration, by the acceptance of the Pope’s concordat in A.D. 1802; while yet he laid foul hands on its wealth, and sent its princes to die in exiled poverty.

It follows, that from the life of the younger brother, (Antiochus Epiphanes) a hint or two may be gathered as to the nature of the events that will soon fall upon the astonished world: in the blood-coloured mirage of the past will perhaps be found shadowed forth the shapes of things, soon to be seen on our horizon.

We are to observe that the six first signs are taken entirely from the silver kingdom of Daniel’s “Image.” The “four” Persian kings fitly set forth the breast of the figure, and the two arms in this instance are Alexander and Antiochus. The two next portions of the Image, the belly and
thighs, and the legs of *genuine* iron,—*i. e.*, the Roman empire in its fullest extent, beginning a couple of hundred years before Christ, and terminating with the *pure* iron in A.D. 1806, are totally excluded from the honourable office of helping forward the designs of the Almighty towards the seed of Jacob. The spirit of prophecy declares the reason: —the Romans were from first to last the great enemies of the Jews,—the rod in the Lord’s hand for the chastisement of His people. By them was the “abomination of desolation” set up in God’s temple,—first, by their vassal Antiochus Epiphanes, and secondly, by Vespasian. By them was the Lord of glory slain. By them was the commonwealth of Israel overthrown. And to them in all their affiliated kingdoms has been assigned the miserable task of treading down the family, of which, as concerning the flesh, the Lord of glory came. How then could they appear as royal principals in a narrative, which professes to foretell the redemption of the ancient nation, and especially therein to depict the successive means and agencies of the Divine favour towards them; having been appointed rather as the scourge of the Lord, and the instruments of His anger! Now the Roman power of *pure* “iron” was overthrown by Napoleon, and its diadem *transferred* (ver. 20) to France. Immediately, Michael began to stand up for his people.

It may be truly said that for, now, about a hundred years, —that is, ever since the relentless power of the iron Charlemagne was seen to be on the wane, the condition of the Jews in the different states of Europe has been gradually improving, as if an unwonted blessing from heaven was gathering around them. They have dwelt in peace, secured both by public law, the general advance of society, and a milder spirit of Christian toleration, from the active enmity of mankind.

The last severe edict against them was issued by Frederick the Great in A.D. 1750: the particulars are given by Milman, (Hist. of Jews, iii. 399,) who commences the story thus:—“The legislation of Frederick the Great almost (as it were) throws us back into the middle ages.” In England, in 1753, a Bill passed through Parliament for the naturaliza-
tion of all Jews who had resided three years in the kingdom, and bestowed upon them almost all the privileges of British subjects; but the clamour of the people, aided by mercantile jealousy, obliged the ministry to repeal the obnoxious statute. It is a subject of thankfulness, however, that the Governmental power of our country has thus washed its hands. In the year 1780, Joseph II. ascended the imperial throne; and "among the first measures of that restless and universal reformer was one for the amelioration of the condition of the Jews." By Louis XVI., in 1788, a commission was appointed for remodelling on principles of justice all laws relating to the Jews;—but by the revolutionary tribunals, more rapid in their movements, they were recognised at once as free citizens of the great Republic, with equal rights. (Ib. 400-2.) The coming wind is known by the heaving of the sea;—we advance to the time of Napoleon, the prophetic Sign. "A parallel (says Milman) has often been instituted between Cromwell and Buonaparte; it is a curious coincidence—that both should have been engaged in designs for the advantage of the Jews. In the year 1806, while this extraordinary man was distributing to his followers the kingdoms of Europe, and consolidating the superiority of France (mark the words—equivalent to παραβιβάζων δοξαν) over the whole continent, the world heard with amazement, almost bordering on ridicule, that he had summoned a grand Sanhedrim of the Jews to assemble at Paris. We are more inclined to look for motives of policy in the acts of Napoleon, than of vanity or philanthropy; nor does it seem likely that in this singular transaction he contemplated remotely, if not immediately, both commercial and military objects." In 1807, an imperial edict confirmed the whole system of organization, that had been proposed by the Deputies for the Jewish nation, throughout the empire. Before the fall of Napoleon, many of the German States—including Prussia, Baden, and Bavaria—" issued ordinances admitting Jews to civil rights, exempting them from particular imposts, and opening to them all trades and professions: and by an act of the Congress of Vienna, in 1815, the Diet is pledged to turn
its attention to the amelioration of the civil state of the Jews throughout the empire." (Ib. 409.) Thus it will be seen that the prospects of the chosen people, slowly brightening for half-a-century before, were immeasurably improved by the imperial Beast—the Roman Emperor and empire—in the days of Napoleon; and that throughout the wide dominions of his rule or his influence, their civil condition was everywhere placed on an amended footing, in relation to the other classes of their fellow-citizens.

The seventh sign is past;—the eighth, its formidable adjunct or renewed self, is approaching. It has been shewn that the interregnum between these signs, assured by other prophecies, has no other notice in the present one than that, while the text (ver. 20, 21) separates the two halves of the sign, yet it so writes them as to make them read as one—i.e., in the Greek. But why do we revert to this remarkable feature? It is to shew that in the history of the favoured people, this interval has had a great significance. As yet it is in relation to carnal Israel only we have considered the prophecy;—but is it for temporal interests alone we should expect the archangel "to stand up"? May we not recognise in the efforts made during the last forty years, and especially in our own favoured land, for the spiritual regeneration of Israel—in the voice of our societies bidding the benighted ones return to the principles of Mosaic truth; and placing in their hands, almost without price, the multiplied copies of their Holy Scriptures; together with the equally holy Jewish records appended, of that "Branch of righteousness," to whom the earlier scriptures bear witness;—may we not rather recognise in these things the "standing up" of the heavenly prince for his people?—"He taketh pleasure in the stones" of Zion—the scattered fragments of the once living temple that are found in every land, not only because they bear the ancient visible stamp of Abraham, and for the fathers' sake; but because from their contexture, He observes their suitableness beyond that of all others, to serve as the materials of the Lord's dwelling, when He shall deign to revisit the earth. As the commencement of this work was,
so we have seen its continuance to be, entirely under the sign Napoleon; the interruption of the sign (which is peace) having afforded the necessary time for some—however slight spiritual preparation.

It is then under the present phase of the last sign, that the great consummation of Israel's return may be expected. The wars and commotions, the changing fortunes of many nations, that will signalize the latter days now coming upon us (Rev. xii. 1), may be regarded as the pods in which the interests of the chosen nation will be matured:—it may be gathered from the statements of this prophecy, even apart from what is elsewhere decreed, that the restoration of Israel—the most important act in the drama of human history, will quickly open upon the admiring world; and will be continually making progress so long as the eventful reign of the Antichrist shall continue:—"A nation shall be born in a day" (Is. lxvi. 8)—this in respect (we presume) of their spiritual life; but previous to this, in respect of their temporal polity, they who have ceased to be a nation shall come forth to a new term of existence. We can scarcely doubt, from the conspicuous position of the wilful king in this prophecy—regarding him (as intimated in v. 21) as the completer of the will of a predecessor, that he will take a prominent part in promoting the return of carnal Israel to their own land; and although it is said (Is. lx. 9) that "the ships of Tarshish (England?) shall be first to bring thy sons from far" (this may perhaps mean—the acceptable spiritual offering now made at Jerusalem, conveyed thither in the contributions of our people), it may be that another power, actuated by different principles—those of Roman pride and infatuation, will longer maintain its exertions in behalf of the great unconverted body of the stiffnecked people.

It is not for us to scan the ways of the Lord in the selection of His instruments. "He turneth the wrath of man to His praise:"—the inference is direct, that the agents of His beneficial rule will not seldom be men of selfish passions, but great energy, seeking their own and not the Divine glory.
But such instruments if He takes in hand and emblazons with honour, He as readily casts away:—of the three greater Signs we have now considered, the prophecy is careful to point out,—of the first (Alexander) that "his kingdom shall be plucked up"; of the second (Antiochus) that "he shall fall and not be found"—for it seems doubtful even what, and where, was his end (Bp. Newton ii. 124); of the third (the double Napoleon)—the first of them that "in a few days he shall be destroyed"—the second, that "he shall come to his end and none shall help him."

We trust it has now been sufficiently shown, that this great prophecy presents an uniform construction with the other prophecies of Daniel that have been examined.

At this point of the investigation we are brought into contact with the images of future things; and prudence as usual, if it does not positively forbid, counsels vehemently to abstain from any but the shortest examination of them. The first question that arises is this,—Are we to regard the long portion of the chapter, from ver. 22 to the end, as appertaining to the joint dynasty of the Napoleons, or to that of Louis Napoleon only? A good deal of prima facie probability attaches to each of these views. If the two Napoleons are treated of as one, what more probable than that the prophet should append to the joint description a joint history? Under this view the explanation of Mr. Frere would, no doubt, mainly stand, which brings the history of the first Napoleon down to the 39th verse. Yet it will occur that some of the most striking points of this interpretation are just those, which are of all the most likely to find their re-application in the events of future time; and that, consequently, the uncertainty is the greater as to their possible reference to the past. For instance, "the ships of Chittim" (ver. 30)—if they are the British fleets, as has been said—are almost certain to be notable engines of future warfare. So too the text—"he shall cause them to rule over many, and shall divide the land for gain" (Ver. 39), though tolerably descriptive of the parcelling out of the Continent among his followers by Napoleon the Great, declares a result of extensive
conquest of all the most likely to re-occur.* The preponderance of probability is, to the writer's mind, altogether in favour of the other supposition—that the whole prophecy is to be appropriated to Louis Napoleon. Analogy seems to insist on this view. In several chapters more or less, but more particularly in the 7th of Dan. and the 17th of Rev., the reference to Napoleon the Great has been found exceedingly limited; he is treated more as a forerunner: while a complete excitement of interest is manifested, Daniel himself giving the example, as the prophetic narrative approaches the day of his successor. In fact, these latter days of the world (again we repeat) appear to be the butt at which every shaft of prophecy is aimed, and on which the Holy Spirit wishes, apparently, to concentrate all attention.

But here another question arises,—Is it to L. Napoleon personally that the prophecy refers; or to L. Napoleon as the Head of a prophetic period; and with him, therefore, to the age he introduces. We observe, in reply, that this long passage has the appearance of the continuous narrative of a single career, similar to the personal histories of the “Kings of the South and North” in the earlier portion of the chapter. These “kings” are clearly shifting titles; and consequently, it may be so in the present portion also,—the same titles being in it also mentioned. But the “vile person” is neither of these kings; and there is an individuality expressed in the title itself—the “vile person,” which does not readily admit of its merging, subsequently, into a title used generically. At any rate, the individual theory of these verses is the one which alone admits of the distribution of the whole prophecy under seven signs—the preceding signs being all personal histories, with no other adventitious history between them than what is necessary for the purpose of connexion. This rule we regard as the safety-lamp prepared purposely for this region of darkness, enabling the bearer of it to avoid the

* It is questionable whether this sign—the dividing the land for gain, i.e., for his own profit and advantage,—as if he had parcelled out the conquered nations as farms to return a rent, can at all be said to be exemplified in the proceedings of Buonaparte.
stumbling-blocks of historical resemblances and other fanciful imaginations. To this view therefore we shall think it wise to adhere. Without some such guidance, it must be evident to those who are acquainted with the variety of interpretation that has been proposed for this prophecy, that the imaginative faculty—to which nevertheless all prophecy addresses itself—is but an ignis fatuus, leading into sloughs of doubt and bewilderment. Forming its conclusions in twilight, it is apt to magnify, or to diminish, to an absurd degree, the importance of the prophetic expressions it encounters, and in which are (this only we are sure of) wrapped up so mysteriously the things of future time. To point out the apparently most significant of these expressions, and throw what light we may be able on the more salient points of the narrative—all that can in safety be ventured upon—will now be our endeavour.

If it be true that this passage of scripture (ver. 22 to 45) is the delineation of a single career, and that the martial career of Louis Napoleon, it cannot be passed over that we have already seen him engaged in one brilliant feat of arms, at Sebastopol:—History, therefore, already looks anxiously to see, whether this her newly developed feature can be recognised in the mirror of Prophecy. The 22d verse in English runs thus, "And with the arms of a flood shall they be overflown from before him, and shall be broken; yea, also the prince of the covenant." Now the picture here presented is very confused; but feeling no obligation on that account to put it aside as unintelligible, we look around for some orthodox and authoritative comment upon it,—such we consider to be the Greek version. It runs thus, "Καὶ Βραχίωνες τοῦ κατακλυζόντος κατακλυσθῆσονται ἀπὸ προσωποῦ αὐτοῦ, καὶ συντριβθῆσονται, καὶ γεγομένος διαθήκης." The literal English of this we take to be as follows, "And the arms of the invader shall have been overwhelmed from before him, and shall be crushed." (The remaining words we will consider presently.) But as κατακλυζόω has primarily to do with the overflowing of water, the above words may be read with more force as follows, "And the arms (i.e., two arms—naval and military) of the overflower shall be overflown from before
him." Now the peculiar feature of this statement is, that there are two cases of invasion:—the invader is invaded. It is not that the invader is repelled, as were the French from Spain; and as would have been the case in the late war, had the operations been confined to the banks of the Danube; but that takes place which in war is, of all things, the most uncommon—that a counter-invasion is determined upon. It is as if, in 1812, Russia—seeing the French armies advancing across the continent—had resolved upon a counter expedition by sea to Marseilles. The English words—"with the arms of a flood shall they be overflown"—seem to contain the same double reference; and we fancy also that in the word "flood" must be an allusion to invasion by water. Altogether, we should say, that the miniature is excellent:—the prophetic notice, however short, is sufficient to show that Sebastopol—especially the "overflowing" from Varna, as much entered into the arrangements of predestinating Providence, as did the overthrow of Pharaoh in the Red Sea. But what are we to look forward to from the long remainder of the chapter, seeing that Sebastopol occupies scarcely more words than there are letters in its own name! The last words of the verse are, "Yea, also the prince of the covenant." In the Greek it is simply (after a comma), "and the prince of the covenant." But as two witnesses are to be preferred to one, we observe that the Latin says with the same emphasis as the English, "insuper et dux foederis." Now this "prince of the covenant" is the Sovereign of England, as may without much difficulty be shown.

In the 22nd, 28th, 30th, and 32nd verses we meet with this word "covenant." It is obviously given as the designation of a Party;—who are these? Those commentators who regard the narrative as applying solely to Antiochus Epiphanes, must needs consider it as signifying the Jewish nation:—whom else could it signify? They only, in those days, were in express covenant with God. But further,—the word is used in these texts not only as a designation, but as a term of distinction and contrast:—by employing it to distinguish one of two parties—whether opposed to, or co-operating with, each other (viz., the forces of the "vile person, and
those of the "Covenant") a positive proof is afforded that the other party, even though Christian, are not of the covenant. Be it first observed, that the same reason which would have made the designation in question applicable aforetime to the Jews, now gives it to Christians:—they only, in the present age, can claim to be the "holy covenant" of God. As to the Jews, it is a question whether, now, they can even be viewed as, in any sense, a "holy" people—such as we read of in the next chapter (ver. 7); but as to their peculiar covenant, we know that it is long ago utterly broken up and abolished; and that they only who receive the covenant of grace can possibly now be considered (as St. Peter calls them) "a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people:" in which text the title "royal priesthood" at once marks them as the conservators of the covenant that is, and themselves by ascription as the "holy covenant." And here we arrive at the essential question—Is it the whole professing Church to whom is here applied by the Spirit this "new name"? If so—who are the opposing, or the co-operating, party (for one of these relations the text supposes) who are not of the covenant? We cannot afford in this question to put aside the recollection that we are engaged with the days and power of the Antichrist; to whom as a designation, still less as a distinction, it cannot be supposed the term can apply: indeed it is in manifest contradistinction to his followers that in these texts the word is employed; notwithstanding that both parties may agree in holding the Christian profession. If then the Christian community in its wide extent be seen to contain those who are, and those who are not, "the Covenant," it becomes an essential step in the interpretation to know, and feel, who they may be on whom the gracious appellation is bestowed. History—the only intelligent witness—claims to speak to the question.

It is an oft-expressed opinion among writers, that the British nation, having done her best with the Divine help to burst the chains of superstition, and detach herself from the degrading connexion of Rome—so "gaining the victory over the beast," are to be regarded as "the favoured nation" of the present age of the world, the appointed conservators of
God's "truth," holding in the Divine arrangements the position of Israel in past times. On this belief it would be futile here to dilate: the fact can only rest on the evidence of circumstances, and it is one which must be either received, or rejected, according as God wills it in every mind. Believing it ourselves, and that Great Britain is the "nation" mentioned in Matt. xxi. 43, we accept the dictum of Mr. Frere (p. 54) that "the British nation is called the holy covenant of the present dispensation."* We prefer however to say that the "holy covenant," as it has peculiarly a spiritual reference,

* The following passages from Mr. Miller's Sermon before the Jews' Society (1854) on the text "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof"—are suggestive of the same idea:—

"England at this crisis of the world's history is the metropolis of Christianity in the world; the loftiest candlestick on which Christ has set His light." "Yon petty island is the spot of His sovereign election. Her's is the supremacy of the seas; her's the weightiest influence among the nations; the giant America is her child; from her have come forth Transatlantic, Asiatic, Australasian colonies, carrying her genius, her spirit, her civilization, her laws, her language, into every region of the habitable earth. And while idolatry, and Mahometanism, and Popery, and fallen churches divide among them the fairest regions of man's world, in this ocean-speck, in this island-corner, hath a sovereign God—sovereign now, as when in sovereignty He called Abraham, and avouched the 'fewest of all people,' Abraham's seed, to be a special people unto Himself—set up His brightest candlestick, the Church of the Reformation; a candlestick whose light is Christ, itself purified and brightened from the soul and corroding canker accumulated in bygone years." "With Israel's history written for our admonition, with God's most just rule of judgment, on Churches, on nations, on individuals—to whom much is given, of him much will be required'—our boasting is turned to fear. At such a crisis in the destinies, not of Europe only, but of the world, how awful England's trust! To her emphatically has the 'kingdom of God' been given. He who has given it demands of her the fruits thereof." But a more argumentative view of this question is found in the "Apocalypse Popularly Explained," pp. 43 to 54, which it would be difficult, according to our humble opinion, to gainsay. Also, in the "Kings of the East," pp. 404, etc. Mr. Elliott also seems to take a similar view:—he says that England "reconstructed as an evangelic Anti-papal state, and with its 'pure and reformed Church' attaching, was thenceforward, like the Apocalyptically figured citadel of Mount Zion, a fortress of Christ's truth and saints against the assaults of Rome."
is the Church of the reformed religion generally, as found within the original bounds of the Roman empire—that is, within the territories of the "fourth kingdom,"—the sovereign of England, as contrasted individually with the "vile person," being its exponent. Proceeding on the same ground, we believe the other party referred to to be that Antichristian power which, in all the preceding prophecies, has borne the appellation of the Beast—its exponent being the same "vile person," or coming "Head," of the ever-enduring empire of Rome.

Now, if such be the meaning of the "holy covenant," or "the covenant," in one of the verses cited (and Mr. Frere claims it for the 30th verse) we can by no means agree that it can mean any thing else, in either of the other three. But this able commentator makes it, in the 22nd verse, comprehend Romanism (!) as well: he says of the expression "prince of the covenant," that it relates to the Pope, who, holding a sacred office, "is therefore called the 'prince of the covenant'"; and that the passage refers to the descent of Buonaparte in 1796, "like a torrent from the summit of the Appennines," upon the puny state of Rome. This seems to us (begging pardon) at best an illustration of the saying—"any port in a storm." We reject the interpretation because it is sustained by no analogy of truth, and because it utterly annihilates the proposition, simple in itself and intelligible, that the "covenant," throughout the chapter, refers to the professors of a spiritual, as distinguished from a worldly and degraded system of worship. Let us now submit the whole expression "prince of the covenant" to a close examination.

The term "prince," or chief (vide Liddell and Scott) is suggestive by itself of no definite idea: it is necessary to consider it in the light of the functions it implies. We conceive that to consult for the general welfare of the body—especially in respect of protection from external injury, is the distinguishing and universal function of the princely office: and thus it happens that the "Prince of the Covenant" is none other than the Defender of the Covenant. And as the "covenant" is synonymous with the "Faith," the "De-
fender of the Covenant" becomes the "DEFENDER OF THE
Faith." (!) Is this a false conclusion?—we shall truly
rejoice if it can be shewn to be so. If it can be shewn by
any means that the identification is not complete between
the title in the text, and that of the Sovereign of England,
it will be a happy discovery so far: but there will still
remain that the expression is certainly a title; and it will
belong to the objector to point out, to what other
potentate within the bounds of Christendom the title may
more fitly—indeed at all—be applied. The title is not
"The leader of the army of the covenant," as if the word
covenant alone carried a metaphorical sense; but the two
words (πανομένως διαθήκης) are equal portions of the title,
and without reference to a state of war. There is no harm
to England from the particular verse under examination;
but he must be wilfully blind who, on casting his eye a
little forward in the prophecy, does not discern the lowering
of the sky over our hitherto divinely-protected land:—not
the less, however, the favoured of God because of the visitation
of evil; for the 35th verse says expressly, that "some of
them of understanding (evidently of the "covenant") shall
fall, to purge and to make them white." It behoves us then
to be prepared for the gathering storm; and let it not be
with those defences only which the wisdom of the "Beast"
would suggest; but with such preparation as becomes a
country, whose Sovereign is known in Holy Scripture by the
honourable title of the "Prince of the Covenant."

Now verse 22 says, "they shall be overflown from before
him, and shall be broken; yea, also the prince of the cove-
nant." Grammatically prolonged, the verse seems at a hasty
view to read thus, "yea, also the prince of the covenant shall
be broken from before him." But History tells a different
tale, saying that the "covenant" was an ally of the "vile
person." How is this to be reconciled? It requires con-
sideration. One thing we say with all readiness—that the
satisfactory explanation of the first part of the verse is not
to be hastily shelved because of this difficulty. If the "vile
person" has been rightly recognised, some notice of Sebas-
topol might fairly have been expected; and it will be granted
that, in that notice, (if the "prince of the covenant" really took part with him in the war) some mention of him also might fairly be expected. And further, it is a natural thought, suggested by the fact of his being mentioned, that if there be any difficulty in recognising his position in the war, it must arise from our faulty manner of reading the sentence. The question then is—Is it possible for grammar and history to meet without dissension on the ground of this passage? Now the Holy Spirit, we may be sure, takes no note of mere victory, excepting as it is conjoined with the accomplishment of His own purposes; and under this recollection we ask, first—may it not be truly said that the forces of the "covenant" were "broken"? But neither does the text, any more than history, say, that the Prince of the Covenant "was broken from before him";—such an expansion of the text were a complete error. Had the words run as follows, "And with the arms of a flood shall they be overthrown and be broken from before him; yea, also the prince of the covenant,"—instead of "shall be overflown from before him, and shall be broken,"—the difficulty would be a hundred fold greater than it is; for the statement would then have been, that the prince of the covenant was broken while standing in adverse ranks to him. But the text says, "they (the enemy) shall be overflown from before him"; and it adds, "and shall be broken"—i. e.,—(as regards the enemy) "be broken (no doubt as before) from before him"; but as regards the "prince of the covenant" it merely says, "shall be broken"—not necessarily therefore "from before him,"—as an attentive consideration of the text cannot fail to shew. Thus the difficulty—a designed difficulty of construction—which seemed at the moment beyond remedy, becomes a substantial prop to the interpretation. For can it be doubted that the "prince of the covenant," though an ally of the "vile person," was broken? What sufferings shall be taken to constitute the term "broken," if not those of the British army in the Crimea? The public judgment as well of England as of the Continent has declared that the campaign of 1854, on the part of this army, was a complete breakdown; and Colonel Tulloch, speaking of the excessive and preventible mortality
that attended it, proves by statistical returns, that even that of Walcheren did not exceed a fourth part of the average recorded,—that the disaster of the Crimea "has never been paralleled in modern times."

We stand, as we pursue the investigation, between the 22nd and 23d verses. "Let him that readeth understand"—take cognisance of—reflect upon, the position we occupy. Let not the believer, unless he first disprove the exposition we have offered of the 22nd verse, dare to shut his eyes to the sequence of things, as declared in the verse that follows. Deliberately does the writer venture to say to the rulers of our people, at this moment, "Be wise now ye judges of the earth: Kiss the Son (who "hath power over the last plagues," Rev. xvi. 9) lest He be angry." "Kiss the Son." Let not unbelief have a voice in the consultations of His kingdom.

With further reference to the ground we have assumed, that Great Britain is the "Covenant," and hence also (it would seem) the "holy people" of the present Dispensation, we must call attention to the prospects which this prophecy holds out to her. In the twelfth chapter there occurs the following expression (ver. 7). Speaking of the period of "the end of these wonders," the angel says it shall be "when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people." Did the angel, by "holy people," intend the holy people of Daniel's day, or those who should be accounted "holy" in the day when his words should be accomplished? The writer will not assert—what nevertheless he has thought—that it is absurd to make this a question. Presuming that the prophecy refers to these latter days, we observe that in them a "holy people" are to be scattered. Of course they are "holy" relatively to the nations around them; the name is a badge of distinction! they must be pre-eminently chosen to the service of God. If then the Jews are intended, it amounts to this—that they, a people forsaken, cast out as reprobate, who slew the Holy One, and are judicially blind to all that is holy in the Truth of God, are honoured, notwithstanding, with the distinction they have so flagrantly forfeited; and that too, while scattered among the very people who are, without question, dis-
tinguished by the same title, by the One Great Head of both the covenants. We cannot entertain this idea:—it is, in fact, to assert that holiness is inalienable,—that there is no possible declension from the state of being chosen of God. To be holy must, in every age, signify an active dedication to God's service, especially in the preservation and promulgation of His truth; and to oppose that truth, as do the Jews, is to be rejected of the Lord. The "holy people" of the text (notwithstanding that many able writers have been satisfied of its referring to the Jews) can, to the writer's mind, be none other than the "holy covenant" of the preceding chapter (xi. 22), and (as we believe) the Protestant kingdom of Great Britain:—holy, because to her is committed the charge of our Saviour's honour in the carrying forth of His name; and in contradistinction to those who corrupt or suppress it.* Her power, it is said, will be "scattered." A hope occurred to the writer that this "scattering" might be of the same kind as when "the Lord scattered them (the builders of Babel) from thence upon the face of all the earth" (Gen. xi. 8)—which was decidedly of the nature of a blessing; and thus, the scattering of the power of the "holy people" might signify, not only their wide extension into all lands; but also, spiritually, the promulgation of the Gospel, wherein their power lay. But it is not so,—the word used by the Septuagint in the passage of Genesis signifies, in unison with the view just expressed of the event, to "disseminate," or "distribute"; but the word with which we have to do means always (so far as can be gathered from the Lexicons) to scatter in an offensive sense,—if an army, to rout them:—it comes only short of "to destroy" (Dan. ii. 44). Again, in the preceding part of the prophecy (xi. 30-3) we are informed, that "they that understand among the people (evidently persons of the covenant) shall instruct many"—(shall carry forth the know-

* If the eighth chapter of Daniel describes either the career of Mahomet, as many believe; or the Eastern Roman empire, as others hold; unquestionably the similar expression—"the holy people" (ver. 24) must in either case refer to a Christian people; for the Jews were already non-existent as a nation.
ledge of the great salvation) "yet they (the people) shall fall by the sword, and by flame, by captivity, and by spoil, many days"; or rather—"certain days" (Lee in loco). Here we have a similar prediction regarding a faithful, and therefore a "holy" people; and there does not seem any reasonable method (should we desire it?) of disclaiming the position assigned to England in this prophecy; nor of avoiding—though it may, doubtless, be greatly mitigated (Rev. xvi. 9)—the predetermined course of her purgation.

Let us return to the 23rd and 24th verses—they read thus:—

"And after the league made with him he shall work deceitfully: for he shall come up, and become strong with a small people. He shall enter peaceably even upon the fattest places of the province: and he shall do that which his fathers have not done, nor his fathers' fathers; he shall scatter among them the prey, and spoil, and riches: yea, and he shall forecast his devices against the strongholds, even for a time."

True wisdom would perhaps counsel here to put by the pen, as we are in the positive darkness of futurity; but curiosity prevails;—let us only, in indulging her, keep a tight hand on her speculations.

We cannot doubt but that the "league" here mentioned is the actually subsisting "entente cordiale." It is not quite apparent from the English and Latin that, when he "shall work deceitfully," this will be against England; though—being coupled with allusion to the "league," and that the Greek says παρ' αυτὸν (i.e., towards the "prince of the covenant")—it is most likely so. Who are the "small people" with whom he strengthens himself? Is this Belgium, or is it Ireland? We are inclined to think the former; because the text speaks of entering "peaceably," and therefore unexpectedly; and upon "the fattest places," as though he would continue his march direct into Holland. We are reminded by this last expression of the expectation elsewhere raised, that the Antichrist would quickly "swallow up three of the ten horns" (Dan. vii. 8)—on which we ventured the observation, that these might be the three seats wherein his three uncles sat—Holland, Westphalia, and Spain, seizing upon them on the ground of legitimate heirship.
With regard to entering "peaceably"—cunningly—unex-
pectedly, we are reminded by the expression of the astute
proposition to the King of Belgium a year or two ago, to
dismantle on either side some of the frontier fortresses.
Did his Majesty swallow the economical bait? The "doing
that which his fathers have not done," &c., is quite in keeping
with the antecedent acts of the "vile person":—the largesses
"scattered" on his way to the throne have been mentioned;
but these proceedings were trifles in comparison with what
the prophecy here prepares us for. In what way its re-
markable words will be verified, in respect of the extensive
treachery and bribery it foreshews, we find no sufficient
analogy to guide our opinion. The only thing to raise the
idea that this passage _may_ apply to operations against
England is, that the "strongholds" against which he is said
to "forecast his devices," are plainly declared in the Greek
to be "Egypt." All these things take place "post
amicitas" (Lat. Vul.)—i. e., après l'entente cordiale, and the
attainment of its reserved objects.

Who the King of the South may be, against whom the
"vile person" is represented as obtaining signal advantages,
both in battle (ver. 25), and by intrigues within his de-
pendencies (ver. 26), is the next question:—we imagine it to
be a power not yet ostensively to be recognised. As there
are so many indications in other prophecies of the coming
conflict having a religious character, it may be that the kings
of the South and North are the potentates claiming to be
the Heads, respectively, of the Latin and Greek Churches.
They will be the kings of the South and North, in refer-
ence (it may be) to the position of the people of the
"Covenant"—here the Protestant States of the Continent:
or with greater probability (as we think) as of old, in
reference to carnal Israel—the _great object of this prophecy_,
the chief mass of whom are in Poland. But how vain is
conjecture! The 27th verse says, that the "vile person,"
and the "King of the South" shall both be set "to do
mischief"; and shall "speak lies at one table,"—that is,
probably, at a general congress. These potentates try to
circumvent each other by perjury and treachery. But it
shall not prosper (ib.)—that is—on both sides it shall fail; and for the reason that "yet the end shall be at the time appointed."

This is the first occasion of our meeting a notice of that most important period of time—"the time of the end"—(examine, in proof that it relates to that period, the terms of the Greek version)—that important epoch during which the great consummation—the burthen of so many prophecies—will be achieved. The words cited—"for yet the end shall be at the time appointed," mean (we believe) "for the reason that the time of the end shall yet (i. e., at the time spoken of) be future:"—"quia adhuc finis in aliud tempus."

At the time of the end it will be seen that one of these parties—the "vile person" falls rapidly into perdition. It seems therefore to be intimated, that the treachery of the king of the South, though failing now, shall eventually,—i. e., at the time of the end—be the cause of his overthrow: "none shall help him"—though he may of right be expecting help from a confederate.

On the present occasion the "vile person" is given to "return into his land with great riches"; and "his heart (i. e., his designs) shall be against the holy covenant" (ver. 28): but it is not apparent that the "exploits" mentioned will be of the nature of victories gained over the "covenant." By concert (as it would seem) he will return speciously to the South (ver. 29):—but this expedition will not be (whether in its object, or whether to the same quarter of the South) "as the former" (vid. Latin and Greek)—i. e., as the former expedition (ver. 25). The scheme will be frustrated by the ships of Chittim (ver. 30). His grief and indignation against the "holy covenant" (and this makes it reasonable to suppose "Chittim" means England) will be excessive; and he shall enter into a secret league and alliance ("shall have intelligence") with some party, for the invasion of the land. And here commences the account of a successful enterprise of this sort, aided by extensive treason, against this stronghold of the Reformation; even to the subversion of the national religion, and the setting-up of a system of idolatry (ver. 31, 2, 3).
Who the party may be who, "having intelligence" with the Antichrist, are said to "forsake the holy covenant" (ver. 30); and who they may be who, in the hour of utmost need, shall render "a little help" (ver. 34), can only be guessed at; but we are inclined to think of the former, because of the nature of the word "arms" in ver. 31, that the Americans are intended, who "forsake" those to whom they are naturally attached by every tie that should be held sacred among men. By "arms"—in the passage "And arms shall stand on his part," we understand forces generally; but in the Greek they are called "σπέρματα," in the Latin "brachia"—is it a forced conclusion that these "brachia" are of the seed (σπέρματα) of England, and indicate that our brother Jonathan will take part with the invader? As the plural is used throughout ver. 31, and seemingly in single reference to the party designated "arms," it is quite clear that this party will be present in the invasion, if not be the chief promoters of the pollution of the "sanctuary." The "sanctuary of strength" is to be considered the kingdom of Great Britain—the stronghold of the people of the covenant—the ark where the covenant is preserved.*

It would be a sheer guess to name them as the party from whom also the "little help" is to come,—such help as an unacknowledged sense of shame, and an unwilling conscience, suggest. The expressions regarding the "daily sacrifice" and the "abomination that maketh desolate" (ver. 31) we shall examine in the place where they again occur, in chap. xii. 11: it is sufficient here to mention our belief, that in their sum and substance they declare, that the Antichrist will set up again in this land the religion of Rome; while those who ought to oppose the horrible act—an infidel internal enemy (ver. 32)—stand aloof during its perpetration.

* On this passage Mr. Elliott has the following remarkable observation (p. 1317—22) "Arms shall stand on his part means properly from, out of; as in ver. 7. 'Out of a branch from her roots.' The phrase is to be interpreted 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. 'In one MS. (Winter observes) the word "arms" in this verse . . . means of the sea, or of the West.'"
The suffering nation will be great and courageous in both spiritual and physical endeavour (ver. 32), and the end of the Divine government will be attained, in their purification. (ver. 33, 4, 5.)

It is much to be noticed that with ver. 35 terminate, in this scene, the sufferings of the "holy covenant"; and it is pointedly said that these sufferings are continued "even to the time of the end"; i.e., until the time of the end begins—the time wherein the Antichrist falls (ver. 40),—an observation which, when we come to the consideration of the sacred numbers, will much facilitate the solution of the mystery attaching to this epoch. Now, bearing in mind that this ver. 35 speaks of something that is completed at the opening of the "time of the end," we may observe that ver. 40 speaks of something that commences at the same point of time:—ver. 40 is therefore the true continuation of the narrative. The intermediate verses (36 to 39) constitute a distinct and parenthetical division of the chapter; and it consists for the most part, if not entirely, of the character of the wilful king, who, in this scheme of interpretation, is of course the same as the "vile person" of ver. 22.

The words "the king shall do according to his will" (ver. 36) have claimed the particular attention of all commentators,—the question suggested by them being, whether "the king" does not denote the commencement at this place of another power or dynasty; but it is the necessity (we repeat) of the present scheme, that the same power and under the same ruler is continued, which has been in activity during the preceding sixteen verses. The individuality of the ruler could not be changed, excepting by the "vile person," as a dynastic head, representing a line of rulers who carry immediately forward both the character and the projects of the vile person; and we find it impossible to participate in any such impression.

That something of a new and peculiar nature is intended to be expressed, by thus suddenly assigning to him the title—"the king," the writer is ready to believe; and he would suggest whether—considering the victorious career described in the preceding verses, and above all the humiliation of the
great anti-roman power of Great Britain,—whether it might not denote the attainment of the fulness of the imperial rank and station, as Head of the Roman empire, to which it is undoubtedly necessary he should attain,—a position greatly advanced beyond what is implied in the 21st verse, where kingly rank within only his own dominions is given him—a stepping stone, merely, to the headship which declares the "wound" to be healed.

The position held by this "king" in the composition of the prophecy evidently connects his title of wilfulness with the discomfiture inflicted on the people of the covenant. And inasmuch as in ver. 40 there is a resumption of the history, its thread having been discontinued in order to introduce the parenthetical passage—36 to 39; it follows that whatever is related in these verses—even the words at the end of them, "he shall cause them to rule over many, and shall divide the land for gain"—is not to be looked upon as a notice of fresh exploits, but of the manner in which the "king" consummated his triumphs over the holy covenant";—so that the "land" which he "divides" is, in all probability, Great Britain.

These verses (36 to 39) present an appalling picture of arrogance and impiety, indicating a supreme contempt, firstly of the laws and honour of God—"he shall speak marvellous things against the God of gods"; secondly of the affections of the human mind,—the chief, the "desire of women" (i. e.—the strong attachment of women to their lords), being put for the whole; thirdly of all restraints, whether of human law or human custom—spoken of as "gods."

A quaint interpretation has been put upon the expression "the desire of women," as though it referred to our Saviour, to give birth to whom was of old an object of intense desire among Jewish women. To make the expression thus understood appropriate, even under the supposition that the scene were laid in Jewish times (e. g., in those of Antiochus Epi-phanes), it would be necessary, not only that this should have been a prevailing "desire" among women—(and this we do not doubt) but also, that the contemner of the desire should
have been aware of its existence, and be thereby prompted to persecute those who cultivated it,—as when Herod, recognising a Jewish prophecy, slew the innocents:—this it is very unlikely was the case with Antiochus Epiphanes. As applied to Christian times, the interpretation is simply absurd. There is but one meaning of the phrase supplied by Scripture itself, viz., (Gen. iii. 16)—“and thy desire shall be to thy husband”—pointing to that strength and constancy of feminine affection, founded upon a sense of dependence, which God has determined as the root of all happiness below,—the best support and solace of our present being,—the representation of the dependence of all upon God himself. This “desire” of the wife is presumed in the text to be reciprocated by the husband; and the failure of its being so to be the foulest of all moral offences:—hence we imagine it to be adopted as representative of the human affections. Scripture seems to take this view, in the sentence “thine love to me was wonderful, passing the love of women” (2 Sam. i. 26). Of all the atrocities of Buonaparte, there is none to be compared with his repudiation of the marriage vow, and his divorce—impious in all its particulars—of Josephine. It is to the honour of the Pope that he had no part in it.* But if it be really true that the first Napoleon is held up as the mild exemplar of the second, it may be expected, in the more complete fulfilment of this sign, that the “desire of women” will again be subjected to some such contumelious treatment,—such being the necessary proof that the “wilful

* It was Napoleon himself who “declared his marriage with his first wife null and void; excepting that a tribunal called ‘Officiabilité de Paris,’ consisting of a few priests subservient to the will of the Emperor, declared it void with mysterious secrecy. On the occasion of his marriage with the Archduchess of Austria, thirteen Cardinals (about half, we believe, of those present in France) abstained from attending the ceremony of the nuptials: and gave as their motive, that the Pope had borne no part in the dissolution of the original imperial marriage. The angry tyrant thereupon stopt the pittance allowed for the maintenance of these honest men, leaving them to the alms of the people; and further ordered that they were not to wear the Cardinal’s dress, but appear in black suits. Hence arose the distinction between Cardinali rossi and Cardinali neri.” (Cardinal Pacea’s Memoires, i. 319.)
king" is destitute of the most ordinary and best affections of our nature.

A reasonable paraphrase of the two first of these verses would (we conceive) be as follows. "The king shall do according to his will; and he shall exalt himself proudly above every constituted authority; and shall blaspheme the Almighty Governor from whom all rule proceeds; and shall prosper until, as the rod of God's anger, he shall have filled up, instrumentally, the measure of the Divine wrath. He shall be a renegade from the true faith, not respecting the fundamental—and in his case hereditary—doctrine of the Trinity in Unity (for 'God' of the text is 'Elohim' in the plural), nor even the most sacred affections of the human heart, nor any constituted power or principle; for he shall magnify himself above all." The description of his impious demeanour is continued in the 38th and 39th verses; which we shall not venture to enter upon—excepting to say, under guidance of the margin, that he seems to regard the God of battles as a power in nature personified in himself, and himself as the tutelary deity of his people.

The limit to the prosperous career of this "king" is determined by that of the Divine indignation (ver. 36). On whom this indignation is inflicted is an all-important question; and we see no reason whatever, arising out of the text, for imagining that it is the indignation now resting on the Jewish people—as usually supposed. We believe it to be a special indignation—an outpouring of the wrath of God, not so much upon His enemies in general, as upon the lukewarm friends of His Holy Son; for the indignation refers clearly to the previously described sufferings of them of the Covenant. When these are "accomplished," the king shall cease to prosper. The events that are comprehended within the circle of this indignation are, consequently, to be held distinct from those scenes, and that "time of trouble," referred to in chap. xii. 1; when, as we conceive, (in the language of Isaiah) "The indignation of the Lord (will be) upon all nations, and his fury upon all their armies" (Is. xxxiv. 2). The previous acts of the Divine chastening terminate, according to the text of this prophecy, before the
wilful king proceeds to his ruin in the holy land (ver. 40). At that epoch (as will presently appear) will the ascendancy of England commence, and in connexion (as we have imagined) with the spiritual ministrations of the Jewish remnant—the appointed and effectual lightbearers to the most distant heathen nations. But prudence forbids the indulgence of a closer speculation.

The expression "the time of the end," which now commands our attention, and which is found in several places of the 11th and 12th chapters, (vid. xi. 35, 40; and xii. 4, 9) presents a problem of not easy solution:—to contribute to that solution (if we may) will oblige us at this place to digress for a while from the straight path of the prophecy. In the Greek there is so great a variety of forms in which the meaning of the phrase is embodied, as likewise there is of views among commentators—all of them preserving at least the sense of the expression, that we are constrained to offer our opinion with less of confidence than is desirable. It is said (xii. 4) that the words of the prophecy "are sealed up to the time of the end." It will be a distinctive mark then of the "time of the end," that the sense of these prophecies is fully known—that is, by a certain few, for "the wise (only) shall understand" (xii. 10). We are not in the present day to be deterred by this consideration from raising and squaring the stones of this quarry, and "making ready" all materials for the future edifice of consummated Truth; so that—if such should be the design of Providence, as in the case of Solomon's temple—"neither hammer nor axe may be heard" (i. e., no fashioning—no disputation) at the time of its erection (1 Kings vi. 7). Much has been collected already by the labours of men; and it may be the intention of the Holy Spirit, by means of such gradual developments, to preserve the natural appearance of events as they occur. But also it may be the case, that the fearful prediction regarding the "day of the Lord" (which there is great reason to believe will have its opening in the "time of the end") that it shall come "as a thief in the night," is founded in the foreseen apathy of Christ's Church with regard to His prophetic word. This declaration—that Daniel's book "is
sealed to the time of the end," when viewed in connexion with the one immediately subjoined that "many shall run to and fro: and knowledge (i. e., of the prophecies) shall be increased," can hardly fail to be received by those who are capable of an unbiassed judgment, as an encouragement rather than the contrary to examine studiously the word of Prophecy; notwithstanding that much of this word (as here declared) will be impenetrable by the wit of man until the appointed "time of the end" shall come:—in which time, perhaps, Jewish discernment—the veil of unbelief being removed from their own eyes—will be able to remove the veil of ignorance from those of their Christian brethren.

The expression—the "time of the end," as rendered in the Latin and Greek, suggests the substitution in English of the following form—"the last measure of appointed time,"—referring by its nature to preceding measurements of time. The measure most contiguous to it in the present prophecy is that mentioned in ver. 7,—the "time, times, and a half";—it will be shewn in its place that this period is fully expired, and yet the "time of the end" is certainly not yet arrived. As then the outgoing of these "times" does not reach to the entrance of the "time of the end," the question is,—Can any other clue be obtained to its commencement? Now on the warning being given that "the book was sealed," a beautiful accession to the vision met the prophet's eye, as he stood by the river Hiddekel, in the appearance of "other two" men (ver. 5)—like (we presume) to himself. "Behold, there stood other two, the one on this side of the bank of the river, and the other on that side of the bank of the river. And one said to the man clothed in linen which was upon the waters of the river, How long shall it be to the end of these wonders?" If we consider the river to represent the flow of ever-passing time, as contrasted with the solid ground of eternity which forms its banks; or (it may be) the continuing generations of human life, through the long ages of unperishing nature; the two men, one on each side of the river, will fitly represent the watchful explorers of God's promises on the subject of the progress and destiny of the
human race—witnesses to Him in the two Dispensations—
men who in every age have stood on the brink of passing
time, interested to scan the acts of the Providential rule.
One of these watchmen said to “the man clothed in linen”
(the same whom the prophet had originally seen—ch. x. 5,
and evidently the Lord Christ) “which was upon the waters
of the river,” i.e., from above them (vide margin)—presiding
over them, “how long shall it be to the end of these
wonders?” The answer (ver. 7) shows, that if “knowledge
shall be increased,” it must be by having diligent regard to
the sacred numbers,—which are, in fact, the grand divisions
into which the field of time is divided. It announces the
unchangeable decree of heaven, that the continuance of these
wonders should be for a “time, times, and a-half.” The
announcement, however, does not end here,—the angel says
“time, times, and a-half; and when he shall have ac-
complished to scatter the power of the holy people;” and he
adds that, then, “all these things shall be finished.” There is
much caution necessary at this point. A hasty perusal of
the verse would be sure to leave the impression, that but one
epoch of time is here mentioned:—that is to say, that the
expiration of the “time times, and a-half,” and the ac-
complishment of the “scattering of the power of the holy
people,” are concomitant events,—that the latter goes out
with the former. But this is certainly not the case:—the
“times” expire, but the “scattering” has not necessarily
even commenced. However, from the circumstance of the
two events being so closely united in the text, a reasonable
expectation arises that the latter will follow upon the former
without delay.

Now there is a remarkable diversity between the Greek
and English translations, in the rendering of the latter clause
of this verse:—in the English we read “all these things
shall be finished,” in the Greek “they (the holy people)
shall know all these things.” The writer would wish, were
it possible, to avoid obtruding an opinion he holds—which
he holds on a ground that he cannot pretend to say com-
mands consideration—that both these renderings may be
good and genuine. The ground alluded to is (he has men-
tioned it in his pamphlet on a like occasion), that wherever in the Greek and English translations a diversity in the rendering of a sentence is exceedingly great, so as to leave no resemblance between them, he has observed on several occasions the two texts to be serviceable in elucidating each other; and thus to witness for each other to the common family of inspiration to which they both belong—like a silver fork and spoon in the same pantry which, bearing the same arms, not only carry this evidence of there being but one property in them, but shew by their particular forms that they are intended for an united purpose. If this observation should be thought untenable, it is at any rate the case that neither of the renderings before us presents a higher claim to be received as the true one than the other; and as the Greek most suits the argument we are upon, we shall avail ourselves of it. Not that we discard the English—which is, indeed, the most natural as an answer to the question (ver. 6) "How long shall it be to the end of these wonders?" while also the Greek version is most in consonance with the promise of future revelations, as previously given in ver. 4, and repeated in ver. 9. But what is our reason for wishing that the declaration that the saints shall know all these things, expressed in terms equivalent in verr. 4 and 9, should be found also in ver. 7? It is this—that in verr. 4 and 9 the promised disclosure shall be at the commencement of "the time of the end"; but in ver. 7, it shall be after the accomplishment of "time, times, and a-half," and of the "scattering of the holy people." Hence it follows that the "time of the end" begins, when the "scattering of the holy people" closes. This is an exceedingly important inference, if a just one; and we believe it to be so:—it moreover agrees with what is said in chap. xi. 35, that "some of them of understanding shall fall...." even to the "time of the end"—the period when, evidently, the tribulation ceases. Hence further it appears that the "scattering" of chap. xii. 7, is a direct allusion to the passage in chap. xi. ending with ver. 35.

* If the moment of greatest depression for the saintly nation should be (as is likely from this passage) just anterior to the "time of the end,"
We are not sure that this argument, grounded on the Greek version, is, after all, at all necessary: for Daniel asks a question subsequently (ver. 8) not dissimilar to that of his fellow-labourer (ver. 6), to which he obtains the promise referred to in ver. 9, 10; so that, if the reader should consider these two questions to be the same in import, we obtain in a direct what we have been seeking in an indirect manner—that at the expiration of the "times," and the accomplishment of the "scattering," the "wise shall understand" these things:—which amounts to this, that at the expiration of the times, and the accomplishment of the scattering, shall commence the "time of the end."

It must however be said, that the questions in ver. 6 and 8, are not exactly the same. In the former it is "How long ("till when," Gr.) to the end of these wonders?"—in the latter it is "what shall be the end of these things?"—what shall there be after these things? (Lat.); as if the prophet had meant to ask, what shall these things lead to? We are inclined to think of this question, that it betokens surprise and vexation, at not hearing anything in the termination of this great prophecy in favour of the "holy people," as he had heard in a previous angelic mention of the "times" (chap. vii. 25),—wherein it is plainly stated that the saints, after their fall, shall rise to dignity and dominion. The prophet is bid wait (as we have seen) till the "time of the end." (Ver. 9.) In compliance, however, with his zealous inquiries—(an encouragement to us to resort to the same means) a couple of additional enigmatical numbers are pronounced,—thirty years, and forty-five years (ver. 11 and 12)—measurements which are evidently intended to connect themselves with his question. And if our conjecture be just—that the prophet's question had reference to the rise of the kingdom of the saints, it may be clearly inferred that, in the latter of these periods, their rule will be established,—the period respecting which it is significantly so we seem to collect from Rev. xvii. (ver. 16 to end) that contemporaneously with this depression will be the judgment of the great "whore"; inasmuch as, with the "time of the end" commences the fall of the Antichrist—the instrument of that judgment.
said "Blessed is he that waiteth and cometh" to the end thereof:—when (if we may be permitted to throw in a conjecture elsewhere derived: indeed it is not obscurely hinted in the chapter before us in ver. 2, 3, and 13), it is probable the judgment of the world will have commenced.

The terms in which these new numbers are given are as follows—a "thousand two hundred and ninety days," and a "thousand three hundred and five and thirty days." Now it cannot be doubted that these numbers are, each, a prolongation of the number in ver. 7, expressed as "time, times, and a half"—the three numbers in their terminations forming a series of periods. But we have shewn that so soon as the 1,260 years are expired, and likewise the scattering accomplished, the "time of the end"—that is to say, the last measure of appointed time, which thus becomes the measure of forty-five years—begins: so also at the expiration of the 1,290 does the same period begin. Hence it follows that the period allowed for the "scattering of the holy people" is the last thirty of the 1,290 years. Again, inasmuch as with the period of forty-five years commences the "time of the end"; and as the epoch so denominated is fraught with vast events, especially in the downfall of many ancient powers—conducting, notwithstanding, to a time of "blessedness" at its termination; we have further concluded that this period will witness in its course the uprising and establishment of the kingdom of the saints. Such then is the relative position in time (the object of our inquiry) of the "time of the end;" but as to its real date, it will be our endeavour to determine it when engaged with the sacred numbers.

The time of the end is entirely of the nomenclature of Daniel; and the designation is appropriate in this the chief of all respects—that it is the last portion of the measured time of that prophet. We shall find it in a future chapter to respond in time to a particular portion of the "seventh trumpet" of St. John; but the designation—the time of the end—would not have suited the junior prophet, who extends his measurements farther than Daniel into time to come. Mr. Birks, it may be observed (ii. 333), takes this period of forty-five years as "by way of eminence" the "time of the
end"—"of eminence," because his view is—that the whole period of 1,260 years is brought under this designation. This is a more convenient than a probable notion:—he might as well at once, with another author, have comprehended the whole Christian dispensation under the title;—Mr. Tilloch says (p. 131) "'the time of the end'—that is, the time of Christ, whose coming put an end to the Mosaic institutions." (!) But we can claim but little agreement otherwise with the first-named author, as he propounds as the startling result of his computation, that more than twenty of the last forty-five years are already expired. From the appearances of things alone—apart from prophecy—we are persuaded that the "time of the end" is yet altogether future—though drawing nigh.

There is nothing more plain in prophecy than that a "holy nation," and therefore Christian,—and among Christian nations relatively "holy"—shall possess the chief dominion on earth. In addition to what has already been offered in support of this belief, the following may be urged with advantage:—In the first place, the Lord approves of the following answer of the Jews to a question He put to them, "He will miserably destroy these wicked men, and will let out his vineyard unto other husbandmen, which shall render him the fruits in their seasons" (Matt. xxi. 41):—wherein it is declared that, other husbandmen with like advantages being called, they will render Him the fruit in their seasons. What nation of Christendom, other than Great Britain, has hitherto come near as a nation to so doing? And introducing from the Psalms the saying regarding "the stone," the Lord adds, "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you (the Jews) and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall it shall grind him to powder" (Matt. xxi. 43):—wherein it is plainly seen, that "a nation" is "this stone;" and that "the stone" (in this place at least, whatever it may be elsewhere) is "a nation."* The latter words, "shall grind him to powder," have a clear reference to Dan. ii. 24, 35, where the "stone" smites the

imperial image upon his feet of clay, and when all the "kingdoms" preceding it (all still in being—Dan. vii. 12) shall vanish before it, "as the chaff of the summer threshing-floor." This imagery places under the headship of Great Britain all the countries lying between the Hydaspes and the Thames—being the countries which are embraced, all of them, in the great Image of Daniel. That the "stone" is a "nation" further appears from the following consideration:—it is written in Dan. vii. 27, that, after the destruction of Antichrist, "the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given" (to whom?—to the saints of the Most High? That would signify the universal Church of Christ:—No; but) "to the people of the saints of the Most High:"—given to a people! There is but one way of escaping from the conclusion above mentioned of England’s wide dominion; indeed that all the kindred of the nations shall be given to England; and that is, that they are given—as aforetime children to Abraham—as spiritual seed:—and that this is the right view seems to follow from the construction of this verse,—the remaining portion "whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him," being placed in such continuity of sense with what precedes it, as to indicate that the exaltation of the saintly nation is inseparably connected with the extension of Christ’s kingdom; and that in building up His throne the development of her own power will be found.

We have already hazarded the notion (it was for the purpose of reconciling conflicting conclusions) that the material power of Great Britain will be found to go hand in hand with the loud voice of the Jewish nation. This is said not altogether without a reason. The previous visions of Daniel have shewn the overthrow of Antichrist to be attended with the rise of the saintly nation, the kingdom of the stone,—"upon this stone I will build my Church." The present vision conjoins with this overthrow the "deliverance" of the Jews (xii. 1); with which last event is abundantly, elsewhere, connected the universal promulgation of the Gospel. Unless then the Jewish be the saintly nation,—so called while yet in unbelief, which is beyond all credence; and
unless too they are to go forth, as heretofore, "without scrip or purse;" there must be material aid and worldly influence a preparing (the aid and influence, of course, of a people both powerful and pious) for the carrying forth of the spiritual word: but the pure word itself will emanate (we may be quite sure) from no other place (people) than Jerusalem (Isa. ii. 3). "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel,"—a question not disapproved by our Lord, and hence assuring to them a spiritual kingdom. The required aid will, in all probability, be that of our highly favoured country, whose all-encompassing chain of empire, as seen in the mighty links of her colonies, already encircles the globe. Through these as on a tramway, she launches forth the rough materials of her civilization, spreading her creature-comforts over the most distant lands;—of which rough materials, not the least significant of her future empire is the printed Bible, the only goods she sells without price—the salt that sanctifies the whole. But the preachers are wanting; these must yet be sent; and for this office the English are but little qualified, being in all respects too ignorant and too unstudious of the ways of men; her children in Christ, of Abraham's blood, are wanting.

Let us now revert to the events of the "time of the end," as foreshewn in the prophecy of chap. xi.—they are found in ver. 40—45. This passage seems to place the scene of the great Antichristian struggle, first within the natural territories of the Beast, wherein the King of the South is apparently powerless, and the King of the North capable of little more than demonstration; and both unable to impede the course of the wilful king; who "overflows and passes over" (i.e., from the territories of the fourth to those of the third "kingdom") extending his arms into the countries of the East. His career is one of astonishing success. And we are here to call to mind the account we had before us of this career in the latter part of Rev. xiii.—another point of view only (as we conceive) of the present prophecy. We there imagined the Antichrist to establish a positive empire in the East, the "Image" of the one he had consolidated in the West. It would be a miserable act of vanity to endeavour
to trace, even from these combined prophecies, the steps of his calamitous ascent to power—an ascent permitted (we presume) that the more astounding may be his fall;—this much however we say with confidence, on the ground of the last-mentioned prophecy, that the instrument of his prodigious elevation will be the Pope of Rome. His appointed end approaches. "Tidings out of the East"—(what other than of the advance of the British forces from Hindostan?—vide "Kings of the East" in loc.) "and out of the North" (a simultaneous reaction, perhaps in concert with Great Britain, among the northern nations) "shall trouble him." (Ver. 44.) Rage and impiety will go hand in hand. Collecting and concentrating his multitudinous forces of (so to speak) every tribe of both the Eastern and Western worlds, "between the seas," in the Holy Land, he will accept the worship of his followers in the character of the omnipotent god of war, who reigns in the tented field (which seems the natural meaning of what is said, that "he shall plant the tabernacles of his palace between the seas")—for he takes possession in this character of the "glorious holy mountain" of Zion, the place where the Temple was built, the perpetual symbol of God's heavenly courts. Here he will seat himself as supreme ruler of the earth, and king of kings. But the hour of his "perdition" is not stayed:—"he will come to his end, and none shall help him." The Antichrist upon Mount Zion seems to be placed before the Church as a paramount figure of that usurping spirit which, in every various manner and by every various device, prevents the Lord Christ in the government of the world; and would defer his reign by a preoccupation of His throne.

The description being closed of the career of the Antichrist, the prophet takes up, and yet only in the most general manner, the true subject of this prophecy—the recall and restoration of the nation of Israel:—

"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." (Dan. xi. 1.)

It here appears that what is called the "deliverance" of
the Jews (a spiritual deliverance, no doubt) is the chief event of the "time of the end"—still distant (it will presently appear) nearly a quarter of a century. And hence we are led to regard all the holy endeavours in their behalf, set on foot, and still extending throughout the countries of the Covenant; all their promising results hitherto; and we may add to these the promised return of the nation, now imminent, to their own land,—as accessory events only, arranged by the Archangel, to conduct the more naturally to those greater designs, which, as their deliverer, it is given to him to achieve. Amidst the convulsions of the nations, and by means of them,—the bursting of the external rhind wherein the favoured nation is enclosed, the Archangel will lead them—through seas (it may be) of cleansing tribulation—to their long-delayed peace.

In concluding his remarks upon this last prophecy of Daniel, the writer trusts it will be seen that his chief aim has been to exhibit it in its right proportions, and to distinguish the "times" referred to in it:—he trusts moreover, that the speculations into which he has latterly been drawn in reference to the immediate future, will be regarded by the reader—not in the light of an attempted exposition, but only as friendly hints and aids to the exercise of his own imagination.
THE NUMBERS OF PROPHECY.

It will now be our endeavour, d.v., to institute an examination of the sacred numbers—measurements of prophetic time, so far as they affect the history of the Beast; herein following the example of Daniel, who reserves the most important of these numbers to the end of his prophecy, appending them to the document as seals to its truth.

It is evident from the conflicting notions abroad, that we possess as yet no certain key to the solution of these numbers; for instance (and this chiefly) we are not at all sure of the relation in respect of historical circumstance (which yet assuredly must subsist) between the beginning and the end of each period of "twelve hundred and sixty" years. In one instance, it appears, Mr. Fleming was led (though we have not seen his reasoning, for it is not given in the little book printed in his name) to a true calculation from this number regarding the temporal power of Rome, the destruction of which he pointed out at the distance of a century and a-half, as to take place in A.D. 1848. One fact professing to have been the result of calculation is worth a thousand arguments; and he who thinks it wise to reject unhesitatingly the interpretation referred to, as being simply "a lucky hit," with the present spectacle of Papal Rome before him, which has endured now nearly ten years, will do well (we think) to shut up for ever the volume of Prophecy; lest, without intending it, he should slide into a contempt of its contents and warnings.

It is an error many have fallen into to suppose, that the number 1260 alludes in all cases to the same period. One might as well imagine the same of the measure of 40 years, which (as we know) in the pages of sacred history have had a great variety of application. The periods of 1260 years are various, but the subject is ever the same—that of the nefarious domination of the Beast over the saints of God. The reason of the selection of this number presents a difficult question:—the number 40 has a sort of square appearance,
as if of completeness, and we ask no questions on this head; but the number 1260 carries in its immediate countenance no feature to explain,—yet surely we may say it presents every inducement to invite, the question of its origin. Is it an accidental measure? or is it one selected on any ground we can comprehend? A reasonable account of its origin may, we think, be suggested; and we venture to state it—subject to future revision—as follows:

Having been led to true results, as we believe, in several important instances, by duly observing the septenary rule of construction which pervades these prophecies, we ask—Is 1260 a Hepdomade? We find it to be so. We receive the fact at once (presuming there is no error in the number given) not only as the usual stamp of a Divine authorship, but as revealing the means of its investigation. Its unit is 180; and the question we have taken up merges itself, consequently, into the following one—What has directed the choice of the fundamental number 180? Now in the use of the numbers 666, 144,000, and others, in these prophecies, we have the assurance that designations descriptive of the objects referred to, have been drawn by the Holy Spirit from the science of numbers; and finding that 666—the "name of the beast" is thus obviously descriptive (however concealed its import) in the method of its construction, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the figure used to express the duration assigned him may be so likewise. The entire number 1260 has indeed, in its immediate aspect, something indicative of its not being a casual number,—for instance, it has in a peculiar degree a quality which is rare in large numbers—that of being divisible by no less than eight out of the ten first ciphers. Now the term of 1260 years is given under no less than three aspects (and therefore on as many occasions) as periods of duration of the Beast's power; and taking either of them singly, it signifies the fulness of the bestial power in respect of the means of its exercise then separately declared. The fulness is expressed by the sevenfold form of its construction: there remains the unit 180—the only residence of mystery, expressive of the power itself, to engage our investigation.
We imagine then the unit 180 to carry in its nature a mystic relation to the power of the Beast; i.e., to his pretensions—the foundation of his power. This we consider it to do in an eminent degree, in that it is framed by the multiplication into each other of the units 3, 6, 10. Of the significance of the numbers 3 and 10 we have no need here to speak; but as the opinion to be expressed of the unit 6 is a new one, we beg to say that in the opinions we shall offer, when examining the "name of the beast," regarding the occult meaning of ciphers as appealed to by Daniel and John, we shall endeavour to shew that six was the most holy of units—i.e., was expressive of that which is most holy. Thus the beast is 666 in his pretensions—appearing externally as "thrice holy," and so named accordingly; in like manner as Isaiah names the same power "Lucifer"—a designation belonging of right to the Son of God alone; and in like manner as "Baal" was once the name of the Lord (Hos. ii. 16: and apparently 1 Chr. xiv. 11). We assert then that the numeric expression $3 \times 6 \times 10$ represents, as much as any such expression can, the Creator, the Preserver, and the Multiplier—or Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. If this be intended, it will be because of Antichrist having assumed, during these many past ages, the functions of each person of the Divine Trinity:—he is called "God" (Bishop Newton, in loc.): he wields the power of the Saviour in a vicarial throne: he is the channel, acting at will, of God's sanctifying gifts to man. By the employment of this number as an expression of time, and as the foundation of a week of time (so making 1,260 years), we may understand the Holy Spirit to foreshew the long ages that would ensue of successful blasphemy.

We are to remember that there is always a positive reality accompanying the figurative scenes of Prophecy; and that, should we have succeeded in shewing the number 1,260 to be of emblematic construction, we are not thereby relieved from the necessity of shewing further, that it is a real and literal measurement of time.

A few words will here be desirable on the prophetic plan of writing a "day" for a "year." It seems that the analogies of Scripture have been insufficient of late to convince
several eminent commentators that this is truly the plan of Prophecy; and that a determined attempt is being made to beat down this (what is called) "year-day theory." If such a text as Ezek. iv. 5, 6,* is to go for nothing, as a means of applying the rule of analogy, it is certainly of no use to debate the matter.

But how it is possible to put aside the evidence arising from the text of Rev. xi. 9, we cannot imagine:—it runs thus,—

"And they of the people, and kindreds, and tongues, and nations, shall see their dead bodies three days and an half, and shall not suffer their bodies to be put in graves. And they that dwell upon the earth shall rejoice over them and make merry, and shall send gifts one to another. . . . . . And after three days and an half the spirit of life from God entered into them."

Do the "Witnesses" remain in death three and an half literal days only? According to this opinion we are actually called upon to believe, that during this short space of time—scarcely sufficient to collect the materials of a good dinner, the whole Roman continent (the "earth") are engaged in fêting each other. However, there is in the writer's mind an argument, or an impression, which supersedes in the present instance (though coinciding with) the demands of analogy; it has reference to the grandeur and prodigious magnitude of the features of Prophecy, which seem to cast these petty literalistic views into the shade of nothingness;—as if in a book which professes to foreshew the sacred history of the world, the Spirit would have written, so far back as Daniel's day, under the title of "the saints given into the hands of Antichrist," of sufferings endured during three and a half literal days only; when we ourselves, looking back on History, can testify to years, nay centuries, of the exercise of this malignant power, and to torments of martyrs as great,

* "For I have laid upon thee the years of their iniquity, according to the number of the days, three hundred and ninety days: so shalt thou bear the iniquity of the house of Israel. And when thou hast accomplished them, lie again on thy right side, and thou shalt bear the iniquity of the house of Judah forty days: I have appointed thee each day for a year."
as it is possible to imagine even the very day of the expected Head of the Antichristian system will introduce.

Another remarkable error has taken root in the modern system of interpretation, even among those who hold the doctrine of 1,260 years. These years they suppose to be literal years of 365 days each. Now Fleming, putting himself under the direction of Jewish annals, was convinced that the prophetic year should be computed at 360 days, and with the assistance of this light made his famous discovery regarding the year 1848. But there is no necessity of Jewish annals: the Holy Spirit has himself shewn, in terms as plain as can be written, that His scale of computation has been of 360 days to a year; and that, consequently, from the measure of 1,260 real years, must be deducted five days from each year, making an abridgment of the period of about eighteen years—reducing it, in fact, to 1,242 years. He has written on different pages 1,260 days, 42 months, $3\frac{1}{2}$ times.* Does any one doubt that these are all one measure of time? If this be granted, then do 42 months, and $3\frac{1}{2}$ years, consist (each of them) of 1,260 days—i.e., a month of 30, and a year of 360 days respectively. This remarkable variety in the manner of expressing the same period of time is fraught with a definite and excellent purpose—that of keeping the Church from error in reference, first, to the Divine scale of computation; and secondly, to the meaning of terms. Other collateral objects may have been had in view in this variety;—thus some have thought, in respect of the registration by months, that they saw in the supplanting, pretentious character of the moon, shining with light wherein is no heat, a fit emblem of Antichrist. In another view of the Lunar emblem, Fleming speaks of 42-months of the "lunacy of men";—he might better have referred the figure (we think) to the fainting state of the expectant Church—the spouse of the departed Sun. And thus again Dr. Wordsworth says (p. 266) that "three and a half, being the half of seven, which is the number of completeness, represents a semi-

* It is scarcely necessary to state that a "time" certainly means a year: this is evident from the marginal comment on the text of Dan. xi. 13.
perfect state; one of transition and probation,” . . . “one of spiritual trial, pilgrimage, and persecution.” This opinion of the Doctor's, whether supported by Holy Writ or not, is more allied to the ancient system of numeric mysticism than probably he would like to acknowledge; for Kircher says (p. 248), “Dyas, i.e., binarius . . . . uti malo et imperfectioni obnoxia est, ita pro symbolo rerum confusarum, malorumque initio sumitur.” . . . . “Non immeriti a veteribus hic divisionis in omni disciplinâ censetur numerus.” If we put aside the mystic view, it may be a question whether 1,260 days, which is the half only of a week of years, is not taken to signify the night portion of the full week, thereby indicating the benighted and wandering state of the Church during the reign of the Antichristian “beast”; for the common state of things in the unenlightened world is called “the night” in Rom. xiii. 12,—“the night is far spent, the day is at hand.” The “night” was put under the rule of the moon (Gen. i. 14), and hence, perhaps, the further computation of time by moons (the “42-months”)—meaning the night-portion of nature; for the “day” was instituted as “evening and day.” The numeric figure would thus correspond with the scene, on one of the chief occasions of its employment—viz., the Church in the dark and dreary wilderness. (Rev. xii.)* Observing how rich in meaning

* This mixing up of the record of passing time with the sacred historic scene to which the time applies, like the long letters in a Roman inscription, suggests (what indeed can little be doubted) that the notation of time was anciently a religious duty. This is shewn among other evidences, by the construction of the Tyrian temple described by Maundrel, and referred to in the author's book, “The Antichristian Character of Freemasonry.” (P. 182.) In this temple, which was essentially open to the day, the worshippers prostrated themselves looking southward towards the idol of the sun, just as the real sun, passing over the head of the idol, crossed the meridian line; or (as in Freemasonry it is said) just as it was “high noon.” For the same purpose our ancestors erected in churchyards (holy ground) what is now called a cross, so called as if it had been designed as, itself, an object of worship. This is a mistake. In the better preserved specimens there may still be seen a Cube on the top, with sun-dials on two of its faces, and with no cross at all. These dials it may be presumed were put to flight by the clock; and the cube fell before the storm; and gradually the shaft became the portion of a cross. That the
are the prophetic writings, we should certainly be on our guard against discarding too hastily collateral views that may be suggested; but as to a diversity of record, the manifest benefit derivable from it in the present instance—that of preserving in its purity, and shewing the relative scale of the sacred number—commends itself as at least its sufficient explanation.

It would be untrue to say that the stamp of seven distinguishes all the prophetic numbers having reference to time; but unquestionably they are all endowed with some special configuration, derivable from the original institution of "two great lights" (moon and sun) for the "rule" of time, to preserve them from injury in their hazardous descent to distant ages; as, for instance, that of an exact month, or month and a half of years, being attached to the original 1,260 (Dan. xii. 11, 12)—this number being a multiple likewise of the monthly measurement. Indeed, a number presenting itself as scriptural could be open to no other so great suspicion, as to present no evidence of artistic construction,—evidence which should accord with the declarations of old, that "by number hath he numbered the times" (2 Esd. iv. 37), and that "he maketh all his works by number." (Eccl. xxxviii. 29.)

Lastly, be it observed of the mystic analysis we have offered of the term 1,260, that it does not affect the character of an interpretation; but only expresses the conviction of the writer, that in some such secret symbolism, conventionally adopted of old, is involved the reason of its selection.

We propose now to consider the following numbers: they are found in connexion with the several subjects of which we have been treating,—viz.,—

1. The "time, and times, and the dividing of time." (Dan. vii. 25.)

original design of the structure had to do with the passage of Time is shewn by the circumstance, that these "Crosses," when near the church, are invariably found on the south side of it, so as not to be obscured by its shadow. A good specimen is seen at Backwell, in Somersethshire.
2. The "two thousand three hundred days." (Dan. viii. 14.)

3. The "time, times, and a half." (Dan. xi. 7.)

4. The "1,290," and the "1,335 days." (Dan. xii. 11, 12.)

5. The "forty and two months;" and the "thousand two hundred and three score days." (Rev. xi. 2, 3.)

6. The "thousand, two hundred, and three score days;" and the "time, and times, and half a time." (Rev. xii. 6, 14.)

7. The "forty and two months." (Rev. xiii. 5.)

These periods are copied in the order in which they appear in the two prophecies successively; consequently, they do not terminate in time in the order in which the events they foreshew occur, as the convenience of the reader might have suggested; but the periods of each prophet, taken separately, do so; and this we shall deem a sufficient vindication of the order we have chosen. It will be seen, if we are in the right path of interpretation, that the periods terminate as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periods</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan. vii. 25</td>
<td>in A.D. 1775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan. viii. 14</td>
<td>1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan. xii. 7</td>
<td>1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan. xii. 11</td>
<td>1877-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan. xii. 12</td>
<td>1922-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. xi. 2, 3</td>
<td>1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. xii. 6, 14</td>
<td>1555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. xiii. 5</td>
<td>2043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DAN VII. 25.

The first number we have cited—the "time, times, and the dividing of time," is given in the following passage of Daniel:—

"And he (‘the little horn’) shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws;—and they shall be given into his hand, until a time, and times, and the dividing of time."

The point of time to date this period from (as an attentive perusal of the passage shews) is directed by the words "they
shall be given into his hand." In the history of the Papacy many enormities appear,—such as the acceptance on the part of the Pontiff, in A.D. 606, of the title of "Universal Bishop"; such too as his acceptance, in A.D. 552, of the entire government of Italy; and of his becoming, a couple of centuries later, temporal "King of Rome"; but these things are obviously irrelevant to the subject-matter of the sign. Now history records an occurrence which not only does suit the sign, but which she gives in almost the exact words of the prophecy; it says that, in A.D. 533, Justinian constituted the Pope sole judge of Christian doctrine, and committed to him power over heretics. What more decided response could history be expected to render to the words "they were given into his hands"! And if we should find this most appropriate beginning of the 1,260 years to yield a termination which presents a reasonable account of deliverance to the saints (for deliverance, at the running out of the period, we conceive to be implied), the enigma (we presume) would be solved.

Every writer we have seen who has taken the year 533 as the starting point of this number, has been content, on counting 1,260 complete years, to find himself landed in the year 1793, in the midst of the French Revolution. Now this we object to on every ground that can be taken. The year 1793 was a remarkable year, no doubt; as were also the years immediately before and after it; but was marked by nothing that affected particularly either the Roman empire at large—the scene of the prophecy, or the saints within it; so that, had the termination we seek fallen on even the preceding year (1792), when the king of France fell, it would not have been at all more satisfactory:—for France is not the Roman empire; nor, consequently, was her king, that suffered, the head of the beast. Had it fallen on 1798, when the state of Rome was overturned, it would have been only perplexing; for it would have told rather of the enchainer being enchained, than of the enchained being set free. The term of 1,242 years (1,260 reduced to the prophetick standard) makes the period terminate in A.D. 1775: and this (we must acknowledge) offers a result as little satisfactory, at the first
view, as any of the preceding. A little consideration will perhaps change the impression.

The year 1775 was distinguished, historically, by no very signal event affecting the interest of religion; yet does it so happen that, just at that point of time, was arriving at its climax that awful conspiracy against the Christian faith, set on foot many years before by the soi-disant "philosophers," which, more than any thing else, determined the character of the latter half of that century. "About the middle of the (eighteenth) century (writes the Abbé Barruel, Vol. I, p. 1) appeared three men who were leagued in the most inveterate hatred against Christianity: these were Voltaire, D'Alembert, and Frederic II. king of Prussia." The soul of this impious league was Voltaire, who, commencing his career of sworn hostility to Christ so early as the year 1728 (Barr. i. 28), was the indefatigable promoter, for just half a century, (for he died in 1778) of every measure which had for its object to damage every form of religion wherein the Saviour is named. The watchword of this party was crush the wretch ("écrasez l'infame")—meaning, "crush Christ"—crush every religion that adores Christ! (ib.). Voltaire lived many years "ruminating alone his hatred" (ib. 48), acting only as the officious defender of every work of an Antichristian tendency. In 1750 he went to Berlin, at the special invitation of the king of Prussia, leaving to his zealous disciples, D'Alembert and Diderot, the management of affairs; and "it is to these two men that the baneful coalition (i. e., of Atheists, Deists, and Spinosists) can be traced." At the return of Voltaire he found the conspiracy complete in its organization;—"its precise object was the destruction of Christianity; the chief had first sworn it; the secondary chiefs (named above) were ever after leagued with him in the same bonds" (ib. 49). Their main tenet was,—

"That every religion subjecting man's reason to mysteries, or to the authority of any revelation speaking in God's name, is a religion of slavery and constraint; that as such it should be annihilated, in order to establish the indefeasible rights of Equality and Liberty, as to the belief or disbelief of all that the reason of man approves or disapproves: . . . . and this they called the reign of Philosophy." "Reason, Liberty, and
Philosophy were as constantly in the mouths of Voltaire and D'Alembert, as a means of overthrowing Revelation and the Gospel, as they are at this day (he was writing in the midst of the Revolution) in the mouths of the Jacobins" (ib. 51-2).

Of course we cannot enter upon the details of this conspiracy; but a few specimens of the correspondence of the chiefs, bearing various dates, but which happen almost exactly to close with the year we have named (1775), will make manifest their importance with respect to the interests of religion at that period. Frederic writing to Voltaire (13 Aug. 1775)—advises that their aim should be—

"the subjection of the faith of Christian nations by every insidious means, before daring to lay the axe to the altar:"—and he says, "to undermine the edifice in silence is to oblige it to fall of itself" (ib. 55.)

Voltaire writes to D'Alembert (1763):—

"Hurl the javelin, but hide your hand: comfort me in my old age."
And again, that "in the war which they waged, they were to act as conspirators, and not as zealots" (ib. 47).

The chief writes (1761) to a noble conspirator:—

"The Nile is said to spread around its fertilizing waters, though it conceals its head; do you the same, and you will secretly enjoy the triumph. I recommend the wretch to you."

Voltaire to D'Alembert (1768):—

"The mysteries of Mytra are not to be divulged; . . . . . the monster (religion) must fall, pierced by a hundred invisible hands" (ib. 41).

Voltaire to D'Alembert (1764):—

"Such is our state that we shall be the execration of mankind if we have not the better sort of people on our side. We must therefore gain them, cost what it will. Labour then in the vineyard, and crush the wretch; oh, crush the wretch" (ib. 47).

The same writes to the same (1776) (exulting in his success against the Protestant Churches):—

"That England and Switzerland were overrun with men who hated and despised Christianity, as Julian the Apostate hated and despised it; and that from Geneva to Berne not a Christian was to be found."

Voltaire to Frederic (1773)—giving his reasons for tolerating the Socinians, says it was:—

"Because Julian would have favoured them, and I hate what Julian hated, and despise what he despised" (ib. 29).
In Frederic's letters to Voltaire (1773-4-5) he compliments the philosopher on being "the scourge" of religion; and in communicating plans for its destruction—

"Foresaw that, should it be preserved and protected in France, the fine arts and higher sciences must fall, and the rust of superstition completely destroy a people, otherwise amiable and born for society."

From these extracts and dates it will be seen, that just about the year 1775, this atrocious spirit (the spirit of the first vial in Rev. xvi.—the filthy, secretly-working, undermining sore) was reaching its predestined climax of impiety, and within its allotted bourne had brought to maturity its schemes for the eradication of the Christian name. But what connexion has this peculiar history with the subject before us,—the unloosing of the chains in which, ever since the year 533, the saints of God had been held? The connexion is intimate; as will be immediately obvious to the eyes of those who are most observant of the means by which the purposes of the Almighty are oftentimes effected. God would have His people set free from spiritual despotism; and to effect this deliverance, hosts of hostile spirits under the name of "philosophers," burning with hatred to all religion, are let loose upon the enslaved world; with commission, while advocating the claims of reason (of which we must all approve) to rouse the public mind against the disgraceful subjugation under which it was held to a pretended infallibility; and to drive from the atmosphere of thought those grievous mists of superstition, by which the whole professing world had been for so many centuries oppressed. Rome is brought into contempt among her own children; who, in casting away their own servitude, and with it too often their faith, of necessity work out the emancipation of the true children of God. While the swine with horrid noises, is forcing his gross body through the hedge of the robber's enclosure, the lamb watches by his side to take advantage of the hole. For all alike liberty is proclaimed.

In a little more than two years after this period, i.e., in 1778, the great chief of the conspiracy was taken off by death from the scene of his effective labours, having enjoyed the triumph of seeing the world filled with the enemies of the
Cross—his own disciples; but in ignorance of the Divine truth, that there were mixed up with them of the "seven thousand" of God's reserved children, who owed to the infidel, instrumentally, their spiritual liberty. What Condorcet says in his "Life of Voltaire" is much to our purpose:—

"Had he, as the author of the 'System of Nature' did, obliged all the kings of Europe to support the ascendancy of the clergy, Europe would still have remained in the bonds of slavery, and buried in superstition." (Barr. ii. 38.)

Again:—

"The enlightened observer and able historian will prove to those who are capable of reflection, that the first author of the great Revolution which astonishes all Europe, which infuses hope into the hearts of nations, and disquiet into Courts, was, without doubt, Voltaire. He was the first who levelled that formidable rampart of despotism, the religious and sacerdotal power. Had he not broken the yoke of priests, that of tyrants never could have been shaken off; both equally weighed upon our necks, and were so intimately interwoven that, the first one slackened, the latter must soon have lost its hold. The human mind is not to be impeded in the career of independence; and it was Voltaire who shook off the yoke, by teaching it to judge in every respect those who kept it in subjection."

It may be safely said, then, that the mission of Voltaire was to set free the reason of men, and to engage them to express their thoughts without fear of a dotard tyranny. It was a general boon;—not only to those who under the influence of an unaccustomed possession, rushed headlong like the swine into the sea of scepticism; but to those also who, taught of God, had so long had their lips fastened that they should not speak His praise. If Voltaire was (as Condorcet says) "the first author of the great revolution," unquestionably he was thereby the finisher of the long captivity of the saints.

The following further extract will illustrate the benefit derived from Voltaire to the true Church:—

"A superficial historian might have been misled by seeing the adepts (enemies of all religion) "solicit more than once the recall of the Protestants into France; but at the very time that Voltaire is expressing how much he laments to see the petition of the minister Choiseul rejected, he hastens to add (fearing his disciples might imagine he wished to spare the Huguenot more than the Catholic) that the Huguenots and the Calvinists
are not less mad than the Sorbonists or the Catholics; that they were even raving mad" (to Marmental, 1767):—"nay sometimes he saw nothing more atrabilious and ferocious than the Huguenots" (to M. de Dirac, 1763). "All this pretended zeal of the conspirators to calvinize France was but a preparatory step to unchristianize it with the greater ease and expedition. 'For my part (says D'Alembert) I see every thing in the brightest colours; already I behold toleration established, the Protestants recalled, the priests married, confession abolished, and fanaticism crushed, without its being perceived'" (Barr., i. 35).

Protestants recalled, and fanaticism crushed, without its being perceived! What a remarkable assortment of effects, and how remarkably produced! Is not the hand of the Most High to be recognised herein, who is ever directing the secret issues of evil to His own praise!

Now it would be a great mistake to say, that Voltaire worked out in a direct sense the freedom of the saints. He struck off the shackles from the human mind; but the power of imperial and apostate Rome was still firmly seated where most it could be wielded injuriously—in the laws and customs of Roman Catholic kings; and to complete the freedom intended, these must be displaced. A few of the words quoted above from Condorcet place before us, with precision, the necessary sequence of things:—"the first (i.e., the yoke of the priests) once slackened, the latter (the yoke of tyrants) must soon lose its hold";—true! and therefore some instrument was wanting, wherewith to tear away that hold. Voltaire's hatred was directed against religion; he was but in an inferior sense the enemy of government. His mission was to unfasten the spiritual cement by which the idol of tyranny was held to its pedestal, but to overthrow that idol was committed to other hands. And this opens another important chapter of the history of that age.

It is a remarkable fact that, just towards the end of the life of the great infidel, a society and sect appeared in Germany, (and here we get into the wide field of the Roman empire) infidel in their principles, whose bond of union was a sworn undertaking to uproot the foundations, not only of all religion, but of all civil government. These were the Illuminées. The founder of this sect was Spartacus Weishaupt, who sat in the chair of law at Ingoldstadt—a
man in whom there appeared to be combined equally the tact and the subtlety of the Evil one. The initiation into his mysteries once set on foot, the German mind yielded itself with avidity to the seduction, like stubble to the flame;—and the sect soon included men of every station in life—

"Professors of colleges, counts, excellencies, ministers of the emperor, presidents, vice-presidents, masters of the post-office, counsellors of the government, all enthusiasts for the new mysteries of Illuminism" (Barr., iv. 185)

—and the various provinces of the land became bound together in innumerable affiliated societies. And what was the purpose had in view by this terrible sect? It was to overturn every throne; and to tear down all the fences not only of religion, but of government, and of property; to open every avenue that might lead to disorganization and rebellion; and to promote the most extravagant and anarchical notions of liberty and equality.

The following is copied by Barruel as the essence of all Weishaupt's mysteries (iii. 23):—

"Liberty and Equality are the essential rights that man, in his original and primitive perfection, received from nature. Property struck the first blow at Equality. Political society, or Governments, were the first oppressors of Liberty. The supporters of governments and property are the religious and civil laws; therefore, to reinstate man in his primitive rights of equality and liberty, we must begin by destroying all religion, all civil society, and finish by the destruction of all property."

Again (p. 25):—

"Yes, a time shall come when man shall acknowledge no other law but the great book of nature; and this revolution shall be the work of Secret Societies."

Now it is a circumstance of no small significance (as we think), in connexion with the subject of our prophecy, that the Inauguration of this "Order of Illuminees" was celebrated, and their chief installed, on the first of May, 1776;—only half-a-year beyond the prescribed term of 1,260 years. Spartacus with his host of Revolutionists seemed to step forward at the exact moment, to pick up the mantle which had fallen from the waning octogenarian; and in so doing to announce that, whereas his predecessor in impiety
had unlocked the chains of a false and domineering religion, it was his mission to clear away the civil and political laws in which those chains consisted. The daring German complained of the French sophists, that their views were too limited on the subject of the rights of man; and while his Antisocial enterprise was the natural offspring of their Antichristian conspiracy, so also must it be considered to have been a tremendous step in advance of it.

For a few years after the death of Voltaire, there seems to have been a subsidence, or at least no progress, in France, of the spirit he had raised; but the inevitable results were not the less surely maturing on the other side of the Rhine. There is not a more certain fact recorded in history, than that the French Jacobin, by whom eventually the throne of France was overturned, and by whom consequently the flood of revolution was let loose which devastated for so many years the whole Roman earth, was the offspring of the German Illuminee on the one side, and the French Sophister on the other,—the place of their espousals being the Lodge of the Freemasons.

"As early as the year 1782, writes Barruel (iv. 336) Philo and Spartacus had formed the plan of converting the French nation to their system of Illuminism; but the vivacity and capricious temper of the people, so difficult to be restrained, made it seem prudent for the two chiefs at that time not to extend their attempts beyond Strasbourg. The explosion in France might be premature; its too volatile and impetuous people might be unwilling to wait till other nations were properly prepared for the grand object." "The reader has already seen him (Spartacus) in secret preparing his adepts, and contriving the concatenation of his correspondence, in such a manner, that he had but to give the signal when the favourable moment should come. On the fatal day of revolution, and at the appointed hour, legions of brethren were to spring forth on all sides from their secret recesses, whether Lodges, academies, or under what other denomination soever, from the North to the South, and from the East to the West. All Europe in short was to be revolutionized at the same instant. Altars and thrones were simultaneously to vanish from the earth."

According to this plan (as has been observed) the French were to be the last people initiated into the mysteries:

"Already, however, there existed some adepts in the very heart of France. During that very year we find on the list of brethren Dietrich,
that mayor of Strasburg, who has since in Alsace rivalled Robespierre in his cruelties. Another adept of vast importance to the sect was the Marquis de Mirabeau, who was afterwards to become so famous in the revolutionary annals of his country. "Long before his initiation Mirabeau had been acquainted with all the revolutionary powers of the Masonic Lodges; . . . . and on his return to France he began to introduce the new mysteries among some of his Masonic brethren. His first associate was the Abbé Talleyrand de Perigord, who had already begun to act the part of Judas in the first order of the Church. . . . . Well acquainted with the reasons that had induced the chiefs of the Order to defer the conversion of France, the Marquis found means to convince them that the time was now come for the accomplishment of their views; that the whole nation only waited for their new revolutionary means, to burst into the open rebellion for which they had been so long prepared."

We cannot of course enter into the particulars of the measures taken:—suffice it to say, that by the influence of Mirabeau it was determined that France should be immediately illuminizd. A deputation of the Illumiines is received in the Masonic Lodges; and this event may be regarded as affording the exact date when the fata of the French monarchy was sealed; when the decisions of blood were thrown into the cauldron of the universal blasphemy that prevailed. In this manner it happened that the tide of impiety which had flowed from the French borders was rolled back upon them in revolution: from the wind of blasphemy which she had sown among the nations she was herself made to reap the whirlwind of confiscation and ruin.

Now we beg to submit with all due deference, that there is something very remarkable in the epoch of history here considered, as illustrative of the prophecy before us; which presumes at the period of its final accomplishment the liberation of the people of God. The hand of the great Infidel becomes paralyzed with age, and the axe of the Revolutionist is immediately ready to lop off and exterminate what he has proscribed. Voltaire and his associates sound for "seven years" around the doomed city the rams-horns of defiance and summons; incontinently its walls and ramparts (its infallibility, its acts of faith, its indulgences) fall:—and forthwith a host, duly prepared from all parts of the Roman world, are ready for a "seven years'" butchery. Rahab the
pious harlot—the seeder from ecclesiastical unity, but who had received the messengers of the Lord, is delivered with all her house. The point of time seems then to be well chosen (viz., at the first summons to the ramparts) for proclaiming that the 1,260 years of imprisonment are at an end. And the writer ventures to suggest—presuming that the 1,260 years is an exact measure of time, and taking into the account the numerous errors to which chronological computation dependent on history is liable—that if we cannot at once receive, we should at least be cautious not at once to reject the 1st of May, 1776 (a date undoubtedly a few months after time, yet attended with an event so consonant in its nature with the expected end of the prophecy—deliverance for the saints from the tyrannical decree of Justinian)—as not exhibiting a fulfilment sufficiently accurate in time. If the precise year 1775 should, notwithstanding, be insisted upon, perhaps some reader better acquainted with the history of philosophism may be able to supply the requisite event:—of the correct choice he has made of the epoch, and of the manner of the saints’ liberation, the writer for himself has no doubt.

But if the overplus of a few months must undoubtedly be considered as preventing the verification of the prophecy, there is not wanting an argument to shew, that the epoch generally, rather than any particular event belonging to it, is probably to be regarded as terminating the long day of 1,260 years. We would ask whether, in the context where this number is given, there is not presented, designedly, a sort of historical summary of consecutive Papal enormities, having for its object to lead the attention gradually from epoch to epoch, irrespective of specific events, to that epoch wherein the year 1775 is situate. It is first said, “he shall speak great words against the Most High.” The natural growth of the “power over heretics” conferred in 533, issued in the speedy increase of the Papal pretensions—assuming to forgive sins, to regulate the pains of a future state, and to sit as the visible representative of the Deity,—“great words” which denote a process of growth, and set at nought the idea of precision in time.
The next sign, as time advances, is, that "he shall wear out the saints of the Most High;" which alludes, of course, to the numberless atrocities before, and at, the time of the great Reformation. A third and later sign shall be, that "he shall think to change times and laws." From a comparison of this with cognate texts,* we conceive this pretension to signify, that it should come into his mind to change the fundamental observances of the Church,† and modify the spiritual enactments of old times; especially the provisions of that great symbol of the Christian faith—the Apostles' Creed, squaring them to his own interest and purposes:—and this was done at the Council of Trent, when there were appended to the Creed twelve additional articles, demanding to be held in equal reverence with the twelve of apostolic times. By these various and successive signs the attention is gradually conducted across the field of ages; the events chosen for the purpose being an enumeration of the greater crises to which the Church should be subjected. And in looking onwards to the deliverance presumed, we seem invited to seek it in some acknowledged division of history, and in the broad estuary of troubles into which the small beginnings of A.D. 533 should expand; rather than pitch upon any particular act of Divine grace and interference. Lastly, whether the explanations here offered of this great number be accepted or not, it is a fact not to be questioned that, from the date of Voltaire's death, and by means of the measures set on foot by the sanguinary hosts in whom his spirit became embodied, Rome has been ever since kept under restraint in reference to her views of persecution; and (speaking generally) the Word of God has had free course;—the saints have been set free,—and the true faith has been individually professed, without molestation, among the nations of the Roman Beast. The paucity of the exceptions proves the rule.‡

* Vide 1 Chr. xii. 32; Esther i. 13.
† "The word rendered 'time,' is that which denotes either a stated period or else a set feast; or else an idea blended, as it were, of the two; viz., the interval from one of the great set feasts to its recurrence, i.e., a year." (Tregelles on Dan. iv. 6.)
‡ Since writing the above, we have lighted upon the following important
But the most difficult part of our subject is still before us. What is to be said of this famous number, when applied to the "little horn" considered as an individual:—for we have expressed the opinion that the sacro-secular system of Romanism works up to a Head,—which Head is, equally with the system he represents, the "little horn;" in like manner as the Roman territory and its reigning Head are equally the "Beast." To answer this question, it is necessary to repeat from a previous page a few remarks on the nature and purpose of these large numbers—measured periods of time. They are altogether independent of the limitations of the prophetic "kingdoms"—the great sections of imperial rule:—on the contrary, they appear intended to act as bands to unite these together, or as comets to harmonize their too detached influences. Now if we consider the human figure (whence the Image of Daniel) in its gait, it makes good its progress by the legs overstepping each other; so that the space passed over is twice measured:—the same may be observed of these mighty strides of time, as the imperial Image moves onwards to its destined end. It will be remembered that these numbers are attached entirely to the "legs" of the Image; and that the legs represent entirely Christian times. And it would appear that the true progress of the Image requires for its purpose two of these strides to cooperate with—i.e., to overstep—each other. This will appear a singular speculation; and it is one unhappily for the better elucidation of which we must rely on a future vision. The period we are upon, measuring from one characteristic footprint to another in the history of the Papacy (i.e., from A.D. 533 to 1775), neither commences nor ends with the Papal power; but it is a step of the leg in its progress. The same may be said of two other similar periods announced

passage in a note of Mr. Elliott's (p. 1010) taken from Mann:—"Imperium Romano-Papale tunc natum videtur quum Papam omnium ecclesiarum caput esse dixit Justinianus A.D. 533, 534: idque non verbo tantum significavit, sed missis ad eum episcopis quasi legatis." Now 534 + 1242, making 1260, give the year 1776—the very year we desire, in which, by the inauguration of Illuminism, the opening of the prison-doors was assured. Thus our object is completely attained, and just in time.
for examination, applying equally to the afflictions of the true Church: they commence one on either side of the epoch of Justinian—one in an earlier, the other in a later age; and the three are to be regarded as co-operating strides of the Image. To the earlier one of the three, ending A.D. 1555, we will not here refer; the later terminates in 1848. And our speculation is, that the two later periods, terminating respectively in 1775 and 1848, and co-operating in such manner as to produce progress, lead up in their united action to the times of the "Head"—the times of Louis Napoleon.

And now let us consider in what shape the expectation may be entertained, that the individual "little horn," the Head and representative of the system evolved in 1848, will enter—in his particular fulfilment of the prophecy—upon such a course of persecution, as will respond to the description of the saints being given into his hand, until a time, times, and the dividing of time. That he will be a persecutor we have lately learnt from Daniel's eleventh chapter; but how are we to understand the measure in time of this burst of individual persecution? In a previous page (p. 123) we have held the argument that both the figurative and the natural acceptations of the words "time, times, and the dividing of time" may be admissible, even in the same prophecy. Indeed, if it be admitted that an individual may represent a system (that the Head of the Roman empire, for instance, and the empire itself may equally claim the designation of the "Beast") there is then no prima facie reason why the same rule should not obtain among numbers referring to time; nor why the word "time," taken in its simple sense as signifying the space of a year, should not be held to have the same relation to the individual man, that in its multiplied sense it does to man regarded as the continuing inhabitant of ages. This then is the rule we propose in the present difficulty: but as it will not (we are sure) be readily received, we beg further to raise in its behalf what may be called a scriptural vindication.

It cannot be doubted that the "seven times" during which Nebuchadnezzar was cast out from the society of men (Dan. iv. 23) were seven natural years; but these "seven
times" were emblematical of the seven ages, during which the rule committed to man should degenerate into the bestial state. The picture here is perfect. For seven years Nebuchadnezzar "eats grass as oxen"; after which, when he lifts up his eyes to heaven, his reason returns, and with it an elevation to a higher than his antecedent glory. In like manner, during seven long ages, the imperial rule of man, typified in Nebuchadnezzar, remains in a state of bestial degradation; after which—on its lifting up its eyes to heaven, the saints are called to "possess the kingdom." Here then we obtain evidence that a "time"—a single year as applied to an individual—may simultaneously express an age when applied to the expanded man, or nation:—indeed, how is it possible that a man should be made the type of a people in their duration, except by accommodating in this typical manner the measures of time? We venture then to think it probable that the subject of our inquiry—the time, times, and the dividing of time of the "little horn's" persecution, is intended to be understood in both a restricted and an expanded sense; and that while it unquestionably means 1,260 years as applied to the sacro-secular system of the Papacy, it means also 3½ years, when applied to the late-coming Head which shall grow out of, and be a concentration of, that system.

If it be true that persecution shall mark the short career of this individual little horn, we may look forward at the closing of that career, through the guarantee of the same prophecy, not only to the necessary deliverance of the afflicted Church (as in the year 1775-6) but to her high exaltation. But we defer the further consideration of this subject to the "number" which yields the advent of the Antichrist.

DAN. VIII. 14.

The next number to be considered is the 2,300 days of Dan. viii. 14: or rather, the 2,400 days—the reading of the Greek version.

The writer quite participates in the opinion that this pro-
phhecy relates to the rise and fall of Mohammedanism within the regions of Eastern Rome—a leg of Daniel’s Image; and although this might seem to exclude it from a treatise on the “Beast,” considered territorially as the *ascendant* Roman empire in the West—or “fourth kingdom,” the reader must call to mind that when we had the “Image” of Rev. xiii. under review, the opinion was expressed that it points to the establishment of an Eastern empire, by the Head of the Western Roman empire,—a consideration which places the subject of this number intimately within our proper confines.

Whether the empire expected to arise will exhibit in its form and government the defunct Eastern empire, it would be impossible from any light that has sprung up in our path hitherto to predict. We should decidedly think the contrary, for the reason before alluded to—that in the answer to a question in ver. 13 of this chapter, having reference to the “sanctuary AND the host,” nothing is mentioned in ver. 14 of the *host*—i.e., of the *secular* power of the people referred to. But let us proceed:—not that we intend to venture further upon the ground of this chapter, than is necessary for the introduction of the number it contains. We presume that the reader has already cast his eye over its contents.

The first important observation we have to make upon this period of 2,400 years is, that it *counts* from the day when the vision was seen:—this is evident from the words of the question (ver. 13), “how long shall be the vision,” &c., i.e., how long from the then existing day—in “the third year of Belshazzar.” Next we may observe that Daniel says pointedly (ver. 2) that he was at the time of the vision “in the province of Elam, and by the river of Ulai;” which, though intended as an index of time, shews unquestionably that he and his compatriots were in a state of *captivity*,—the Gentiles were *treading underfoot* both the “sanctuary and host” of the Lord. It is presumable that this and every vision was interesting to Daniel only in its relation to the elect Church of God; and as the narrative thus commences with an allusion to the then prevailing captivity and oppres-
sion; and as the question, to which the then to be predicted epoch was the answer, also alluded to captivity and oppression; it is reasonable to conclude that it was the evil then weighing upon the Church, which the expiration of the term was to remove. Not as if the then existing evil was to endure 2,400 years; but that, regarding the then existing evil as typical of a similar evil to arise in the same place (i. e., the same in typical nomenclature—Babylon, in the Christian ages of the world, this later evil should find its termination at the end of the then foreshewn period. Accordingly, it is asked by a “saint” (ver. 13) “how long shall be the vision . . . . to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?” By the sanctuary is meant the people who then had, or (by parity of type) should have at the expiration of the period, the charge of God’s honour, and be the depository of His truth:—by the host is meant the civil power of the same people, as exhibited in their national organization and government—the emblem being of union and strength. Be it observed that this people is spoken of as a sanctuary only, not as the covenant. The expiration of 2,400 years was to see both “sanctuary and host” set free from bondage: or (it may be) only the sanctuary cleansed,—for this (as said just now) might be reasonably contended from ver. 14.

The contents of the vision are, first, the rise and fall of the Medo-Persian empire (vers. 2 to 4); secondly, the career of Alexander the Great, and the ultimate division of his kingdom into four parts (vers. 5 to 8). These require no comment. At ver. 9 we arrive at the more difficult part of the vision, which refers (we believe) to the rise and progress of the Mahometan empire, and its successes against the Eastern leg of the Roman empire,—ending in the utter subversion of the latter “by reason of transgression.” (Ver. 12.)

The chief difficulty attending the “little horn” here mentioned (ver. 9) is found at the outset of the description: it is said that “out of one of them,” i. e., out of one of the “four notable horns,” or kingdoms, into which the great horn of
Alexander was divided, "came forth this little horn." The question here arises—the all-important one, whether history warrants the belief that the region where the false prophet was born—that part of Arabia wherein the towns of Mecca and Medina are situated—was comprised within the dominions of Alexander, or of the Ptolemies, his successors in Egypt. It is one of those points of history which it is very possible, as it may suit the purpose of the writer, either to affirm or contradict:—we shall do no more than direct attention to the testimonies on both sides which we have been able to collect. The "Universal History" in a "Dissertation on the independency of the Arabs" (xx. 234) speaking of the kingdom of Hijar, where the greatest part of the Ishmaelites settled themselves, has the following observation, —"That the Arabs were continued in a state of independency, from the days of Ishmael to the birth of the famous impostor Mohammed, who was one of them, appears not only from what has been already advanced, but from the concurrent testimony of the best Oriental historians. . . . We have not the least reason to suppose that the Arabs ever received any foreign yoke before the reign of Saladin." Concurrently with this, Mr. Salt, in his "Preliminary Discourse" to the Koran, says, "Thus have the Arabs preserved their liberty, of which few nations can produce so ancient monuments, with very little interruption even from the very deluge. . . . I do not find that any of his (Alexander's) successors, either in Asia or Egypt, ever made any attempt against them." These are formidable opinions; but they must be taken "cum grano salis"; we must give due weight, for instance, to Mr. Salt's words "with very little interruption." As to extent of subjected territory, we ask only for the sea-coast, and the very narrow strip that appertains to it, from whence the false prophet sprang; and we contend that history authorizes the belief that it came into the possession of one of the "notable horns;"—but whether to an immediate successor of Alexander is more doubtful;—but is this a peremptory requisite of the prophecy?

Arrian, in his account of the partition of Alexander's dominions, (Rooke's translation, p. 243) says—"Ptolemy
the son of Lagus was deputed by Perdiccas to preside over Egypt and Libya, with that part of Arabia adjacent to Egypt.” Quintus Curtius says only (vid. Rooke’s Tables) “Ptolemy enjoyed Egypt, with all the countries of Africa which were subdued.” So also Diodorus Siculus, and so Dexippus. But Justin says, “Ptolemy received from Per- diccas the government of Egypt, Africa, and part of Arabia.” And so too Orosius.* The “Universal History” (xx. 208)

* A great mistake prevails, founded on an erroneous view of the language of Daniel, that the empire of Alexander was divided into precisely four kingdoms. The number “four” is to be taken here in a symbolical sense: and the specimen is an excellent one of the use made of the number in ancient sacred writings. Where it is said (Dan. viii. 8) that for the great horn “came up four notable ones towards the four winds of heaven,” it is meant, “according to the number of the four winds of heaven”;—and they (we know) are as numerous as the points of the compass. “This place (says Orosius) St. Jerome, and from him others of subsequent ages, expound of the four chief kings and their kingdoms.” “Alexander in twelve years brought the trembling world under subjection by dint of the sword; and his princes, for the space of fourteen years more, harassed it like ravenous whelps, tearing in pieces the prey which had been seized by the mighty lion; and their covetousness of the spoil causing them to quarrel, they mangled and devoured each other. The distribution he gives of the great king’s dominions is as follows:—

“Ptolemy obtained .......... Egypt, with part of Africa and Arabia.
Laomedon .......... Syria.
Philotas .......... Cilicia.
Philo .......... The Illyrians.
Atropatus .......... Media the greater.
The father-in-law of Perdiccas .......... Media the less.
Scynus .......... Susiana.
Antigonus, son of Philip .......... Phrygia the greater.
Nearchus .......... Lycia and Pamphylia.
Cassander .......... Caria.
Menander .......... Lydia.
Leonnatus .......... Phrygia the less.
Lysimachus .......... Thrace, &c.
Eumenes .......... Cappadocia and Paphlagonia.
Seleucus, son of Antiochus .......... The chief command of the Forces.
Cassander, son of Antipater .......... The command of the King’s Guard.”

Then follows an equally long list of the independent governors he left in the farther East. “The first book of the Maccabees (i. 8, 9) expresses no certain number, but says, ‘And his servants obtained dominion, every
meets these authors—such of them as speak of Arabia—with the observation, “When therefore some authors insinuate that Ptolemy, upon Alexander’s death, had Arabia assigned to him, we must understand them as speaking of but an inconsiderable part of that country.” It goes on to say, that “the Arabs governed by Ptolemy seem to have been none other than the Egyptian Arabs”; for that—“in the earlier ages, Egypt extended very little beyond the Eastern bank of the Nile, if the Nile itself was not the Eastern boundary of that kingdom.” Hence the “Universal History” would have us learn, that the “part of Arabia” governed by Ptolemy must have been the territory lying between the Nile and the Arabian Gulph. This question we must leave in painful doubt;—that is, so far as the first of the Ptolemies is concerned. But does the prophecy require to be understood of Alexander’s immediate successor? Is it not sufficient that the “notable horn” from which we are supposing the Mahometan rule to have descended was the Ptolemaic dynasty? And if so, it appears to the writer, that the following passage from the above-mentioned opponent concedes the question in full:—we read (xx. 213) that Ptolemy Euergetes did not come into possession of Arabia,—“for, in the year B.C. 222, being the last of his reign, he only made himself master of the Arabian and Ethiopian coasts of the Red Sea; which amounts to a plain implication that he did not penetrate far into Arabia.” The latter part of this conclusion we willingly concede, the first being all we are interested to see established: and on the grounds thus elicited, we triumphantly claim that the impediment regarding the descent of the “little horn” is removed.

The description of this power, as “waxing exceeding great towards the South, and towards the East, and towards the pleasant land” will be recognised as perfect in its application to Mahomet, who extended his spiritual dominion, in the exact sense of the prophecy, into Africa, and into Hindostan, and into the countries around Palestine. So too one in his place: and after his death they all placed crowns upon their heads, as did their sons after them; and evils were multiplied upon the earth.”
of his having cast down some of the *host of heaven* (ver. 10)—the secular reigning magistracy, and of the *stars*—the spiritual authorities, and stamped upon them. Also, of his having *magnified himself* (ver. 11) to the station of "Prince of the host" (thereby dethroning our Lord), calling himself emphatically "*the* prophet of God." "By him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down" (ib.); where by *daily sacrifice* is meant, we presume, as transferred to Christian times, the daily sacrifice of praise as enjoined in all churches of the saints. The daily sacrifice exists wheresoever by *public appointment* the means are instituted for the daily worship of God,—that is, wherever there is an *established church*;—and we believe that in no part of Christendom but spiritual offerings are ordained from day to day. By the "sanctuary" is meant, with reference to the regions of Mahometanism, the Eastern Church—the depository of the precious truths of the Gospel in that part of the world;—and the "*place* of his sanctuary" may mean, either the chief seat of the Christian empire—Constantinople—the Eastern Rome; or (and more probably) Jerusalem—the *place* (which altereth not) of God's own choosing.

Now the *negative* proof which is further presented in these points of their allusion to Mahomet, rather than to the "little horn" of the preceding chapter with which this "little horn" is often confounded, is not among the least imposing, viz., that although the *daily sacrifice* was taken away, the place of *God's sanctuary* cast down, and the *truth* cast down to the ground—points which are most fitly illustrated in the career of Mahomet, but which some commentators have fancifully (as we venture to think) applied to the Pope of Rome,—it is not said in addition (as in the case of the Western Antichrist), that the "abomination that maketh desolate is set up" (Dan. xii. 11); nor that he "sits upon the mount of the congregation" (i.e., as the *Head* of the *Christian* congregation—and thereby *the* Antichrist); nor that he "will be like the Most High" (Is. xiv. 13, 14). The offering, the edifice, and the truth itself, did Mahometanism overthrow, consummating the sign in every
particular in A.D. 1453:—but in personal pretensions, the false prophet lagged far behind the Antichrist of the West, in that—though the "prophet of God," he was not the "Vicar of God"—endowed with Divine power, nor "God himself." Other principal marks are contained in the words, "by peace he shall destroy many" (ver. 25)—alluding to the Mahometan alternative universally proposed to the conquered—"The Koran or the sword": and—"shall stand up against the Prince of princes" (ib)—placing himself (that is) in front of Christ, whom, notwithstanding, he acknowledged as Divine; and of whom his followers have ever believed that He shall come to judge the world.

We cannot but regard it as encouraging the view here taken—viz., that while the "little horn" of the seventh of Daniel points to the Papal Antichrist, the "little horn" of the eighth points to the Mahometan imposture; of which two "horns" history records that they sprang up almost simultaneously—(viz., the Papal horn in A.D. 606, and the horn of Ishmael in the same year, as some say; or in A.D. 611, says Dr. Wordsworth, p. 213; and by none said later than A.D. 622)—that the two visions were seen by the prophet within two years of each other, as if to mark the collateral courses of their history; and both of them removed by upwards of forty years from the first great vision of the "Image," and by just twenty years (taking them together) from the great prophecy of the eleventh chapter. The natural expectation arises (if this be indeed an intended point of significance) that the two Powers will find their issue at the same epoch of time:—we bring them to an end simultaneously (a prophetic end, calculated from the numbers—not always discernible in actually passing events) in A.D. 1848.

The question is put, "How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot"? (Ver. 13.) The "daily sacrifice" we have just considered:—the "transgression of desolation" (i.e., the transgression which makes desolate) is an allusion to the expression in the preceding verse, "by reason of transgres-
tion": and the question proposed is—how long shall the lamentable and desolating consequences of this transgression endure, to the effect of giving both the sanctuary and the host—the Eastern Church and the organised Christian government under whose auspices it flourished, and was for so many ages upheld, to be trodden under foot? The answer is "unto 2,400 days, then shall the sanctuary be cleansed:"—cleansed (that is) from the filth of Mahometanism:—there is no reference to the filth of its own corruptions. What may be signified by the omission in this answer to speak of the "host"—equally the subject of the question as the "sanctuary," cannot be determined by this prophecy. But now, as to the number.

Mr. Frere has pointed out (though for a different purpose than that for which we now adduce the fact) that 2,400 days are one less than 2,401, which happens to be the exact measure of forty-nine jubilees. He does not propose the number 2,401 as an amendment upon the one given; but suggests it, for certain reasons, as another sacred number. The circumstance is so curious of there being a deficiency of one only, to complete the period of forty-nine jubilees—the jubilees of jubilees it may be truly called—being \((7 \times 7) \times (7 \times 7)\) that it must needs arrest attention; but particularly so in these days, where we further find that, without the one, the number reaches to the year 1847, and with it, to the year 1848. The reader is referred to the biblical margin for the commencement of the period, viz., "circa 553 B.C.":—the difference between which and 2,401 is 1848. Now the writer would humbly propose the question, whether this vast period (2,400 years)—having its origin in Daniel's time when the day commenced in the evening, and extending into the present times when it begins at 12 p.m.—does not naturally convert itself into 2,401; the process being analogous to that of the moon, which, after a journey of twenty-eight days, has still a short space to travel over, to bring it into a right relation with the movements of the sun. In the margin the original is said to read as 2,400 "evenings and mornings;" so that when the last of these "evenings and mornings" should have passed away, there
would remain (if the fulfilment were intended to be in Christian times) a few hours (figuratively—months) to complete the Christian day then in being; and as a piece always counts for a whole in Scripture, we thus attain to 2,401 days. The interpretation we are offering entirely depends upon the concession of this point, and for the following reason.

We cannot but receive as agreeable to the truth of Scripture the rule of converting the solar into prophetic years; which rule, however, if applied in the present instance, would render nugatory all that has been said. But if the number be indeed intended to mark a period of $49 \times 49$ years, *in preparation for a year of jubilee in this manner hinted at* and foreshewn, consisting of seven years—the unit of the hebdomade, and expressed as forty-nine; we know that the computation of the Jubilees was by *natural* years; and consequently we are set free in this instance from the observance of the prophetic rule. This argument, founded on the *necessary* increase of the number of days by one (the consequence of a change in the notation of time), would apply equally well, of course, to the number 2,300—the one given in our version, as to the 2,400 of the Greek; but there is this stamp of truth on the latter number which the first fails to present—that of its converted form (2,401) being a *multiple of seven*; not so 2,301. This is a notable instance of the corrective value of the septenary division.

There is no other so wonderful property of prophecy as that whereby, not confining itself to the foretelling of events to come (which an infidel might say is the result of sagacity) it actually speaks of, and calculates upon, circumstances to arise in the progress of human history, by which alone these events could be controlled to their predetermined issue;—relying herein upon circumstances which not only had no existence at the pronouncement of the prophecy, but which even the most erudite of the period could not have comprehended if placed before them:—in a word, "speaking of the things that are not as though they are." Of such sort is John's numerical enigma—the "number of the beast," which we shall presently find is to be understood only by the help of a numeration table, which had not in his day
come into existence:—and of the like sort was the looking forward by Daniel's Divine informant to a change in the ordering of daily time, which was to be productive of the conversion of the predicted number of 2,400 days into 2,401.

It is then the conclusion of this reasoning, that in A.D. 1848 commences the period wherein the Eastern Church will be purified from the foul pollutions of Mahometanism, with which for so many ages, "because of transgression," it has been overspread. In that year the work will be found to have had its commencement, even though it should have gone no further than to expose to view more manifestly than before, the filthiness of this Augean stable. In Louis Napoleon as a sign, is involved this among the other great events already alluded to of his "kingdom." An event of this sort is not the work of a particular year; and a reason is deducible from the prophecy for believing, that it will not have its completion for, yet, nearly a quarter of a century. In verse 17 we read (and in the call to read attentively there is some significance)—"Understand, O son of man; for at the time of the end shall be the vision":—in the Latin, "Intellige, fili hominis: quoniam in tempore finis complebitur visio":—and in the Greek (still better) "ετι γαρ εις καιρον περας," &c. The meaning is, that still there is a considerable period to the completion of the work of "cleansing," reaching even to the time of the end, over and above the termination of the 2,400 years. May it not be said that the words "unto two thousand four hundred days, then shall the sanctuary be cleansed" (ver. 14) favour this view,—the words "then shall" seeming to point to the expiration of a period when shall commence the predicted cleansing?

But what is to be said of the jubilee of seven years, which we have conjectured to commence equally in A.D. 1848, and which has now (1856) run out its course? Is it possible to sustain this speculation by a reference to any events that have taken place in the period, either happy in themselves or hopeful, such as one might imagine to be a cause of exultation to the glorious company of the blessed? The rejoicings of the ancient jubilee may be considered as illustrative of those glorious hosannas which are heard in the
courts of heaven—thus responded to by the listening Church on earth—on beholding the accomplishment of any of God’s ancient promises; especially regarding the promotion of the kingdom of His Son, and of the means instituted for that end in the free circulation of His Gospel. The feast was attended with the release of the prisoner, and the restitution of land; and the release of the prisoner, in a spiritual sense, will shew forth the disenchainment of the understanding; and the restitution of land the restoration of those Gospel privileges and promises which are provided for the depasturing of the Church, and of which she may have been robbed by the powers of the world. And we ask—Does recent history point to any transactions in the East, during the years of our supposed Jubilee—(however small when viewed as results, but when viewed as seeds instinct with life promising a sure and certain harvest)—which we might venture to regard as the first acts of the predicted “cleansing,” and as demanding the grateful acknowledgments of God’s saints?

Of such like transactions (though neither of the things specified) we are inclined to name first—giving it precedence as the most hopeful of all—the abandonment by the higher Turks of the horrid pollution of polygamy. Dr. Cumming, copying from the “Standard” newspaper, says:—

“Passing events point most strongly to the extinction of Ottoman barbarism and bigotry. The reforming party is gaining strength, while among the reformers polygamy is abolished, and the one wife is introduced into society, and in all respects treated on the same footing as an European lady.” (“The End,” p. 156.)

This is in itself a grand social revolution, and may be taken as an earnest of what more is approaching:—besides being a return to first principles, it is an acknowledgment of the higher standard of Christian morality. The immediate effect (says the same article) is apparent in a superior humanity, which engaged the Turkish ladies, like our own, to take an important part in alleviating the miseries of the late war.

Accordingly,—

“we notice (says Cumming, p. 160) not only the exhaustion of the race,” (itself a removal of the unclean thing) “but the extinction of all that
makes Turkey Turkish. The most stringent laws of the Koran are at this moment broken. The renunciation of Islamism by one who once a Christian had adopted it, and now renounces it, is by the Koran death; but by the law of the Sultan, thus set up in opposition to the Koran, it is no longer death."

A firman obtained in 1850, in favour of the professors of the reformed religion, declares that,—

"It being contrary to the royal pleasure that they should suffer difficulties and inconveniences, from their not having yet been placed under a separate and special jurisdiction, it is the royal will that measures should be taken for insuring the proper administration of their affairs, and for enabling them to live in peace and security."

Accordingly an agent now transacts at the Porte or elsewhere, all the business connected with this profession in the Turkish empire, by memorials sealed with his own seal. (Ib. 160-1.) "When (asks Cumming) will the Pope of Rome, or the Czar—the Eastern Pope, grant similar toleration to Protestants in their dominions?" Thus in the chief seat of the Mahometan religion is there granted to all Christians a substantial relief from persecution, and perfect liberty of conscience; and the two great marks we have mentioned of a spiritual jubilee—release from spiritual bondage, and restitution of all those ancient privileges, civil and ecclesiastical, which appertain of right to a Christian community—are established.

Thirdly, among the late concessions to public opinion, and to the desire to conciliate the Christian portion of the Turkish population, may be noticed the abolition of the Haratch—a tax upon Christians alone—not so much an oppressive tax, as an invidious distinction: the admission of the Giaour to the rank of colonel in the army: the formation of a board of education, of which one third will consist of Christians: above all, the equality of Turks and Christians before the law—which (as says the "Times") "is the abrogation of a policy of twelve hundred years": and the admission of Christian testimony. Add to this, that a firman of 1854 prohibits the importation of slaves.

"From almost every part of our field (say the American missionaries) there has been a demand for the Bible in the Turkish language, and we have reason to believe that the
Scriptures are now read by Turks more than at any other period." (Ib. 170.) "Contemporaneous with the exhaustion of Turkey, the sinking and submerging of all that is peculiar to it as a Mahometan nationality, there is emerging day by day an enlightened and increasing Christian population." At a Bible meeting at Constantinople, Lord Stratford in the chair, "the cheering fact was established that in more than fifty towns and villages in this empire there are assemblies of the Reformed faith for Divine worship on every Lord's-day." At Aintab, near Aleppo, there are more than seven hundred of the Reformed profession. In the Turkish empire there are not fewer than fifty-five preachers of this profession, where, only a few years ago, there was not one. (Ib.) Among the signs of the times, the following extract of a letter from Jerusalem (vide "Times," 6th February last) is not the least curious:—

"Yesterday was Epiphany-day, and his Excellency Kiamil Pasha came to the English Church service, attended by his Turkish business Secretary and his French Secretary (the train of servants stayed near the door). Who would have thought a few years ago that upon our small English premises there should have been the church-bell ringing, the British flag flying, and the Pasha walking reverently to church? It was an Epiphany indeed to see the Pasha in a pew, standing up with our Prayer-book in Turkish at the glorious chant of the Te Deum, facing the ten commandments, the Lord's Prayer, and the creed, in Hebrew writing, in Jerusalem. His Excellency came entirely at his own proposal, and without the claim of public duty. The lady who presided at the organ, I need not say, played with spirit after the sermon 'The people that walked in darkness,' &c."

Now in confirmation of our view respecting a seven years' jubilee in the prophetic distribution of time, it is observable that, such as these facts represent it, has been the general aspect of historical testimony regarding the position and state of Mahometanism during the period commencing in November, 1848—when the "vile person" was raised to power, and up to the present time. Everything demonstrates that the thick polluting "darkness that may be felt" of Islamism is passing away; and this beauteous land, for so many ages the tomb of civilisation and sepulchre of hope, has begun to expand its bosom anew to the "cleansing" beams of truth.
When engaged with chap. xii. we had occasion to point out, that in ver. 7 the passage, "time, times, and an half, and when he shall have accomplished to scatter," &c., denotes a double period of time; and that the first portion expired (as determined even by the rise of L. Napoleon—not to speak yet of other matters) in A.D. 1848; when the latter portion began—leading in its termination to the time of the end. We also said that by the numbers in chap. xii. this "time of the end" would with much assurance be determined. Now it is certainly very remarkable that in these two prophecies (chaps. viii. and xii.) so dissimilar in their objects, the measurement of time—likewise so dissimilar, should lead (as we have pointed out) to the same date in their respective terminations; and moreover, should point alike to a certain peculiarity to attend that date. The "time, times, and an half" (we say) of chap. xii. will be found presently to terminate in A.D. 1848. The "2,400 days" of chap. viii. terminate in the same year. And then, in each prophecy we are referred to a further portion of time, over and above the term first specified, for the absolute completion of the matter spoken of,—this further portion being described, in each case, as leading to the veritable time of the end. What a wonderful instance is this of the consentient character of all prophecy! Hence it appears that we have to witness in the present era (viz., the interval between the year 1848, and the time of the end) as determined by one or other of these visions, the career of the Antichrist, and the abasement of Great Britain; the utter fall of Mahometanism, but "without hands" (viii. 25) i.e., without the violence of man; and in its place the restoration of the Jewish state and polity; but this last after (as would appear from Dan. xii. 1) the commencement of the "time of the end."

Lastly, as there is so complete a parallelism of time in the outgoings of the two scenes of chaps. viii. and xii., the reader is requested to consider whether he cannot discern an identity in the two original sources of information respecting them. Compare Dan. xii. 5, 6 with Dan. viii. 13, 16; and we ask—are there not discernible in each scene the same
speakers, viz., the two saints—inquirers of all ages into prophetic truth, and our Lord—either "clothed in linen upon the waters of the river," or (the same thing) "between the banks of Ulai." Are not these intended as significant points of resemblance, when the times are identical? As if it was intended to say, that the providential courses of the two Churches (Eastern and Western) however dissimilar, were decided upon by their common Saviour, with the ultimate design of leading to an united end.

DANIEL XII.

We now approach the numbers of Daniel's twelfth chapter, which, leading onwards as measurements to the end of prophetic time, are in the meantime most startling in their reference to the days we live in:—these are the "time, times, and an half" of ver. 7; and the "1,290, and 1,335 days" of vers. 11—12. In ver. 6, it is asked, "How long shall it be to the end of these wonders?" the answer is, 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." Daniel says, "I heard, but I understood not." How was it possible he should understand;—for the main thing in all computation was withheld—the place to begin from? No event or feature of history is mentioned,—the Angel is not so far communicative. Now, although the request the prophet immediately makes for further information is not at first heeded, it issues eventually, in recompense of his importunity, in his obtaining two additional most important numbers: they are thus given (vers. 11—12) "And from the time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away, and the abomination that maketh desolate set up, there shall be a thousand, two hundred, and ninety days. Blessed is he that waiteth and cometh to the thousand, three hundred, and five and thirty days." The first of these numbers is precisely the same in its allusion and scope, as the number together with its accompanying communication, of ver. 7: that is to say—in ver. 7, are named a period of 1,260 days, and a further period "when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power
of the holy people"; in ver. 11 is declared a single period of 1,290 days: so that the period "when he shall have accomplished to scatter," &c., of the first of these parallel passages, responds to, and is measured by, the thirty extra years of the later passage. But the equally important distinction between these passages is, that in the latter we are favoured with the essential requisite of a point of time to start from,—one, moreover, which carries a double mark, and is thus assured to us by (as it were) the mouths of two witnesses. This double mark consists of "the taking away the daily sacrifice," and of "the setting up the abomination that maketh desolate." Let us speak of the last sign first.

In the year 606, the Papal Antichrist received the full proportions of his spiritual being, in the act of accepting the office of "Universal Bishop," and of sitting himself in the vicarial throne of the Lord Christ. Now in this position—receiving the homage due only to the true Head of the Church—he became actually, and to all intents and purposes, the idol of the Church. An "idol" is an object of false worship; and is the true meaning of the word "abomination,"—as in the expressions, "Milcom the abomination of the Ammonites," "Ashtaroth the abomination of the Zidonians"; and he who could calmly place himself as a vicegerent on the throne of the Lord Christ, claiming to exercise all His power; and in a subsequent day could accept the title of "our Lord God," may be safely pronounced such an abomination. This, then, was the "abomination," causing desolation, or astonishment (vide margin) at that time set up. Again it happens most remarkably, that in the same year (606) the "daily sacrifice" was—virtually, if not really—taken away. As was said some time ago, the daily sacrifice is ever offered where there is an established church. The term "daily sacrifice" is an evidence of a constituted order of things:—it is a sacrifice—(the sacrifice of prayer and praise) appointed by authority. Every Christian (it is presumed) addresses himself daily to the author of his being and his hopes; but this does not reach the mark of a "daily sacrifice," for the reason that it may be intermitted without public scandal: but in an edifice dedicated to God, wherein
daily prayer is enjoined by authority, as in our parish churches, even a continued neglect does not abrogate the appointment; and therefore neither does it annihilate the possibility of an enemy's stopping the sacrifice. Furthermore, it is the characteristic of Christian worship to be a reasonable sacrifice:—it is not, as in the earlier dispensation, the work of the hands—the opus operatum around the altar, but must be approved by the intelligence, and proceed from the spirit, of all who would draw nigh to God. Such a sacrifice it is within the reach of the adversary to stop in two ways,—either by coercion and robbery of the means, or by instituting in its stead that which cannot render the sweet savour of an acceptable sacrifice;—in other words, either by stopping the supplies altogether, or by obligating the use of illicit victims. It is the latter of these courses which was taken by Pope Vitalian, when he commanded the offices of public worship to be celebrated everywhere, and ever thereafter, in the Latin tongue. By this nefarious provision has the Roman worshipper been compelled, ever since, to approach the Most High God in public worship with words he does not understand—words, to him, of mere charm and incantation. Such is no true sacrifice—the spirit of the worshipper not being engaged;—it is neither prayer nor praise; and so in the evil day was the "daily sacrifice" taken away.

As in the prophecy, so in the history, the two marks (we have said) are to be seen in close proximity; for the first-mentioned in the prophecy—the taking away of the daily sacrifice—was the almost immediate consequence of the other. In the introduction to the Rev. J. Brown's Bible (of Haddington) it is said, respecting the Papal pretension to an universal bishoprick, "the clerical form of Church government, modelled after the imperial, requiring a 'Lord of all' instead of Jesus Christ, the monster Phocas made Boniface III. Universal Bishop": and respecting its accompanying mark, that "about the same time, the missionaries sent forth to enforce subjection to this new authority, being ignorant of the language of the people to whom they were sent, Pope Vitalian appointed that public worship should be everywhere celebrated in Latin." The distinction in nature between
these marks, though they are here seen in combination, is too obvious to dwell upon: nevertheless, it is in their combination—spiritual ambition contriving to lay its firm foundation in the popular ignorance, that what may be called the one great feature of the period is found,—the feature therefore which, at the termination of the 1,290 years, it is presumable will be removed.*

It is very possible here to urge as an objection, that the decree of Pope Vitalian does not date precisely from A. D. 606, but from a few years later; and that in this respect the words above quoted—"about the same time"—are very inexact. True!—but the later transaction (as the author very properly observes) was the inevitable consequence of the earlier. The taking away the daily sacrifice was necessitated by, and therefore may be regarded as a part of, the first feat of setting up the idol. The two together constitute (we repeat) "the one great feature" of the period. The one date is therefore (at least, such is our belief) the year 606. There is room, no doubt, on this point for difference of opinion. It is possible that something may be intended by the reversal in the prophetic narrative of the order in which the two events occurred; reminding us of the reverse view taken of the "lion, the bear, and the leopard," in Rev. xiii., used as a mark of time. On this ground, an opponent may fairly contend, that the mention, first, of the "taking away the daily sacrifice"—the latest event in time, and secondly of the "setting up the idol"—the undisputed event of the year 606, seems to shew, that the one united transaction was not complete, until the portion of it latest in time was brought to pass; and that, consequently, from this later date the 1,290 years should be counted. Against this we contend, that both events should be included within the 1,290 years: for this, as a consequence, does the specification of a period said to contain them both require; and this necessity the objector's scheme ignores. It becomes necessary, in consequence, to begin the computation with the earliest event; observing that it does not matter how much later the other

* It scarcely needs to be repeated, that only one of these marks—the taking away of the daily sacrifice, is applicable to Mahomet.
event should arrive, provided it were within the thirty years:—it was, in point of fact, much within that time. It is thus that Prophecy seems to provide against a too great precision and certainty of interpretation, while yet she expects on our part the conviction of her exact and infallible truth.

From the date then of A.D. 606 we are enabled to count 1,290 years; viz., 1,260 years ending in A.D. 1848 (606+1,242=1848) and thirty in addition, reaching to A.D. 1877-8. The only difficulty here is to steer clear of the too easy conclusion, that the "scattering" (ver. 7) takes place within the "time, times, and an half":—the "scattering" marks an additional period of (in that verse) an undefined extent; but the additional period is, in the eleventh verse, defined to be one of thirty years. Thus the measure of the whole period is learnt from the eleventh verse, and the purpose of the added portion from the seventh. The present thirty years, then, are for the "holy people" (Great Britain)*

* In offering this interpretation of the "holy people," the writer is constrained to add that he has seen but one commentary (that of Dr. Lee, who refers the expression to the Christian Church), which doubts at all of its proper application being to the Jewish nation. Some indeed see a direct grammatical relation between it and the term "thy people" in the first verse, which certainly does allude to the people of Israel. Undoubtedly a very good case in favour of their claim to the title can be made out from the eleventh chapter of "Romans." "The election hath obtained it (i.e., to be God's people), and the rest were blinded unto this day" (vers. 7, 8); from whence a hope may be entertained, that as the great body of the Jews who were given over to "blindness" have so remained "unto this day," so the "election"—or faithful "remnant" may have so remained—albeit utterly unknown to the world. At any rate, as "the gifts and calling of God are without repentance;" and as, moreover, it is said of the Jews that they are only "blinded in part"—i.e., not totally blinded; there arises a warrant for imagining, that what is called the "rejection" of the Jews would be just as rightly designated an obscuration—a state of abeyance of their privileges, not attended with the loss to them of the honourable title under consideration, being "beloved" of God—even while "enemies" of the Gospel (ver. 28), for the sake of their fathers. Furthermore, "if the first fruit be holy, the lump is also holy: and if the root be holy, so are the branches" (ver. 16),—on which text it would not surely be preposterous to build the conviction, that there attaches to the Jews in the eyes of Jehovah an inalienable holiness. On the other hand, it is difficult to believe that Daniel would have imputed...
a period of "scattering" (xii. 7)—let every one interpret the word in fear, and of "purification" (xi. 35)—also a fearful sound.

To come more closely to the days we live in—the present is the tenth year of the thirty, by which the original term of 1,260 years is prolonged. How soon our chosen nation may be called to her account, no means of calculating is given; but the "holiness" in the present age, in disconnexion from a reception of the Gospel, or in allowance of a merely prescriptive right. Holiness can attach only to the "people of God"; and the Jews can only become again of that people "if they abide not in unbelief." (Ver. 23.) But here again an important view arises in favour of the Jewish claim:—they may have so far become, in the times the expression alludes to, converted to the Christian faith, as to afford from among them a "holy people." This is indeed to be believed: for the first verse of the chapter informs us of the "time of the end" being arrived, and of Michael consequently having already "stood up" in their behalf. We must here observe, that if the verdict of Christian judgment should incline in this direction—giving the title in question to the Jews, the whole passage "when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people"—viewed as an index of time and denoting a certain measurement—will not thereby be much affected; for instead of its then pointing to chastisements upon Protestant England, we have only to consider it as written thus—"when he shall have ceased to scatter the rulers of his holy people":—the passage still constitutes a measure of thirty years. But now—admitting the difficulty before us, and leaving the reader to form his own conclusions, we must draw attention to the more important expression (more important so far as we are concerned)—the "holy covenant" of chap. xi., and which we have assumed to be the same as the "holy people" of chap. xii. It is quite clear that during the times of the trials foreshown to impend on the "holy covenant"—i.e., during the career of the Antichrist, the Jews are as a nation in unbelief:—the "time of the end" is not come, nor are the "seven plagues fulfilled" (Rev. xv. 8)—of which more hereafter. Is it possible to imagine that, under such circumstances, the abettors of the old exploded system would be referred to under the designation of the "holy covenant"? We think not. Even if the title be borrowed from the ancient system, the reference must be to professors of Christianity; for the "people of the covenant" must in every age be those who—not glorying only in being of the seed of Abraham, are "Jews" in the praise they render to God in the reception of his revealed truth. We take the opportunity of observing that the expression "Ships of Chittim" (xi. 30) —which we have imagined at p. 356 to signify ships of England—is more naturally thought by several Commentators to be an accustomed designation for ships of the best quality.
writer invites again the sincere attention of his countrymen to the position he takes up (and which he would not venture to take up, he trusts, on merely conjectural grounds) that we stand at this moment between the first and second bursts of the great storm of the Antichrist’s reign, i.e., between vers. 22, and 23, of Dan. xi. From this position we observe treachery and “deceit” written in large characters on the page of the nearest future. We have shewn that the words “after the league,” may be translated “after acts of friendship and alliance”:—what further warning would we desire? Once the trials of the “Covenant” and the scattering of the elements of her power begin, they will (as we interpret) continue to the end of the period, i.e., to A.D. 1877-8. It would even seem, from the manner in which the prophecy is pronounced, (“time, times, and an half—and” until a certain event shall happen) that the prolongation of the original period by thirty years owes its appointment to the events alluded to—the “scattering,” and “purification” of the “holy people”:—as if the angel (ver. 7) had said,—“A sufficient time—an extra month of years—shall be allowed between the expiration of the prophetic period and the time of the end, for an unexampled portion of history—the career of the man of sin, the rod and the refiner; together with the purification which, under a restraining Providence, he shall be the instrument of effecting.” The first act now to be expected is, that “he shall come up,” &c. (“ascendet,” Dan. xi. 23)—perhaps as on a map, i.e., shall march northwards. Among the methods of scattering that may be imagined (for it can be but a guess), it may—in the mildest acceptation of the term—be effected by the breaking in upon the vast chain of the British colonies (vide ver. 43), so as to disturb the imperial unity and continuity that now prevails.

It has been a blind (we suspect) to many, that mention is made in the very midst and course of this prophecy (viz., in chap, xi. ver. 31), of the taking away of the “daily sacrifice,” and the setting up of “the abomination that maketh desolate,” as though this twofold transaction belonged of necessity to the same era as the transaction similarly described in chap. xii. ver. 11, and there given as a date wherefrom to calculate the prophetic number; but this is a great mistake.
At this place (xi. 31) the narrative is in direct progress of the
career of the Antichrist, and the twofold transaction being
mentioned as one of the incidents of that career shews, that
it must be interpreted with a sole relation to his day. It is
meant to pronounce simply (as we believe) that the con-
querror shall set up forcibly in this land the abomination of
Papal idolatry (a system which admits, as much in the present
as in times past, of being recognised by this double mark)—
"taking away" (or rather "transferring"—μεταστησουσι; i.
. e., appropriating to his own false worship) the means of the
present "daily sacrifice." The verse may (we say) be con-
verted into the more ordinary statement, that "they shall
seize upon the endowments of Protestantism, in order to
establish Popery."

But there is yet a reason (we cannot doubt) for the choice
of this language, rather than of any more simple, to express
the forcible re-establishment of the old religion:—it may be
stated as follows. The period of 1,260 years, which was
fulfilled in A.D. 1848, began its course with the signs, "the
daily sacrifice shall be taken away, and the abomination that
maketh desolate set up" (xii. 11): and these signs, accord-
ing to our plan of interpretation, ought to be attended
with evidence of their removal at the end of the period. It
is however otherwise: there is no such countermark in
history. The Papal idol still occupies his "infallible"
throne; and the Almighty is still addressed by quantity—(a
dozen or two of "Ave Marias") and in an unknown tongue.
The reason of this continuance appears to be as follows. The
two texts—xii. 7 and 11—combine to shew, that there is a
postponement of the outrunning of the period, and conse-
quently of its appointed signs, by thirty years; and of the
arrival of the epoch when "all these things shall be finished";
—a postponement expressly to the end of humbling the
"holy people," and that too by the instrumentality of the
"vile person"—the Antichrist. Indeed in the last of
these texts it is directly intimated, that the signs which
ushered in the 1,260 years shall prevail for 1,290 years.
Now this being so, it were only in obedience to the most
obvious requirements of harmony, that if the Antichrist
—whose career is measured by the thirty years of pro-
longation—should attempt that (in his position as Head and Exponent of the great Antichristian system) which had marked the commencement of that system,—should deal with the chosen people of his day, precisely in the same manner as the elect Church were dealt with at the entrance of the long period of 1,290 years; it were to be expected (we say) that the transaction would be described in a similar form of speech—a form carrying evidence in itself, in some sort, of the continuance of the signs. Hereby the language itself becomes a testimony to the view we have taken of the prolongation, and of its purpose.

The purpose of this prolongation becomes more manifest, if we regard the Antichrist as the Head and Exponent of the whole Antichristian system as described by Daniel; that is to say—of the system which includes his first period of 1,260 years (ver. 25) ending in A.D. 1775-6, as well as the period before us ending in 1848; and this we propose to shew is really the plan of Prophecy. As to the first of these periods—commencing in A.D. 533, the sign given of it was that the saints were said to be "given into his hand." The signs of the second period (commencing A.D. 606) were the abrogation of the "daily sacrifice," and the erection of the idol that creates wonderment. Now all these signs are amased together to mark the day of the Antichrist:—as may be observed in the following words of Daniel (xi. 31)—"they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily sacrifice, and they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate." If the "sanctuary of strength"—or stronghold of the Covenant—be (as we have said) Great Britain, the pollution of that sanctuary will be by means of blood; and this is equivalent to the sign, "they shall be given into his hand"—that of the year 533. As to the double sign which remains of the year 606—directly descriptive of the establishment of Popery, it requires no further comment. Thus do all the characteristicks of the Antichristian system converge and concentrate in the Antichrist—the Head and consummation of the system.

It is the consequence of the preceding reasoning that the forty-five years commencing in 1878 constitute the true
"time of the end," being—as we believe the phrase itself may may be rendered—the last measure of appointed time. (Vide the Greek.) We do not hesitate to put forth the opinion that the "time of the end" will be to England, after her complete abasement, the period of her ascending influence and dignity; spreading, in unison with the Jewish evangelizers, her free institutions throughout the world; and that therein will be fulfilled the declarations in chaps. ii. and vii. of Daniel, to the effect that a saintly nation shall possess the kingdom. Before her the imperial Image—ever more and more tottering to its fall—sinks to the ground. That the reign of the Antichrist, after walking the earth in victory, pride, and revenge, the greater part of the preceding thirty years, will then be fast drawing to a close, may be inferred, first, from the conditions of human existence:—but also with this agrees the description of his impious exaltation and final fall as given in the six last verses of Dan. xi.; and as signalizing the very commencement of the "time of the end."

In looking at Daniel's "image," the "toes," not yet fully accounted for, may perhaps help our present argument. The heel of the image has been shewn to be the "kingdom" of Napoleon the Great; the instep to be the intervening portion of history, before arriving at the ball of the foot, in which the "kingdom" is reinstated in the present (or rather, rising) imperial majesty. As a man stands upright, his feet diverge from each other,—a fit emblem of that double rule—an Eastern and a Western empire—which was unfolded in Rev. xiii. under the semblance of the "Beast," and an "Image of the beast." They both terminate in "toes," altogether "ten":—that is, the independent states into which this united empire shall be broken up, are indefinitely multiplied in number. Thus divided, like the vast empire of Alexander, it will present perhaps no great difficulty to the future power—the Stone, to bring them into subjection; so that into that "kingdom," in some mysterious sense not altogether of a spiritual nature, they will all be absorbed.

In the first verses of chapter xii. are certain expressions which the writer regards as the core of this great prophecy. The prophecy has respect to what shall "befall Daniel's
people in the latter days" (x. 14); and as we have abundant evidence elsewhere that it is the purpose of the God of Jacob to bring the descendants of Jacob in the latter days within the fold of His Holy Son, it is presumable that a prophecy professing to treat of the future of this people, would make allusion to so great a purpose of mercy—so blessed a hope for the nation. This allusion we find in the following passages: "And at that time shall Michael stand up, that great prince which standeth for the children of thy people": "at that time thy people shall be delivered": "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." (xii. 1, 2). It cannot be doubted, we think, that the two expressions, "Michael shall stand up," and "many that sleep in the dust shall awake," are to be regarded in a common sense, as both of them figurative, or both literal. In what sense then, we ask, is the first to be regarded? The utmost that can be gathered from Scripture regarding Michael is, that he is the appointed guardian of the Jewish people. But this "great prince," like his Divine Master the "King of Israel," is unseen in his agency; and the utmost that can be predicated from his being said to "stand up for his people" is, that he will direct in their favour those courses of Providence on which, more than on human endeavours—though in conjunction with it, the well-being and happiness of States depend. Were we to propound that the "standing up" refers to operations of a sort that have not yet come under the cognizance of our experience,—for instance, that Michael would become visible to the eyes of men, or that in some hitherto unknown manner angelic agency would be manifested,—who would be disposed to characterize the idea otherwise than as vain and idle? The literal sense, then, will not stand. The "standing up" of Michael must be viewed, in ordinary language, as an announcement of important Providential arrangements, and probably of the dispensation of unwonted spiritual light, in the days spoken of:—it is in fact, an entirely figurative expression—i.e., to our apprehension. But if this expression be figurative, then cannot the writer for himself receive the "awakening
from sleep" in any other sense: for (we repeat) the "literal"
or the "figurative" must be accepted as the common
characteristic of the two expressions.

St. Jude says (ver. 9) that "Michael, when contending
with the devil he disputed about the body of Moses, durst
not bring against him a railing accusation, but said—The
Lord rebuke thee." In turning to Zech. iii. 2, from whence
the Apostle takes the words, we read, "And the Lord said
unto Satan, The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan"—where
the first "Lord" stands evidently for the Michael of
St. Jude; and evinces the eminence and power of this great
functionary. The dispute about the body of Moses is
explained by the text to signify the question about re-
establishing the Mosaic state and polity—called "the body
of Moses"; for of the Jewish nation Zechariah is speaking
under the typical name of "Joshua the high priest"—a
similar figure. In other words the question in dispute
has regard to the recall of the Jews, in the latter days, to the
peculiar distinction among the nations which they have now
forfeited. But this is also the very subject (viz., the question
what was to happen to the Jews) of Dan. xii. 1; so that the
words of Daniel "thy people shall be delivered," must be
taken in connexion with what Zechariah says in his parallel
prophecy. And what is that?—that Joshua's "filthy gar-
ments" shall be changed, and he be thus fitted to "judge the
Lord's house" and "keep his courts." (Ver. 7.) Now,
how does Daniel express this "change of garments"—this
putting off of the filthy garments of deistical self-righteous-
ness, and "putting on of the Lord Jesus Christ"? He says,
"many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall
awake,"—a figure analogous to that of the dead man rising
from beneath the waters of baptism to a new life. Daniel
could not go nearer than this to the not yet instituted rite
of baptism, but he conveys the same idea. The "dust of
earth" expresses the exceeding degeneracy of the Jewish
present condition, as numbered among the veriest outcasts of
mankind. Their rising thence "some to everlasting life, and
some to everlasting contempt" expresses the greater respon-
sibilities—the more elevated hope, and greater depth of con-
demnation—that will attend them on an introduction into Christ's kingdom. It may be observed that in the next verse, the very purpose is expressed of the Jews' recall, as in the text of Zechariah:—Daniel says, "they that be wise (teachers, margin) shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever": for God will give them "places to walk" (Zech. iii. 7)—paths of spiritual usefulness (we presume) among the surrounding nations. We are confident the reader, on reflection, will view this explanation of the words of Daniel as more in harmony with the declared subject of the prophecy—the fortunes of the Jews in the latter days, than a more direct sense of the figure (the "awaking from the dust of the earth") would place it in,—as if it had reference to the final resurrection. If the direct sense be entertained, the following consequences will ensue—first, that "Michael will stand up"—not until the Lord comes to judgment; and the "time of the end" will be the positively last day; secondly, that "what shall befall thy people in the latter days"—the great subject of the prophecy (Dan. x. 14)—instead of referring to those magnificent promises to Israel with which Prophecy elsewhere abounds, reduces itself to the simple statement, that when the great untenancing of the graves of men takes place, the Jews shall not be left in the "dust."
The general result then is, that before the end of the term which expires A.D. 1878, there will have taken place a great ingathering of the sons of Jacob into Palestine; that "at that time"—the time of the end, the city of Jerusalem will speedily behold "Joshua the high priest"—Christian Jews—occupying her palaces; and that from thence—i.e., from the "New Jerusalem"—will be carried forth far and wide by the lamp-bearing nation the light of the Gospel, in paths duly prepared and made ready for them.

On the mighty oath in which the intimations of these times are enwrapped (ver 7) we have some observations to make; but shall reserve them until we meet with what may be called its counterpart in Rev. x. 6. One remark only may here be in place, viz., that the perception of the common subject-matter of the two oaths does not bring with it an
explanation of the common and very remarkable form in which that matter is given; yet there must be a purpose involved in the community of form—a chronological purpose (as we believe)—that of attracting the eye, as by two responding lights on the coast brought by the steersman into one, to the same epoch of human history.

"Blessed is he that waiteth and cometh," says Daniel, to the end of the five and forty years (A.D. 1922). The word "blessed," having reference to time, denotes a time of rest. Not only in that day will the ancient enemies of the Cross have been every where subdued, and the chosen nation of Great Britain, in company with the re-elected priestly nation of Jacob's seed (so we think), be lifted up to their destined pre-eminence; but all will be well ordered and arranged in things secular, so that the followers of the Lamb will every where find security and rest; such rest as most befits servants whose privilege it will rather be, with ever-increasing energy, and ever-brightening ardour, to carry forth His name and praise among the still unenlightened nations, and to publish throughout the wide world the Gospel of His grace.

REV. XI. 2, 3.

Of the Numbers to be investigated in the Revelation, the first are those of Chap. xi. 2, 3; and if it be true, as set forth in p. 380, that these numbers are fulfilled in the year 1848, the presumption is that they will be found in the sequel to hold a strong connexion with the numbers of Dan. viii. 14, and xii. 7, which have been found likewise to terminate in that year. They are thus written:—

(1.) "And there was given unto me a reed like unto a rod: and the angel stood saying, Rise, and measure the temple of God, and the altar, and them that worship therein. (2.) But the court which is without the temple leave out, and measure it not; for it is given unto the Gentiles: and the holy city shall they tread under foot forty and two months. (3.) And I will give power unto my two witnesses, and they shall prophesy a thousand two hundred and three score days, clothed in sackcloth. (4.) These are the two olive trees, and the two candlesticks standing before the God of the earth."

To understand these numbers, it is necessary to examine
the circumstances out of which they arise, and for this end nothing less will suffice than to examine the connexion they hold with the two preceding chapters. The reader is requested to read these chapters, as well as down to ver. 14 of chap. xi.

In chap. x. the attention of the prophet is called to a "little book." What is this "little book"? Bishop Newton calls it a codicil to the greater book of chap. v.—the book "written within and on the back side, sealed with seven seals." Of this greater book it is written, that "no man in heaven nor in earth could open it, but only the Lamb as it was slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven spirits of God sent forth into all the earth,"—having (that is to say) acquired the title to, and exercising by means of his emissaries, an universal rule, in both the material and spiritual worlds. No one in heaven or earth was able to open this book, not even the "Lion of the tribe of Judah"—as such, in respect of His Almighty strength; nor the "Root of David"—as such, in respect of His royal title; but only "the Lamb as it had been slain," who was able, because thereunto worthy—a worthiness acquired by the Lord Jesus in His human nature, through the humiliation of His death. We have here a strong hint at once that this book, or roll, was the Conveyance Deed of the Kingdom that had been promised Him, as the reward of suffering. Indeed we find it impossible to doubt the correctness of the view which regards this book (vid. Rev. W. Burgh, on the Revelation) as the "Title Deed of Christ's inheritance" in this earth, sealed (as was usual with instruments of the sort) with many seals. This interpretation in its full extent had better be examined by the reader in the work referred to, the subject being beyond our proper range. The author says that "the book with seven seals" contains "the account of the redemption of Christ's inheritance and purchased possession; according to that passage in Eph. i. 14, where, speaking of the 'spirit of promise,' the apostle says—'which is the earnest of our inheritance, until the redemption of the purchased possession';—the possession, and our inheritance in it through Christ, being purchased, but as yet not redeemed—not yet recovered out of the hands of the usurper" (Burgh 23).
"It is the book of the dignity of the Lamb; the book of the development of his power, and honour, and glory, the taking of which is the taking of his kingdom." ‘Thou art worthy to take the book,’ and to receive all that the book implies, riches, and wisdom, and power, and strength, and honour, and glory.” (Ib. 30.)

This book is evidently a very bulky book, as is intimated by the circumstance that it was seen—not “in the right hand” (as in our version), but “upon the right hand of him that sat on the throne” (ἐν τῷ θνείῳ δεξιᾷ)—a peculiar expression from which Mr. Tilloch derives the singular notion, that, instead of reading “in (upon) the right hand a book,” we should read “a treatise upon the power”—taking a symbolical view of the “right hand.” What is meant to say is this (as we believe)—that the book was too large to be clasped in the hand, and was consequently laid upon it as a burden. The “right hand” and the “book” together constitute the Symbol of His Majesty—in like manner as does the globe in the hand of an imperial ruler of the present day.

Now Mr. Burgh believes (very inconsistently, as it seems to the writer) that this sealed book is identical with the Revelation of St. John; and that its contents, and therefore those of the Revelation, will be fulfilled only in the events of a still future age, viz., at the recall of the Jews as a chosen people. With this opinion we have no sort of sympathy. We beg to suggest on the contrary with all deference—(if we would assign their proper weight to the expression he has himself employed, viz., that the seven-sealed book is the “account of the redemption” effected by Christ, the “development of His power,”)—that it can be nothing else than the history of Christ’s Church from its very foundation in Eden; for what else is that history—antediluvian, patriarchal, Jewish, Christian (for Christ is slain from “the foundation of the world”)—than the continuous act of taking possession? This history, as shown to St. John, was partly in the state of a living embryo of the future—“written within,” and partly in a fulfilled state—“written on the back side,” i.e., as being past, open to the inspection, and claiming the intelligent
consideration, of all the world. The opinion of our author not only regards the Revelation and the sealed-book as being, neither of them, the history hitherto of Christ's kingdom, and of its victorious progress—however slowly asserted—among the false systems set up by Satan; but even ignores the last eighteen centuries as rightly of Christ's kingdom at all. What then are we to think of the introduction into this same "Revelation of Jesus Christ" (i. 1) of the Gentile Churches of Smyrna, Philadelphia, &c.? Was it as a lure to beguile presumptuous reasoners of later times into the very natural notion, that, in the progress of time, even the Gentile Churches of Rome and of England—equally important with those above-mentioned—might be intended?

Now the Title-Deeds of Christ's kingdom, considered apart from the present discussion, are unquestionably the prophecies—the "word of promise"—the earnest of the inheritance both of Christ and His people. The prophecies—the record of the "spirit of promise" from the beginning—constitute a chronicle of the Saviour's rights, foreshown in eternity, and to be acquired and asserted in time,—the pre-determinations of the Almighty Father respecting the exaltation of His Holy Son in the earth—the ultimate result which it is the aim of all prophecy, more or less closely, to declare. Hence it will follow that, if the "Book with seven seals" be these Title-deeds, it must be considered the Book of all Prophecy, commencing with the promise first pronounced in Eden ("the Seed of the woman shall bruise," &c.) and bringing down the records of the progressive kingdom (fulfilled prophecy) to its completion;—for all that is called History has had a chrysalis state of existence in the shape of prophecy; as is well expressed in the prophetic symbol of a "book written within," as well as on the "back side." It is in accordance with this view that we find the "mystery" of Christ's kingdom spoken of (Rev. x. 7)—not as a mystery wrapped up in the Book of "Revelation" only; not as being unfolded to St. John singly—the last of the prophets; but—as a thing which God had declared to His "servants the prophets"—mainly therefore, in respect of their number, the prophets of the old dispensation.
The "seals" of this book, when loosened, expose to view "a series of symbolical pictures and drawings" (Tilloch, 178); and from the study of these, especially of the four first, the beholder is enabled to understand the appointed means and methods of the Saviour's kingdom. To understand these means, as thus exhibited, it seems to the writer that we shall do well in the first place to pay attention to the symbolic sense of the number four. "Four," in ancient writings, stands as a compendious expression for all—the sum total of the several portions of the subject to which it is applied. "Four," (says Hartwell Horne, iv. 545) represents "the universality of the matters comprised therein—Isa. xi. 12; Jer. xlix. 6; Ezek. vii. 2." Thus we lately found the four great kingdoms into which the Empire of Alexander was broken up, to represent in History all the independent States which sprung from it. Thus too in Ps. lxviii. 27, four tribes are taken to represent the whole nation of Israel. It is probably under guidance of the same perception, that in the parable of "the Sower" our Saviour divides the hearers of the Gospel into four classes, of which one only receives it rightly,—reminding us of the "man" in the four-faced cherubim:—"Every minister (says Trower) finds that his people may be divided into the very four classes here described." In the same light we are to regard the four horses—white, red, black, and pale, of the four first seals, as exhibiting the Lord Christ in possession of, and holding under

* On this example the following interesting note, derived from Bishop Horne, is found in Mant's Bible:—"The literal rendering of this verse is, 'There is little Benjamin their ruler, the princes of Judah their council, the princes of Zebulon, and the princes of Naphtali.' In this enumeration of the tribes of Israel that were present at the removal of the ark, four only are mentioned; Benjamin and Judah, who dwelt nearest to the city of David; Zebulon and Naphtali, who were farthest distant from it; to show, as Dr. Chandler observes, the unanimity of the whole nation, and of all the tribes far and near, in attending this solemnity, to testify their willing acknowledgment of David for their king. Benjamin, though the youngest tribe, is named first, and called the ruler, because from that tribe sprang Saul, the first King of Israel. Upon David's accession to the throne, Judah became the royal tribe, and supported the throne by its counsels. Zebulon and Naphtali were tribes of eminent learning and knowledge. (Gen. xlix. 21; Judg. v. 14.)"
His control, all the means which the powers of nature in their vicissitudes afford, both literally and emblematically, of enforcing His rule on a refractory world.

As Adam was commissioned to "subdue the earth," so the second Adam is seen to come forward in the first seal to subdue the stubborn heart of man, by means of the weapons of adversity. These are named the sword—the second seal: famine—the third seal: pestilence—the fourth seal. It is necessary that the numerical picture (so to call it) shall not exceed four in number; consequently, as the Conqueror himself must appear in the scene, the agencies mentioned are only three; but to the end we should know that these three really represent all when in combination with a fourth, in like manner as if they had been four, it is added immediately (ver. 8), "power was given unto them (i.e., the three agencies) over the fourth part of the earth (i.e. each over the fourth part) to kill with sword, and with hunger, and with death, and with the beasts of the earth"; where the "beasts of the earth" are introduced as a fourth into the catalogue of means, solely with the view of making the assertion complete of all means. The opening of the "four seals" is witnessed to, successively, by the "four beasts" (living creatures) of the Cherubim, the same as we found in the first chapter of Ezekiel, and described as follows in Rev. iv. 7: "And the first beast was like a lion, and the second beast like a calf, and the third beast had a face as a man, and the fourth beast was like a flying eagle." These represent (we presume) the intelligent creation, having among them the "man"—the Lord's Anointed, who is "the Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world." He is surrounded by the lion, the calf, and the eagle—emblems of the many and universal tribes of mankind—all who descend from Shem, Ham, and Japhet—themselves (otherwise viewed) these figures, in company with Noah—the man, who is a type of Christ.

* We presume the third in order of the "living creatures"—the man opens the first seal—that of the Conqueror. What the reason may be of this transposition of the Cherubim we cannot divine, though we doubt not it has a mystical importance; but that we are warranted in the
immortal nature) observe from age to age, and bid observe ("come and see")—i.e., are called upon to teach, the ways and means of the Divine government; and especially to warn the race of men against imagining there is aught but good in the acts of the Redeemer's rule, even in its sternest features:—that "ice and snow," no less than "showers and dew" do in their appointment "bless the Lord, and praise Him, and magnify Him, for ever." This is all we need at present say on the character of the "book with seven seals":—it is the preconceived History of the Saviour's unseen rule,—the means and detail of His conflict with the Usurper in this His terrestrial kingdom.

As to the "worthiness" of the Saviour to unloose these seals—i.e., to take unto Himself power, and to reign; this is a method of expressing the provision of the Mosaic Law, whereby He alone of the descendants of Adam had been able to make use of the right of recovery granted in that Law;—for Adam having forfeited his sovereign rights in this earth, and Christ his kinsman having the right of redemption (Lev. xxv. 25), He alone had been found able to pay the price—the price of Life—life not forfeited by transgression. That price, and that life, Christ did lay down; and man, thus ransomed in Him, lives for evermore:—for which benefit received he may well desire to join (as he does, ver. 13) in the hearty song, "Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever."

Now if the greater book is the summary of all prophecy, containing "within" its seals the records of the impenetrable future, and without on its "back side" the admonitions of prophecies fulfilled, patent to all men, and accumulated in the shape of history for the use of all: if such (we say) be the greater book, it is evident that the "little book," if prophetical, is a part of the greater. And that it is pro-

above conclusion may be learnt from the circumstance, that in the vision of the four chariots (Zech. vi.) the white horse, belonging in the Revelation to the Leader and Conqueror, occupies the third place in the order of the horses, in unison with the position of the "man" in the Cherubim.
phetical may be learnt from the circumstance, that as a consequence of St. John's eating it (Rev. x. 11), he was called on—being doubtless thereby qualified the more—to prophesy "again" before many people. What then is the "little book"? It clearly is not the open Bible, as Dr. Cumming propounds; for the Bible contains all prophecy as part only of itself, whereas the "little book" is only a portion of prophecy. It is not a codicil, as Bishop Newton calls it, for a codicil supposes an afterthought. Nor need we much regard the opinion of Mr. Frere, that the "little book" is the History of the Church, as contrasted with the "sealed book" of the civil history of the Roman empire. The "Revelation of Jesus Christ" contains no allusion (we may be sure) to secular history, beyond what its connexion with the history of His church requires: and therefore nothing so thoroughly secular as is here supposed.

Now when we consider that the Angel who held the "little book"—viz., the Lord Christ, who swore a great oath "by Him that liveth for ever and ever" in Rev. x. 6, is the same as He who "swore by Him who liveth for ever and ever" in Dan. xii. 7—the two being evidently but one oath in their mystical sense; and that He says in Daniel (v. 9), "the words (i.e., the words of Daniel's prophecy) are closed up and sealed till the time of the end," and that in John (x. 7) He makes a direct reference to the seventh trumpet which unquestionably embraces the "time of the end"; it seems to the writer indubitable, that the "little book" was the book of Daniel's prophecy. St. John is directed to "go and take the book which is open in the hands of the angel" (ver. 8):—it was in all likelihood a book well known to the apostle, only that it had been a sealed book to his understanding until the present moment, when now it is presented to him open. In the "belly," or prophetic storeroom, of St. John, was already a plentiful store of prophetic material: he had to tell (for instance) of one more even of the trumpets, and of all the vials:—consequently, in eating up the "little book" (as by command he did), what he therein did was to add the contents of Daniel's prophecy to his original store. They became mixed up together, as are any
two sorts of meat that have been eaten. The spirit of Daniel is infused into St. John.

The immediate benefit so derived is seen in the use of Daniel's imagery. Now for the first time (chap. xi.) we read of the measure of 1260 years, in the two forms it bears in the "numbers" with which we are at present concerned; also of the "beast from the bottomless pit"; also, in the succeeding chapter, for the first time, of the same beast when equipped with "seven heads and ten horns." In fact, it is by the eating of the "little book," that the union and single character of the two prophecies is established.

Now the Lord Christ in His oath (Rev. x. 7) makes use of the words, "in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound"—a proof that this scene of the "little book" is enacted, if not during the time of the sixth trumpet or second woe (as we are persuaded it is), at least before the seventh trumpet sounds,—a distinction which the reader will do well thus early to take notice of. It may be well here also to direct attention to the position of chap. x.—an episode between chaps. ix. and xi. which both treat of the sixth trumpet—as affording in itself unequivocal testimony regarding the chronological position of the scene. Let us now turn to chap. ix. and the two scenes it contains, presenting together a glowing tablet of the plague of Mahometanism.

This chapter contains the fifth and sixth trumpets—the foreshewn history, when taken together, (as assented to by almost all commentators,) of the great Mahometan power. The first half depicts the rapid and disastrous irruptions of the Saracenic armies; the latter the victorious career of the Ottoman horsemen, in number "two hundred thousand thousand"—a prodigious host, indicating the many ages and successive centuries of their domination;—the two bodies, woe upon woe, are sent to trample under foot the Eastern Church "by reason of transgression" (Dan. viii. 12). The Eastern portion of the Roman empire is here said by some to bear the designation of "the third part of men" (ver. 15), for the reason that the empire, embracing in its complete state the three then known portions of the world—Europe, Asia, and Africa, the Eastern portion was a "third part."
But if this view of the expression be not approved, we must be content to regard it (as does Dr. Wordsworth, p. 204) simply as "a large portion"; but still the Eastern portion of the empire. We would wish to suggest, notwithstanding,—considering that the Christian Church and its muniments were established in respect of language, and therein in respect of the divisions of mankind, in "Hebrew, Greek, and Latin"—whether the "third part" may not have an eye to one of these. Indeed it may be questioned whether the expression "the third part of men" can apply to the Roman empire per se—that empire being in these prophecies denominated "the beast":—"men" must signify the Church of God. It is remarkable (so exact and consistent is the language of prophecy) that the Saracenic or first woe is not said to fall upon the "third part"; for the reason that the Mahometan power "waxed great," in that woe, "towards the South, and towards the East, and towards the pleasant land" (Dan. viii. 9), thereby keeping clear of the capital of the Eastern empire and its adjacent provinces. With regard to the historic commencement of the great Mahometan power, it is necessary—when considering the subject conjointly with other prophetic dates and statements, to be precise in the date; and on this ground we consider it to begin in a.d. 606, and to end in 1848,—the last of these dates being foreshewn in the great Eastern number 2400 (Dan. viii.), and the first being thence ascertained by simple calculation. Let this testimony suffice for the present,—it will grow into proof presently. Considering the subject separately, many dates may be suggested with nearly equal pretensions (vid. Elliott in loc.), as will in a future page be adverted to.

Now, in order to place the numbers before us in a right view, we shall do well to give force to the simple consideration, that when Angels of woe sound, woe is proclaimed to the whole Roman empire,—that is, to the whole Church therein contained; notwithstanding that the visitation of the second woe falls in the first instance upon, apparently (see ver. 15), only the third part. The very expression "for to slay the third part of men" (i.e., of the whole empire) indicates
that, although the Eastern portion alone was to come at once under the infliction, the other portions also were had in view. And thus it happens that, after the impending woe with all its fearful accessories is fully described, it is added (ver. 20), "And the rest of men which were not killed by these plagues yet repented not, &c.");—that is to say, the other two thirds—the Western and other portions of the empire, who escaped, and only (as History tells) barely escaped, either the Saracenic or the Ottoman inundations—these repented not:—and by the mention of this impenitence, it is meant to charge them with what is ever held up in Scripture as among the greatest of national sins—that, spared these inflictions themselves, and called as spectators only to see them fall upon the one third of their body, they "regarded not the work of the Lord, neither considered the operations of his hands" (Isa. v. 12). Observe in the above passage the expression "these plagues":—it is hence quite clear that our attention should at once embrace the two woes alluded to; and that we should be prepared in consequence to see them noticed in combination on a future occasion.

Again, it will much facilitate the progress of the investigation (and the structure of the prophecy seems to require it) if we regard the whole tenth chapter as in a large parenthesis;—or (condensing the matter of it within the smallest possible compass) as if the Lord had said, interrupting the discourse of the prophet, "Beloved!—before finishing your observations on the Mahometan trumpets, examine the book of Daniel, which I now give open into your hands." Now the consequence of this will be, that the first thirteen verses of chap. xi. will become an appendix to, indeed a continuation of, what had already been said upon these trumpets in chap. ix.,—and an appendix interwoven with the newly acquired material of Daniel. This is just the view we take of these verses. There are two subjects referred to in them:—these are, the measuring of the temple (xi. 1, 2), and the giving power to the two witnesses (xi. 3—13). They are to be considered as appliances, respectively, to the Eastern and the Western churches during the two (the first and second) woes. They refer to these churches in the order in which they had
been previously mentioned in chap. ix.—to the Eastern first and then the Western; referring to them during the whole course of the two woes, in conformity with the expression "these plagues" (ix. 20); whereby—as the plagues, so—they are seen to embrace the full period predetermined, of 1260 years. Both parts of this appendix exhibit the same provision of mercy in favour of God's true children, and indicate that such true children are ever found in both churches. Though accompanied with "woe" the living principle is ever kept alive, and saved—even though it be in death (xi. 7), from the surrounding corruption. In obedience then to the Divine arrangement, let us first see what helps may be gathered from the parenthesis of the tenth chapter.

The Lord Christ sets "his right foot upon the sea, and his left foot on the earth" (v. 2)—interpreted generally (we believe) to signify a claim to supreme and universal authority. We believe rather it is a figure relating, as usual, to time: the "right foot on the sea"—the ocean into which the detritus of the passing hours are washed down—denoting the foundation of Christ's power to be in the depths of past eternity, and the "left on the earth" equally claiming dominion in eternity to come. The figure corresponds with that of the "book written within and on the back side," exhibiting the title-deeds of His power from the beginning, and to endure to the end of time. It carries a resemblance also to the position of Christ "upon the waters of the River" (Dan. xii. 7), presiding over all generations of mankind—past and to come: on which occasion the mighty Oath followed, which here in the Revelation we shall immediately again hear pronounced. But principally, perhaps, it was an instance of suitng the action to the immediate purpose in hand—which was, to join together the prophetic books of the two "beloved ones"; to which end the Holy One is seen to step forth (as it were) from the Lethean sea of the past time and writings of Daniel, into the present day and work of John.

And He cries "with a loud voice as when a lion roareth"—a lion who is ready for his prey,—i.e., He is come to judgment. By thus stepping forward personally, holding in
his hands, as it were, a rod of chastisement, He shews how much He will be interested for His personal honour and the defence of His great name, in what, in the acts of His government, He shall be seen to have determined upon. Immediately consequent upon this angry cry "seven thunders" utter their voices; but what they say the scribe is forbidden to note down (ver. 4). It is an anxious question, as the latter days draw nigh, what this "loud cry" and these "seven thunders" may import; and it requires our immediate and close examination.

The very position of this whole scene, in the midst but towards the end of the sixth trumpet, helps us with very considerable certainty to say when the loud cry was sent forth, and in what, in a more expanded form, it may be recognised. The woe of the sixth trumpet had in the description come to an end, viz., at chap. ix. 19:—it had raged in the East, for which part of the Roman empire it seemed especially designed. But in the next verse is the allusion to the "rest of men"—the Church of the West, whereby we are guided to the expectation of some inflections in preparation for them also,—an arrangement the more probable, as the sixth trumpet, which had carried so much of evil into the East, does not end as a measure of time (as shewn just now) until A.D. 1848. It is quite clear that the "loud cry" is not heard, until this trumpet, in its sound of woe, has ceased. Now in chap. xi. occurs the account of the slaughter of the "two witnesses," which—while it is declared to be in time a portion of the "sixth trumpet," will likewise shortly be recognised as a scene in the great French Revolution;—it is therefore before the French Revolution—because before the allusion to the Witnesses, that the voice of judgment goes forth. But the French Revolution has its place among the seven vials, or "last plagues"; and as the place in time of this "loud voice" must be (as thus shewn) between the finishing of the sixth trumpet's Eastern woe (say, some earlier point of time in the last century—Mr. Elliott, we shall see presently, gives the year 1774) and the French Revolution, we may assume with confidence to say, that the "angry cry" was an announcement of the seven vials of
wrath, to be quickly poured out upon the kingdom of the Western Beast.

And now, as to the "seven thunders"?—From the close connexion observable in the narrative between the "loud voice" and the "seven thunders," we conclude there is such a connexion in reality:—we do not mean a connexion only as between an act and its consequence, but a connexion of origin and of nature between them. Very various interpretations have been offered of these "thunders." Dr. Wordsworth says "The seven thunders are the Voice of God." (Apoc. 236.) Mr. Elliott says they are the voice of the Papal Antichrist—in reference to the thunders of the Vatican (p. 451). Mr. Frere, that they are synonymous with the "seven vials of wrath" (p. 69)—which we have rather concluded are the "loud cry." Some commentators, referring them to the times of the Great Reformation, have heard in them the outbursts of Gospel-preaching. Vitringa (vid. Elliott, p. 446) refers them to the seven crusades. And a multitude, because it is said, "seal up the things which the seven thunders uttered, and write them not," have passed them over as a point which it is presumptuous to inquire into (ib.). The above interpretations are all severally founded, of course, on a previous conclusion regarding the age of history to which the scene of Rev. x., and the "sixth trumpet" in whose division it is placed, are referable:—this is natural, and we shall follow the example. There are several peculiar points of difficulty attending the subject: "In the phraseology of this remarkable passage (writes Mr. Elliott, p. 448) there are to be noted five things:—first, the vocality of the thunders, for they are said to have voices:—secondly, the absoluteness of the prohibition, 'seal up and write them not':—thirdly, the singular definition of the voices of the thunders as their own voices:—fourthly, the distinctive article prefixed to and defining the thunders intended:—fifthly, their further definition by the septenary numeral." All these points must of course be met and determined in the true interpretation.

We believe then of the "seven thunders," though found in close connexion with the angry cry, that Dr. Wordsworth's
view of their nature is the true one—that they are the Voice of God; but that they are the softened and merciful, the cautioning and remonstrating—perhaps menacing, Voice of God, in contrast with, and accompanying, the "cry" of condign wrath—"as when a lion roareth." It must be then, that they and the angry cry are directed to different parties. Now in the relation of this "cry" to the seven vials, we are to remember it is said of the Vials (xvi. 19) that Christ "hath power over these plagues," shewing that they may be tempered and softened in their infliction; and we shall presently have evidence that they had a salutary effect in one quarter, for it is said (xi. 13) that "the remnant (the holy nation) were affrighted, and gave glory to the God of heaven"; and consequently (we may add with assurance) received the benefit of Christ's restraining "power" over them. The clue to this imagery is the great truth, that God in his judgments ever remembers mercy; and that in the midst of the tempests of his anger against a reprobate world, He fails not to call to mind that there are ever "seven thousand" who have not bowed the knee to Baal. We conceive then that the "seven thunders" are the positive Echoes of the "angry cry." In ordinary life a corresponding occurrence may be thus stated—"The bugleman at Killarney sounds his horn,—the tops of the mountains return the challenge in glorious responses." The echoes, as they run among the hills, are like to the voices of many angels taking up the single appeal to heaven, correcting and sanctifying it, as it rises in the tuneless note of this lower world; and yet have they had their own origin in this single—oftentimes harsh, ever tuneless—sound. In like manner the avenging roar of Judah's Lion may be supposed to have struck against the seat of mercy in the heavens, and to have been reverberated in awful "thunders," both warning and encouraging those whose ears could appreciate the heavenly sounds, who alone could recognize the Divine origin of the tribulations they spoke of—the elect of God—the "remnant"—ever ready to bow in fear before His mighty voice.

It will be observed that the difficulties above quoted from Mr. Elliott are all entirely removed, if the sentence we have
proposed be taken as a counterpart, in respect of its construction, to the prophecy:—first, the vocality of the thunders is accounted for, for as echoes they possess the original nature of the "voice"; and yet, it is with "their own" voices they speak, for the harsh "cry" they reverberate is become in their "own" mouths glorious and sublime. Again, as to the absoluteness of the prohibition to write them, this may be considered as based on the same principle with the decree "let them both grow together until the harvest"; or, as according with the observation, "the same afflictions are accomplished in your brethren that are in the world,"—the inference in either case being, that there was nothing to be gained or avoided by a predisclosure of their nature; for that, so long as God's children are in the flesh, they must partake of its evils,—under encouragement, however, of the heavenly sound, "that all things work together for good to those who fear God." To have made clear the decrees of the thunders, even were it only to the apprehension of the wise (Dan. xii. 10), must have been fatal to the co-operation always expected of human energy. Again, the distinctive article is accounted for:—"the bugle sounds, the echoes are returned." Lastly, the septenary numeral ("seven" in the imagery thus springing from one) gives its testimony—viewing them as echoes—in favour of the original "cry" having a connexion, itself, with the number seven; and prepares us for seeing it issue in the "seven last plagues."

When on the subject of the vials, we left in doubt during which trumpet—the sixth or the seventh—they were poured out, content at the moment to signify our dissent from the prevailing notion, that the "seven vials" spring out of the "seventh trumpet." Since then, we have determined the times of the "seventh trumpet"—dating from the close of the sixth—to commence in A.D. 1848: so that if the vials commence with that of the putrid sore in the middle of the last century,—(or, to be particular—which, however, is not necessary with the vials unless taken in combination with other subjects—if the first vial be poured out in its full libation in A.D. 1775-6, that great prophetic year when Illuminism—its most bitter ingredient—was seated in state
in Germany; and when Voltaire—the vial itself (so to speak) was the perfected octogenarian idol of the French:—that great prophetic year when also the "time, times, and dividing of time" of Dan. vii. flowed out)—if (we say) the seven vials here commence, they will have occupied nearly a century of the "sixth trumpet." Of the correctness of this general era of the vials many slight hints might be adduced in confirmation; but the following deserves our special notice.

At the first announcement of the vials we read—

"And after that I looked, and beheld the temple of the tabernacle of the testimony in heaven was opened: and the seven angels came out of the temple, having the seven plagues" (xv. 6). "And the temple was filled with smoke from the glory of God, and from his power: and no man was able to enter into the temple, till the seven plagues of the seven angels were fulfilled" (ib. 8).

This is the first notice for many a long year of the Jewish nation; being much anterior in its date to a notice of them by and bye to be examined, which we find in Rev. xi. 19. Now in the latter of these places they are seen in a state of conversion to the Christian faith: here in their wandering state of expectation in the "tabernacle"—"blinded in part" (Rom. xi. 25)—but ever objects of the Divine solicitude; holding their place, as here emblematically shewn, in the interior—the reserved apartments—of the "temple" (ver. 5); not as the Heathen—"cast without the temple" (xi. 2—see also Lev. xxvi. 44). In the examination of Dan. xi. we found that the returning favour of Providence towards the children of Israel, as manifested in the treatment they received from Christian nations, may be dated, in a general sense, from the middle of the last century. This returning favour dates then (remarkable to say) exactly with the "giving" of the vials. Two subjects more dissimilar—less linked together, apparently, in mutual dependence—cannot be imagined, than those of the present lot of the Jews, and the plagues of the vials; yet are they here essentially conjoined:—and as regards the view we have given of the epoch of the latter, the two subjects furnish in their union, the historic proof of its truth. Truly (as some one has said) "the Jew is the key of prophecy." It would seem from the
prophetic narrative (xv. 6) that the desolating wars of the last hundred years have had as a leading object the disengagement of the Jew, not less than of the hidden saints of Christ, as already shewn, from his fetters; and the abasement of that infidel spirit which would presume him to have forfeited for ever his original election; in despite, moreover, of the testimony borne by Providence, and which the believer observes with fear, that in these very wars he has been presented, in the influence of his wealth, as the essential cement of international policy. But what says ver. 8?—"No man was able to enter into the temple till the seven plagues were fulfilled."
The expression "no man" is comparative; the passage means that no body of Jews should deliberately, and of their conscientious will, enter into the Christian temple, till the plagues were over. This we easily recognise as agreeing with Dan. xii. 1, that "at that time"—the "time of the end" (1878) shall Michael, their prince and leader, "stand up" in their behalf. And hence it further follows, that as the vials commence a century ago, so also do they flow out in the "time of the end"—the time of the sounding (the word will be explained by and bye) of the "seventh trumpet,"—in the midst of that tremendous convulsion which shall mark the "beginning" (Rev. x. 7) of that period.

To return—When the Lord Christ descended in the time of the sixth trumpet (x. 1)—the woe of which trumpet was intended peculiarly (chap. ix.) for the Eastern empire, he had (we have seen) in his hand a "little book" (ver. 2)—the Book of Daniel. This book was brought forward, as seen by the use immediately made of it, chiefly with reference to the Western empire; and it is consequently reasonable to suppose that the Lord's angry cry had a sole reference to the Western empire. And hence with greater assurance we recognise its effects in the "seven vials." He held in his hand judgments,—what judgments other than these? If we examine the habiliments of the angels charged with the vials, we find they are those of priests, such as they would wear were they in the train of the great Highpriest of our profession (conf. xv. 6 and i. 13: together with Ex. xxviii. 6, 8). And at the least they are here seen as having received a
special commission from Him who is the *Glory of the Lord* (conf. xv. 8; and Ezek. i. 29: also x. 1)—i.e., Jesus Christ. The probability therefore is, that the “one of the four beasts” (xv. 7), who gave the vials to the angels, was the Lord Christ viewed as the Son of David and Head of the Jewish nation, being therein the “man” of the four-faced Cherubim (Ezek. i. 10);—in like manner as, in another scene, He was the “fourth whose form is like the Son of Man” (Dan. iii. 25). Thus do the angels of the vials become the special ministers of Christ as *King of the Jews*—of Him who “cried as when a lion (the Lion of the tribe of Judah) roareth.”

Now we are to observe that the mighty Angel in his descent had, among other insignia, a “rainbow about his head”—the emblem of justice and mercy combined. “The iris (says Dr. Wordsworth, p. 114) denotes severity blended with love.” It is natural then to ask—if the *angry cry* like as of a lion declares the presence of the just Judge, what is there in the audible provision of the symbolism to give assurance of his *mercy*? We repeat in answer—it is the “seven thunders”: thunders *seven*, to correspond and run parallel with the *seven* vials. Thunder in symbolism denotes the presence of God in the host, giving assurance of victory: thus in 1 Sam. vii. 10, “The Lord thundered with a great thunder that day upon the Philistines, and discomfited them.” It is used also as significative of the Divine remonstrance and reproof (ib. 17, 18). The “voice of thunder” is mentioned (e.g., Rev. vi. 1, and xiv. 2) not as expressive of anger, but as a call to fear and reflection. In the enumeration of the twelve apostles (Mark iii. 17) three only received a new name—Peter, James, and John; the two last that of “*sons of thunder,*” denoting (we presume) their special appointment as the *consoling and encouraging voice* of the Church: two *witnesses* provided—the one to be heard in oral doctrine from his episcopal chair (the first established) in Jerusalem, the other in his written testimony—especially as regards the fundamental principle of Gospel love.

To whom then did the “thunders” speak? For as to the *angry cry*, it was directed without question against the
kingdom of the "Beast." The argument we just now held
would seem to say it was to the Jews: and certainly the
prohibition to write would, more than any other circumstance,
accord with this idea—the Jews being so much kept out of
sight in the present Dispensation. But we believe rather—
now that History lends her light—that the heavenly sound
was directed, not to the Jew carnally, but to the Jew
spiritually—the elect nation of the present age:—they
spake to Great Britain. And we are almost inclined to
throw out the question—the date and circumstances
prompting it—whether the "seven thunders" were not
the first acclamations of heaven at the election of our
nation. Running parallel with the vials, they were the dis-
pen-sation provided for our favoured land, during the awful
chastisements that fell upon the apostate Roman empire.
Hence came our wonderful career of victory by sea and by
land (may we adduce in this secondary sense the words, "He
set his right foot upon the sea, and his left foot on the
earth")? and hence the perpetual calls throughout the last
war to triumphant thanksgiving, under a sense of perfect
immunity from the foot of the enemy on her soil, which
attended happy England throughout those awful convulsions.
To her those convulsions certainly were not plagues, as from
"vials of wrath":—they were, on the contrary, found to be
suggestive in their infliction of thoughts religious and pro-
found:—they were as "thunders"—reproofs, admonitions—
as addressed to the domestic inmates of the House of the
Lord. The angry cry went forth unrestricted in its wrath;
but finding our nation in a Paschal state—acknowledging
the Lamb and marked with His blood, it "passed over"
them, and was heard only in its reverberations—Christ thus
speaking to them from heaven.

Viewing then the "thunders" as an earnest of the special
protection of Providence over our nation, we consider them
now as in the midst of their course, accompanying every-
where the results of the great cry; and it is remarkable that
in the last of these results—the "seventh vial," thunders are
mentioned as among its accompaniments. But let not the
flattering notion arise that "thunder," assuring Divine
benediction, always secures victory; much less military glory, which is as the dust in the balances of Him who determines the issues of human energy. On the contrary, the "falling by the sword," and the "scattering," of Dan. xi. and xii., are clearly included in their times: while, notwithstanding, these are to be recognised as of the nature of "thunders," and not as of "wrath," by its being said that the "scattering" is of the "holy people," and that the "falling by the sword" is expressly to "purge and make them white." It is by the spiritual result that the nature of a tribulation is determined. Perhaps what has lately come to pass at Sebastopol may illustrate the scattering effected by the "thunder"—as consisting in the loss of armies, and the wasteful expenditure of our "power," in distant expeditions. Or it may consist (as said some time since) in the forcible disconnexion of the chain of our colonies; or in both of these, and many more. As to the "falling by the sword"—this doom meets us unhappily, if anywhere, in our own land.

Let us consider again. The mighty Angel "cried with a loud voice as when a lion roareth: and when he had cried seven thunders uttered their voices." Compare this passage with all that relates to it (which is the major part) in chap. xv., announcing the vials, and it will be apparent that the two very different dispensations it records adapt themselves with great nicety to the two very different bodies had in view in that chapter. The "loud cry" responds to the "seven plagues" of ver. 1: and then, the "utterings of the thunders" are heard in glorious unison with the triumphant songs of those who "had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image," &c. (xv. 2, 3, 4)—of those (that is to say) who had achieved their freedom from the bondage of the blasphemous beast's dominion. Their standing on a "sea of glass" may have a literal reference (among other senses) to the insular position of this happy land, set like a diamond in a manner calculated at once to preserve and enhance its brilliancy:—on which account the "sea" is "mingled with fire"—the emblem of its illustrious daring and life-preserving exertions. Here they sing the song of Moses—"The Lord hath triumphed gloriously (not them-
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selves, but the Lord, hath triumphed;—see Nelson's Despatches); the horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea,—i.e., the power of the otherwise conquerings "Beast" is overthrown. Here too they sing "the song of the Lamb" (compare ver. 3, and Deut. xxxii. 4), especially in respect of the words "all nations shall come and worship before him" (ver. 4), in allusion to England's propagation of the Gospel during the Vials—an allusion similar in its import to the words of Daniel (xi. 33) "they that understand among the people shall instruct many." We are to observe that this nation gains the victory, not only "over the beast," but "over his image"—showing that the struggle is not yet over, for the "image" is not yet raised:—the sentence turns our reflections especially to the picture presented in Dan. xi. 31 to 35. It is only after grievous spiritual trials, as well as the extensive discomfiture of her arms, that England will be raised to pre-eminency among the nations, when the sound of the triumphant seventh trumpet asserts the victory of the saints. Afflicted patriotism, shuddering at the intermediate prospect,—above all at its most malignant feature which testifies that, "post amicitias," the "Man of Sin" shall overthrow our Church and Government (Dan. xi. 23, 31), must seek her consolation in the thought that the cleansing judgments thus foreshewn (for it is of the nature of "thunder" to cleanse) are represented as in a peculiar manner under the control of the Lord Jesus. It is He who, when He would award victory, bids the "thunders speak," and when He would purify "scatters the power" of His people. It is ever Christ dealing with His own.

In its declared connexion with "thunders" (xvi. 8) we would wish to say a few words more on the "seventh vial." So soon as the angel had poured out his vial (xvi. 17) a voice from the heavenly throne exclaims, "It is done." The plague is spoken of in the home of eternity, where things to come are as though they were, as if it had run its course: to the intelligence of mortals a more detailed account was necessary, and it follows immediately. Notice is given in that detail of an "earthquake" "such as was not since men were upon the earth" (a phrase, perhaps, to signify exceeding terrible)
wherein the Roman empire will be "divided into three parts" (ib. 19): "the cities (states) of the nations"—beyond the boundaries of Rome—will fall: and great Babylon—the Roman Church—come "in remembrance before God,"—i.e., (as said before) to drink up the dregs of the fifth vial, to which through irrepenatence she becomes entitled. So far, we recognise in this vial the nature of the "loud cry"; but where is aught that betokens the presence of cautioning thunder? Now it is observable that by the exclamation "it is done," considered as a catchword (a contrivance much observed upon by commentators) we are referred to a very different scene, hereby shown to follow upon the close of this vial, viz., that described in Rev. xxi. 6. The antecedents of that scene must of course have had place during the vials. In it the Lord Christ, repeating the words "it is done," is represented as "wiping away all tears from the eyes" of His servants; and the Lamb's wife—the New Jerusalem—is seen descending from heaven. Upon this remarkable imagery it is not our purpose at present to hazard an observation:—but is it not evident from the language cited—"wiping away tears," &c., that the scene must be supposed to take place after severe tribulations? And consequently, as these tribulations—the antecedents (we say) of the scene involved in the words "it is done"—are contemporaneous with the vials—i.e., with the results of the "loud cry," is it not likely that they are the correctional results of the "seven thunders" into which we are inquiring, whose utterings and cleansing purposes were suppressed? It is ever in a successful appeal to the agreements of prophecy, that the best support of a speculation is found.

The next thing that meets us in this intercalary chapter is the oath: it is thus expressed. (Ver. 5.) He—

"Lifted up his hands to heaven, and spake by him that liveth for ever . . . . that there should be time no longer. But in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God should be finished, as he hath declared to his servants the prophets."

This oath, to be understood, must be confronted with that in Daniel (xii. 7) which runs thus. He—

"Held up his right hand and his left hand unto heaven, and spake by
him that liveth for ever and ever, that it shall be for a time, times, and a half; and when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished."

The identity of these oaths—not to be mistaken—is itself a testimony to the "little book," thus ushered in in the language of Daniel, being the book of Daniel: while also the repeating of the oath at the time of producing the book, affords a clue to the right attribution in time, in the later prophecy, of the matters referred to in it,—the book itself (as we have shewn) having become one with the later prophecy, by being eaten. In the oath as now repeated, John applies by allusion the measurements of Daniel to the times he was himself describing, and especially distinguishes between the two great periods of 1,260 years each, which are given in Daniel's seventh and twelfth chapters,—in the connexion (furthermore) of these numbers with the great Mahometan number of chap. viii. We shall do well to institute a comparison of the terms of the two oaths.

But first, the leading clause of the oath in the Revelation requires verbal elucidation:—it says, "there should be time no longer." The meaning given of these words ("χρόνος οὐκ' εστιν οτι"), in the English, it is agreed on all sides is untenable. Of the readings offered in explanation two only (as we think) deserve attention:—the first is, "there shall be no more delay,"—for χρόνος (time) requiring to be regarded in the abstract, as in the English version, is yet to be viewed as coupled with the expression οὐκ' οτι (no more), and the word "delay" seems to fall in with this consideration:—the second is, "the time shall not be yet"—wherein the sense of the word "time" is somewhat altered, and an entirely other sense is assumed for οτι. Whichever be the true version, it is clear that its force is regulated by what follows, viz., "but in the days of the voice of the seventh angel," &c.,—this reference to a future period (if that period be otherwise ascertained) making it really very indifferent which version we take;—the point of consequence being, that under either view, such future period is referred to. In that distant day, something is to take place—says the oath; there shall be no longer delay. The intermediate time then is announced in
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the exclamation, as a *postponement*, or *adjournment*, of the present time; still better, perhaps, we may call it a *prolongation* of the then-existing period. "Time (i.e., the *present* measurement of time) shall not yet close": or, "Time (i.e., a *future* measurement) shall not be yet." Now at what point of time were these words pronounced?—The "great cry" informs us that it was just before the vials of wrath were distributed. But this was also the period (1775-6) when Daniel's first measurement of 1,260 years came to an end. This consequently is the *present* point of time to which the "mighty angel refers" and he speaks of its righteous issue as being *postponed*. Till when?—Unquestionably until the *next* point of time mentioned by Daniel, viz., A.D. 1848. In other words, this is the method the Holy Spirit has adopted in the "Revelation," of marking the distinction, and of turning that distinction to a profitable account, which subsists between Daniel's two great periods, ending respectively in A.D. 1776 and 1848:—He calls the latter, or rather the interim between the two, a *prolongation* of the former.

By this device (for device it is) a state of identity is attributed to the two periods of Daniel, the isolated remnant of the later one being viewed as (in a certain sense) belonging to the earlier,—for "Time (regarded as a measuring line) shall not yet run out"—shall not yet reach its end. Now here the reader is requested to call to mind what we have asserted, that the year 1848 is the entering year of the period of the last trumpet;—when also we have seen the Antichrist to arise. And we have said of him, that he is to be regarded as the "head," exponent, and apex, of the whole Antichristian system,—as well of the division of time commencing in A.D. 533, and ending in 1776; as of that commencing in 606, and ending in 1848:—it is thus that we shew it to be the case—for the two are but one period. He might have come in the epoch of 1776, but his coming was deferred.

Can we assign the reason? It was for the infliction of the Western "plagues." With this agrees the circumstance observable in the collateral register of time—the "seven heads" of the beast;—the seventh, and last, arose shortly
after the year 1775; but as the term of human life would not admit of his being in the scene in 1848—at the commencement of the "seventh trumpet," his existence (to speak in the figure employed in Rev. xiii.) was reconstituted; he comes in 1848, as the resuscitated seventh—"one of the seven";—belonging properly (as it were) to an earlier period. Let not the reader proceed further without first bringing himself to acquiesce in this theory of a postponement, its method, and purpose:—it is the mainstay of our further interpretation. It was adopted (we repeat) for the special end (speaking always in the sense of an imaginary necessity) of carrying out the burthen of the "angry cry" just pronounced; in the infliction of the vials of wrath upon "the rest of men"—the inhabitants of the Beast's Western Kingdom. From this contrivance also results, that there is an equalization of the times of outgoing, of the Papal and Mahometan "little horns."

By these remarks we have established (as we hope) an important point of agreement in the times of the two oaths in the year 1848. The second clause of the oath in Daniel runs thus:—"And when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people"—ending in 1878. The question is—is there anything found in the Revelation to correspond herewith in time? We conceive there is,—it is in the remarkable wording of its first notice of the days of the "seventh angel" (Rev. x. 7),—it is as follows, "But in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God should be finished." The exceeding compactness of the language of the Revelation may inform us, that wherever a more redundant character than is usual presents itself, there should be suspected some hidden meaning in addition to the more obvious one. The simple and sufficient form of expression for the commonly received sense, would have been, "But in the days of the seventh angel, when they shall begin": why is mention made of his voice, and the sound of his trumpet?—The answer we believe to be this—that the shorter form would have alluded to the "seventh trumpet" only as a division of
time, but the "voice," or the "sound" of the angel's trumpet, is a commencement of his "plague"—an announcement of immediate woe; and this it is possible may follow the commencement of his appointed "days" at a long interval. An immediate analogy suggests itself in the case of the Angels of the Vials: they all leave the courts of Heaven together, on receiving a general command to proceed on their errands (Rev. xvi. 1); yet, as they "pour out" consecutively, the wrath of several of them follows at long intervals their presence in the earth. It is clear (if we may be understood) that a distinction is intended between the "seventh trumpet" as a division of time beginning in 1848; and the time of its woeful voice, which is heard at a remoter period. This then is the arrangement in St. John's symbolism, designedly corresponding (as we believe) with the prophetic announcement of Daniel, that at the outflowing of his second period of "times" (1848) there should be a season expressly set apart for the "scattering" he refers to "of the holy people." In the imagery of St. John this amounts to saying—there should be a peculiar season within the chrometical boundaries of the "seventh trumpet," which should precede, and not be brought under, its sound of woe.

Let us review what has been said. It appears then that the words of the oath, "there should be time no longer; but in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the mystery," &c.—that these words intimate and express a twofold postponement of time;—the mark of the first being "there should be time no longer" (i.e., time should not be yet) reaching up from 1776 to 1848; of the second "when he shall begin to sound," leading the eye onwards to 1878. These agree in time respectively—the first with the difference between the terminations of Daniel's two great periods; the second with the words at the end of the latter of these "and when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people." This interpretation will much depend for its reception on the general estimate the reader may have formed of the plan and language of the "Revelation," whether as being irregular and diffuse, or
compact and concentrated. The latter view is taken by the writer, who looks upon every word in its form and fashion as the result of as close a consideration, as the colour of the minutest stone in Roman Mosaic work.

The next point of coincidence to be noticed, is the identity of the period of time which, in each oath, is last alluded to—the period when the mysterious sayings of Prophecy should be consummated and revealed. In Daniel the oath declares that, at the time it last names, "all these things shall be finished"; or (says the Greek) "they (the saints) shall know all these things." In the Revelation it says that, at the time it last names, "the mystery of God should be finished." And it is observable that, if the two versions (Greek and English) here reported of the words of Daniel be put together, they constitute an exact equivalent to the one expression of St. John. It appears then that the oath in each writer brings us to the point of time, when Mystery vanishes; when the whole scheme of the Divine government, pursued through ages, will be laid open—i.e., to the "wise" (Dan. xii. 10); and which will then be issuing in the establishment of the Lord Christ's universal kingdom. That which has been seen only, hitherto, in the gloomy perspective and "dark place" of prophecy, by the watchmen of many generations, shall be seen advancing rapidly at that epoch to its final consummation;—not the mystery involved in St. John's "Revelation" only, but "as he (God) has declared to his servants the prophets,"—including therefore the correspondencies and mutual aids to interpretation, which "the goodly fellowship of (all) the prophets" supply.

Lest we should have failed to make clear certain points in this very important passage of Prophecy, we may be permitted a short recapitulation. The whole series of "Trumpets" (but let us confine ourselves at present to the three last)—more exact in their boundaries than the Vials, which flow sometimes into each other, are essentially divisions of time. The fifth and sixth—the two Mahometan trumpets must evidently be viewed together in an united, but still consecutive, duration; and the latter terminates in 1848—this date being determined for us chiefly, as yet, by the
outflowing of the great Mahometan number (2400) in Daniel viii. The seventh trumpet, consequently, as a measure of time, then begins. The "trumpet" is a symbol of St. John's: but we find St. John, in the midst of his "sixth trumpet"—(having received Daniel's "little book" open)—referring to a measure of Daniel's even with reference to his own trumpet:—he says to the effect, that there shall be an adjournment of time. Of what time?—Undoubtedly of the period he was then mystically standing in, at the end of the Eastern woe and commencement of the Western Vials, in 1775—6; which (we say) was peculiarly a point in the measurements of Daniel—being the end of his first period of "times":—and the adjournment was to last to the end of his second period—1848; at which time it is necessarily implied that something in John's own measurements should take place. What?—Why that his sixth trumpet should terminate, i.e., his seventh trumpet should begin. It is a remarkable confirmation of this view of the adjournment, that the prevailing Woe of the sixth trumpet, so far as it was peculiarly Ottoman and Eastern, was just at that point of time (1774) come to an end—as we have already had occasion to notice: for among the valuable facts collected by Mr. Elliott (p. 1,041) we find the following:—he says that the peace of 1774, dictated by Prince Romanzoff, "proclaimed to the world in language too clear to be mistaken, that the Turkman power was no longer a woe (sic!) to Christendom, but Christendom to the Turkmans. The dissolution or conquest of its empire had become thenceforth, it was evident, only a question of time (compare the expressions "question of time" and adjournment of time) and European policy. The second woe had passed away.—This, I say, was in 1774."*

* The epoch 1774-5-6 is in a prophetic sense the most remarkable we know of:—the "time, times, and the dividing of time" flow out:—the filthy "sore" which brings on the caustic vials is brought to maturity:—illuminism holds its first orgies:—the great oath is taken, serving to unite the voices of the two "greatly beloved" ones:—the Ottoman woe comes to an end:—the "thunders" roll promising favour to an elect nation. Of this last sign another coincidence of history furnishes an illustration
angry cry of the Lord Christ,—(and hence the requisite adjournment) a transference is made of the woe from the Eastern to the Western side of the prophetic empire; and the woe, so transferred, continues for nearly forty years to the Congress of Vienna:—it is not necessary to suppose it of longer active continuance, notwithstanding that the full adjournment, and the trumpet as a measure, continue until 1848. But an allusion again to Daniel accompanies the decree, intimating that even then (1848) there would not come to pass an immediate consummation of the Providential designs, for that that depended on the Woe-trumpet sounding its woe. We are clearly here invited to make a decided distinction between the times and the woe of the "seventh trumpet": and we consider the season of specific woe to be necessarily advanced forward to 1878—that being the next mentioned period of time. This view of the "seventh trumpet"—which makes it embrace the two last periods of Daniel, viz., the present period of thirty years for the "scattering," and the last of forty-five years for the exaltation of the Cross—the true "time of the end," gives it a continuance of seventy-five years, terminating in A.D. 1923.

Now we would ask, in bidding farewell to the two sacramental declarations, for what purpose they can have been made—framed as they are with so many resemblances as to shew, that there is a designed correspondence between them both of material and allusion; as likewise of solemnity in their enunciation; if not for a purpose of construction?—And for what other purpose of this sort, if not to shew (as we said in a previous page) that, as two corresponding lights on the coast of futurity, they are thus brought by the Divine which may be added to the list, (it is mentioned in the continuation of the passage from Mr. Elliott) viz., that "That same year was the date of the American Revolution." It may not be so much England, perhaps, as the Protestant Race, who constitute the elect nation:—and under this view, might not England (the English) say—"with my staff I passed over this (Atlantic) and now I am become two bands"?—It is increase, at once spiritual and temporal, that constitutes—as to Abraham—the blessing of a nation.
steersman into one, and that the two "beloved ones" speak thenceforward with a single tongue?

Now, does the reader find it difficult to accept this novel interpretation of chap. x. of the Revelation? Let him observe that the Scripture speaks of the matter of the chapter as food difficult of digestion. The transference of the ancient store of Daniel into the new garner of John, and (we may add) the changes time has further effected in the ordinary habits of thought between John's day and our own, seem to be pointed at in ver. 9, as creating impediments not instantly to be surmounted; while yet they are in themselves circumstances of sweet attraction. John is told lastly, that he "must prophesy again before many people and nations, and tongues, and kings." The expression "before many people" (say Stuart and Tilloch) means "concerning many people"; and it indicates for the future a vastly extended sphere of prophecy:—this, as the theme expands, appears to be the case,—the prophet's eye stretching beyond the bounds of the Roman empire, even to the utmost habitations of mankind.

From the long digression we have made to chap. x., we return now to the two numbers of chap. xi. These numbers (i.e., the passages containing them) refer contemporaneously to the saints of the Eastern and Western Churches, exhibiting under two distinct figures the care of the Lord Christ for their common preservation, during the long ages of darkness which it was foreseen would settle simultaneously upon these grand divisions of the Church general, under the forms of Mahometanism and Popery. The first two verses refer in this wise to the Eastern Church during the first and second woe-trumpets—the two trumpets being joined together by the expression "these plagues," in the text of chap. ix. 20:—and from ver. 3 to 13, applies to the saints which grew up during the same period, among the "rest of men" of the same text—the Church of the West. These portions of prophecy remind us of the institution of cities of refuge, being the unquestionable provision of the Saviour against the threatened danger of a total extirpation of the faith.
In proceeding from the second to the third verse, there is apparently a continuation of the subject, and the field of action appears unchanged:—we reply to this, if urged as an objection, that there is a continuation of the one only subject, viz., the provisions of mercy established within the one Roman empire; and the field does remain the same, though distinct scenes of action are constituted within it—this oneness of the field itself rendering unnecessary a greater distinction between the scenes.

The first number—forty-two months (ver. 2) is derived and accommodated (so to speak) from the “2,400 days” of Daniel viii. 4, relating equally with it to the ascendancy of Mahometanism, and the Gentile possession of the Holy City. The number of Daniel was found to flow out in A. D. 1848,—this must therefore do the same: and counting back 1,260 prophetic years, in search of an appropriate date for its commencement, we arrive at the year 606—the year when it is commonly said the career of Mahomet began. “This formidable power”—the Arabian (writes “Kett on the Prophecies,” ii. 256) “commenced about the year 606, which is considered by most of the early commentators as the year when (likewise) the Papal Antichrist was first established.”

We know of nothing in the vast field of prophecy more wonderful than this fact, of two “numbers” relating to the same event in a very distant age—the one pronounced nearly six centuries before the Christian era, and the other depending, when pronounced by St. John, upon an event to happen six centuries after the Christian era—being found to issue together in the year required, and so to confirm each other’s testimony.* The two trumpets (first and second woes) being

* It is much to be questioned whether prophecy, however habitually exact in the application of historical events at either end of a chronological measurement, does not depend sometimes for its verification on a cluster of events, rather than on any particular one. Thus with the rise of Mahomet:—on weighing duly the different steps and circumstances of that rise, Mr. Elliott comes to the conclusion that the year 612 is most to be approved as a period to date from; though he mentions several others—not without substantial claim, each of them; but none satisfactorily avouching the period of 150 years (‘five prophetic months’)—the subject on which he is occupied. It was in the year 612 that the false prophet
exactly commensurate with the 1,260 years thus assigned them, they divide this period in about equal portions. The period in its entirety, regarded in a spiritual point of view, is that of the one “little horn” of Arabia (Dan. viii.); and (as Kett observes) corresponds with much precision with the times of the Papal “little horn” (Dan. vii.); the subject of which latter is thus further shewn to be the “rest of men” (Rev. ix. 20) who “repented not of the works of their hands.”

It will be desirable now to examine what points of agreement there may be, between the expressions in the two first verses of Rev. xi., referring (we say) to the Eastern Church, and the expressions in Dan. viii. referring to the same subject, in order to see whether they be not corresponding prophecies. The words to be adapted run thus in the Revelation:—

“Rise and measure the temple of God, and the altar, and them that worship therein. But the court which is without the temple leave out, and measure it not: for it is given unto the Gentiles: and the holy city shall they tread underfoot forty and two months.”

The temple of God in any particular locality is, undoubtedly, the whole professing Church of Christ there existing,—and here the Eastern Church. But we have here to do with one of those tripartite expressions peculiar to the Apocalypse, some time since adverted to. The “temple of took that step which may be called his ‘declaration of war against Christendom’ (ib. 287), and in the year 762, at the end of the measurement, the Caliphate was removed to Bagdad,—happily called ‘the settlement of the locusts’ (ib. 290)—the end of their ravaging activity, and commencement of their decline. Now the year 612 would not suit our present purpose at all; for then the measurements of Daniel and John (the 2,400 years, and the 1,260 years) would not flow out together, which it is essential they should do, and which can only happen in the year 1848. Yet we ask—may not both dates have been simultaneously in the eye of the prophetic Spirit, both years having contributed equally to that cluster of events in which, it may be truly said, the Mahometan power had its origin? It is very remarkable (should this idea be approved) that adding on 1,242 years (1,260 reduced) to 612, we arrive at the year 1854—the year which, above all others, has lately borne witness to the decrepitude and impotency of Islam as a military power, and the ascendancy of Christian arms. Assurance as to the subject of the prophecy is thus made doubly sure.
God" comprehends the other two terms—the "altar," and "them that worship therein"; and to these two we shall consequently address ourselves. As the "temple" signifies the whole Church, the "altar" may reasonably be interpreted as them of the altar—the constituted ministry for holy worship. "Them that worship therein"—the accompanying term—requires no explanation. And we would ask, is there not a direct analogy between these terms and what are found in Dan. viii. 10—the "stars" and the "host"? Or, if the "altar" be interpreted (as by some it is) to typify the true elect of God, as contrasted with the general body within the "temple," then the analogy will be found between the altar and the worshippers on the one hand, and the sanctuary and the host (Dan. viii. 13) on the other. The measuring expresses the solicitude of God for his prostrated Church, in unison with the text "not a hair of your head but is numbered"—for "God has ordered all things in measure, and number, and weight" (Wisdom xi. 20):—though overwhelmed "because of transgression," we hence learn that the Eastern Church is the constant object of the Lord's cognizance and observation. Again, "the court which is without the temple"—that is, without figure, the surrounding mass of the Mahometan population (in past times all were admissible into the outer court, even though not professing the truth) "leave out and measure it not":—take no notice of it, "for it is given unto the Gentiles":—given away! in no wise preserved or cared about! Its population had been mine; but now I give them away "because of transgression":—"cast them out" (vide Lat. and Gre.) of the measurements of my regard. The correspondence here is, in the first place, this—that in Daniel, as well as the Revelation, the scene is laid wholly, and obviously, among those, whose rightful place is without the temple," and by whose intruding and usurping presence within it, the sanctuary is trodden under foot and defiled (Dan. viii. 13, 14). But also the considerate reader will perhaps see a strong reflection of John's words in the following notice from Daniel (viii. 12)—"an host was given him against the daily sacrifice." The "daily sacrifice" was offered on the "altar of burnt offerings," which was placed
by Moses "before the entrance of the tabernacle" (Calmet, voc. altar)—in other words, in "the court which is without the temple":—so that the "giving of the outer court to the Gentiles," and the "giving the Gentiles power against the daily sacrifice," are synonymous figures of speech. Again, "the holy city shall they tread under foot"—words which exactly answer, not only to the words just above quoted, but more pointedly to the words of ver. 10 of Daniel—"they stamped upon them," i.e., upon the "host" and the "stars"—the component parts of the "Holy City." But the holy city in this sentence is also equivalent (we conceive) to "the place of his sanctuary," of Daniel's symbolism (viii. 11)—the "place," chief seat, τὸ αὐξον: and means (as we said some time ago) the "holy hill of Sion," ever remaining unchangeably the spot of God's delight. It may be objected perhaps to this last point of interpretation, that it is a sudden descent from the figurative to the literal; but of this the text itself presents, close by, an eminent example, wherein it speaks of "the temple, and the altar, and them that worship therein"; the latter words of which sentence have certainly no figurative sense, and shew that the judgment of the reader must be exercised, as to the class to which any such expression belongs:—a "singularity" of the Apocalypse consists (says Tilloch) in "the blended use of common and hieroglyphical language, and preserving the properties of each throughout" (Diss., 314).

Now, if the "holy city" here mentioned be the literal city of Jerusalem, it must suggest itself that a closer verificati-
on is necessary of her being "trodlen under foot," than to view her simply as partaking with the "holy land" at large of the general lot of Mahometan oppression, commencing in A.D. 606; unless it can be shewn (which it certainly cannot) that Jerusalem was brought under the tread of the oppressor in that very year. When the number is applied, as here, to the lot of a single city, there are two things the reader has a right to expect; first, an exact fulfilment of the terms of the prophecy in the particular downfall of the city; and secondly (as on larger occasions) the usual contrast, or other peculiar relation of circumstances, between the going
in and going out of the prophetic measurement. Consulting history under these expectations, she tells us that “in the year 637 the Caliph Omar took Jerusalem by capitulation: the Christians were not allowed liberty of worship but on the most severe and humiliating conditions: and he built a mosque on the site of Solomon’s temple which remains to this day” (Kett, ii. 317). Thus was, indeed, “the holy city trodden under foot”; and (as the Greek Patriarch exclaimed on the occasion) “The abomination of desolation was raised in the Holy Place.” But the year 637, computed with the addition of the prophetic period, brings us to the year 1879; in which year, consequently, it may be expected that this “Place of God’s Sanctuary” shall be raised from its dissected condition. But how far did we find the account of Daniel to be in unison with this apocalyptic view? We reply—the great number (2400) of Daniel was found to flow out in A.D. 1848; but with this remarkable reserve—that only the instrument (the spade, as it were) that was to remove the Augelian filth collected in the sanctuary,—or the Head (it may only be) to mark the initiated period of time—was then presented to the world’s contemplation in the “man of sin.” The full accomplishment of the cleansing was to be expected only on a later day. What day?—Somewhere (says Dan. viii. 17—19) in the time of the end, when, at the voice of the “seventh trumpet,” commencing in 1878, so many Gentile ramparts fall. But this happens when “the angel shall begin to sound”! that is—when he is already sounding. We conceive that on the strength of this last expression one more year may reasonably be added to 1878; and this will make the relief of the holy city as computed from Daniel, issue in the same year (1879) as when computed from the Revelation. We ask now—Does any doubt remain that the two first verses of Rev. ix. are the echoes of the eighth chapter of Daniel?

We turn now to the second number, which is thus given (ver. 3).—

“And I will give power to my two witnesses, and they shall prophesy a thousand two hundred and three score days, clothed in sackcloth.”

This passage has relation to the times of “the rest of men”
—the Western church in her apostate state, unreclaimed by God’s providences from her scandalous fornications (ix. 20). It has been brought before us that it is necessary to take a combined view of the two periods of Daniel affecting the Western empire, commencing in the years 533 and 606; so that the interim between their respective terminations in 1776 and 1848 should be regarded in the light of a prolongation of the first period. In like manner we are at liberty (as we conceive) to regard the interim between the years 533 and 606 as an antecedent or precursive portion of the last period. It is important to ascribe the state of unity to these periods, for the reason that we have spoken of the times of Mahometan and of Papal darkness respectively, during the fifth and sixth trumpets, and as represented in the “numbers” under investigation, as holding a parallel course in history:—they do so, excepting as to a slight, and (through the operation of this device reduced to) an only apparent deviation. The Mahometan times commence in 606, and (strange to say) terminate their woe close upon the year 1776, as if having commenced in 533; but the “woe” is continued upon the Western empire in the vials, during a period which, in the measurement of the sixth trumpet, does not end until 1848. The Papal times commence first in 533, and end in 1776; but prolong their measure to 1848, as if they had commenced in 606. The result is—and it is of great consequence to the interpretation, that we are to consider the period before us as commencing in A.D. 533.

The two witnesses (my witnesses) are, we presume, the several sources of testimony, of which it can be said that, by God’s appointment, they testify of His grace. They are two, i. e., sufficient in number, according to the saying “in the mouth of two witnesses shall every word be established.” They are, first, the Holy Scriptures—the testimony from the beginning, “what our fathers have declared unto us of the noble works of God in their days, and in the old time before them”; and secondly, they are the ministers of God’s Word, holding His apostolic commission, under whose handling it is declared that His word shall “never return unto Him void.” Together these are the ground and the pillar of that glorious
entablature, in the centre of which the name of God is written; the Jachin and Boaz—the strength and the direction of the Church.

Bishop Newton has devoted some sixty pages to shew, that in all the dark ages of Popery there have been some true and faithful worshippers of Jesus Christ; and he calls attention (iii. 134) to the peculiar circumstance, that these witnesses, as well as God's witnesses from the beginning of time, have usually appeared in pairs: Moses and Aaron, Elijah and Elisha, Zerubbabel and Joshua, the Waldenses and Albigenses, John Huss and Jerome of Prague, Luther and Calvin, Cranmer and Ridley; and that our Saviour sent forth his disciples “two and two.” Of course the “witnesses” of every succeeding century have not been of the same celebrity as these we have cited; but their testimony has ever been sufficiently clear to shew, that they have been raised by the Most High in their respective generations, to tend and keep alive the waning lamp of truth. But while the Bishop confines his view of the “witnesses” to the living in their order of succession, another high class of interpreters, such as Dr. Wordsworth and Mr. Frere, pronounce them to be, solely, the Old and New Testaments. Undoubtedly the general meaning is preserved under either of these views; but the writer states it as his humble opinion, that the particular incidents related in the chapter before us of these “witnesses,” are best met by the interpretation he has offered. If the Scriptures are the “two olive trees” (ver. 4) containing the oil, surely the placing their light on “candlesticks”—the opening and expounding their contents, whereby the whole congregation is brought at once to see and understand, must be descriptive of the work of the Christian Ministry.

The fifth and sixth verses (qu. vid.) declare—what the infidel of course would ridicule, but which the confiding disciple of Christ knows to be the cornerstone of human history—that all the horrid wars, rebellions, persecutions, as well as the sufferings of our race by plague, pestilence, and famine, all proceed from a neglect of God's “witnesses,” as illustrated in His holy sacraments, precepts, and admonitions—those
Divine helps which are able to make men wise, as well unto their present well-being, as hereafter unto salvation. It is the preference given to the rule of the Wild Beast over that of the Lamb—τὸ θηρίον τοῦ Ἀρνίου—that is the entire cause of the world's present degradation.

With the seventh verse the great question arises as to the season of visitation upon the Witnesses here specially referred to:—it is said,—

"And when they shall have finished their testimony, the beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit shall make war against them, and shall overcome them, and kill them."

From what has been said—may we say, demonstrated?—regarding the two periods of 1,260 years each, and that portion of time whereby the period last opening extends beyond the earlier one, the verse before us becomes exceedingly easy of interpretation. It appears that the witnesses testify for 1,260 years, but that, when "they shall have finished their testimony," they do not vanish from the earth,—they continue to live. In that condition (i.e., their testimony completed, and they still alive) "war" is waged against them by the "beast from the bottomless pit," who at last slays them. The points to be observed here are, that after prophesying for 1,260 years in sackcloth, the witnesses are then to be viewed as in a more joyous state of hope and freedom,—for this is a necessary inference from their putting off sackcloth: that in this season of their comparative well-being the infidel beast arises; and the figure then employed of his "making war" against them (a long operation) is proof that a considerable space of time must pass, before the catastrophe happens of their death. With these premises to rely upon, our undoubting conclusion is, that the 1,260 years of sackcloth is the period ending in 1775-6. It was at this epoch that the saints (in the original vision which gave the number—Dan. vii.) were set free by the assertion on the part of the atheistic philosophers of an universal liberty; when also the barrier of laws prohibiting their exertions in their Master's service was shaken to its foundation. History moreover bears witness, that at the epoch of 1776, the witnesses had fully "finished their testimony"; for all the
testimony that a Christian people had a right to desire, every argument that Gospel truth could furnish to induce men to turn from their "murders, sorceries, and fornications," (chap. ix. 21,) had been brought to bear upon the recreant Western empire. The call to a Reformation had been sounded in every quarter of the Roman earth: it had produced effects, however ephemeral, in France, Austria, and Italy, and even in Spain: it had been listened to with a more enduring attention in Great Britain, and several parts of Germany. The Scriptures had been drawn forth from their Latin tomb, into the vernacular light of all the chief languages of the Beast. The body of its standard divinity had been completed in the chief Protestant kingdom. Moreover their "testimony," in the sense of the word martyrdom, was then also "finished"; for none (so to speak) have since that time forfeited their lives by their confession. After this epoch (1776) we get upon the second period of 1,260 years, or "prolongation of time"; and it will appear, as we proceed, that every portion of this "prolongation" is necessary for the due fulfilment of the prophecy before us—ending at ver. 13, with the sixth trumpet, in the year 1848.

Now a sign is given of this particular age of the witnesses—a most strange and elaborate sign, extending from the 7th to the 12th verse—that of what is commonly called their death and resurrection. Many solutions have been offered of this sign, drawn from the more perilous periods of the Church in the wilderness, to be found in Bishop Newton's work—all plausible enough, considering that in his day the time for the enactment of its clauses had not yet arrived. Adopting the view of Mr. Frere that this sign was emphatically realized in the commencement of the French Revolution,—occurring (observe) but a short time after 1776, and during the "prolongation of time"—we cannot do better, in borrowing his facts, than give them in his own words, together with such of his comments as fall in with our own view of the right interpretation.

On the 7th and 8th vers. this author writes:—

"At the end of the sackcloth testimony of 1,260 years" (which he very erroneously places in 1793) "infidelity, the last form of the Beast, abro-
gates the authority of the Scriptures. On the 7th of November, 1793, Gobet, the Republican Bishop of Paris, with his grand vicars and others of his clergy, entered the hall of the National Convention, solemnly resigned his functions, and abjured Christianity. On the 11th a grand festival, dedicated to Reason and Truth was celebrated in the Cathedral of Notre Dame, which had been re-named the Temple of Reason. A pyramid was erected in the middle of the church, together with a temple inscribed to Philosophy. The torch of Truth was on the altar of Reason, spreading light, &c. The National Convention and all the authorities attended at this blasphemous celebration. In June, 1794, was ordered a fête, in honour of the Supreme Being the God of Philosophy. Thus was Revelation systematically deposed,—and (he might have added) the hierarchical body (the other witness) humbled in the dust.

The 9th and 10th vers. represent the—

"rejoicings of the infidels on the success of their labours during the period of three years and a half, in which every outward indication of belief in Christianity was abolished, commencing from November, 1793: the cause of their enmity against the truths of Revelation is here stated to be, that the Scriptures torment them with fears of future retribution."

The 11th verse alludes to—

"the formal resuscitation of Christianity, which took place three years and a half from the above-mentioned period. On the 17th of June, 1797, Camille Jourdan, in the Council of Five Hundred, brought up the memorable Report on the 'Revision of the laws relative to religious worship.' It consisted of a number of propositions abolishing alike the Republican restrictions on Popish worship, and the Popish restrictions on Protestant worship." . . . . . "The removal of all restrictions gave to the reformed faith a freedom which had never before existed in France; the oppressive laws which had continued in force from the time of Louis XIV. were abrogated; and it may be said that the support now given to it by the authority of the State, set the religion of the Scriptures for the first time on its feet in France."

The 12th verse goes on to declare "the triumphant exaltation of the Scriptures" (ib.); to which, with our view of the witnesses, we may add—the re-establishment of the Christian ministry, who "ascended up to the third heaven" of their rightful authority, "in a cloud" of incense—the praises and thanksgivings of the spiritually-afflicted Church—chiefly the lower orders of the people.

Dr. Wordsworth observes upon the text (ver. 9) "they shall not suffer their dead bodies to be put in graves," that
for graves should be read monuments—being in the LXX. μνημεῖα not rāfous (p. 249); and—considering the Witnesses to be the Old and New Testaments—he explains the words as pointing to the remarkable fact, that "Rome has ever laboured that the two Witnesses may not be committed to the immortal monuments of Editions, Translations and Expositions." We should rather think—even be the two Testaments alone the witnesses, but certainly if the ordained Ministry be likewise counted among them—that the words refer to that exposure to public insult and derision which customarily attends the death of malefactors, and which in the days of the Revolution was meted to the deposed ministers of religion; instead of that decent burial (here, literally, retirement and seclusion) which is usually accorded to a vanquished but respected enemy. In fact, if the sign be truly the passage of history we refer to, it must be from among the incidents of the period, as they affected all the witnesses to God's truth, that the true elucidation of the text must proceed; and these may be learnt from Alison, in the indignities cast upon the whole institution of the Church during the "reign of terror"—not only upon her Scriptures and Ministers, but in the abolition of the Sabbath-day, the profanation and alienation of the Edifices dedicated to God's service, and the insulting suppression of the very name of the Most faithful Witness—His holy Son.

And all this took place, it is said, "in the street of the great city which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt,"—a very important notice, shewing that it took place not in all the city, which would have meant the Roman empire, but in a particular locality—the great "street." The street of a city is the place of general communication, where the manners of the entire city may be said to receive their impress, and from whence the principles most approved in the commerce of life are disseminated. The City itself, at the time pointed at, is called "Sodom"—no doubt for its corruption of morals, and "Egypt"—for its persecution of the saints of God. Here our Lord (it is said) "was crucified"—"Tiberio imperante crucifixus";—showing that the City is the Roman empire; and where (it may be added)
He has been crucified continually in His members, through many generations. The "Street" is France.

The "power" (ver. 3.) shed upon the witnesses was of unequal force in the different ages of their testimony; evincing itself in efforts more or less successful to break the chains of the universal ignorance, and to open out the sources of Divine light. The power was therefore manifested (not to go higher in the list of holy martyrs) in the persons of Huss and Jerome, in the noble band of the "League of Smalcalde" a century later, in the Huguenots of Languedoc, in the Protestants who suffered by the "revocation of the Edict of Nantes," in the contemporaneous sufferers in Piedmont under the Duke of Savoy, in the noble band which at the same time witnessed to the truth in this island, when Popery was advanced to the throne. It is a remarkable circumstance that on each of these occasions, being the occasions brought forward by Bishop Newton, the prescribed measure of time—three years and a half, a very little more or less, intervened between the beginning and the end of the persecution; and it is referred to here in order to introduce the following—what the writer considers—very important observation of the learned Divine (iii. 146)—"In all these cases there may be some resemblance to the prophecy before us, of the death and resurrection of the witnesses; and it may please an overruling Providence so to dispose and order events, that the calamities and afflictions of the church may in some measure run parallel one to another; and all the former efforts of that tyrannical and persecuting power called the beast, may be the types and figures as it were of this his last and greatest effort against the witnesses"—alluding to an effort which he (the Bishop) writing in 1771, considered to be future, but certain. This reflection should be ever present in the study of prophecy, to discourage too rapid conclusions. The great Creator who has contrived the different parts of the physical creation on such an uniformity of plan, amidst an infinite diversity of external shape, purpose, and qualities, that they appear to be arranged in parallel lines, and be intended as illustrations one of another, is the same Lord who has fixed the events and seasons of
human history; and in them, consequently, we should expect to find, with regard to their configuration, that the same rule of uniformity in variety would obtain. And thus it comes to pass that the more important prophecies admit of many steps of fulfilment; but not so as to preclude or prejudice the greater and final event that from the beginning was had in view.

Reverting to the question of the period of the Witnesses' prophesying in sackcloth, it must be evident, on a moment's reflection on history, that sackcloth was as appropriate to them as a dress between the years 533 and 606 as at any era of their testimony,—a consideration which at once justifies our adoption of the first of these dates as that of the commencement of the period. Again, as the Witnesses are slain in an age, not during, but beyond, the period of their testimony, may we not recognise in this arrangement an avowed application of the season of "Adjournment of Time": —Χρόνος (Time) lifts his measuring line from the point 1776, and transfers the peg to the point 1848:—it is only the same measure prolonged. And this is our warrant (we repeat) for saying, that the Head that rises to view in 1848, is head of the united periods. Furthermore, the close contiguity in this chapter of the two subjects of the Eastern and Western churches, and its simultaneous allusion to the Eastern and Western "little horns," (which should call to our recollection the simultaneous announcements of these "horns" of old to Daniel—within two years of each other—vid. dates of chaps. vii. and viii.)—this (we say) may inform us of a further reason, over and above its being the season of the Western Vials, for this prolongation of time:—it was in order to insure a simultaneous termination of the "times" of the two "little horns." The Western "horn" arose some 73 years before the Eastern (the difference between 533 and 606); but in 606 a second commencement was given it, which is expressed in prophecy as the removal forward of its termination. And why is a simultaneous termination desirable?—It is that at the epoch 1848—but not till after a further period of thirty years, ordained for the manifestation of the Head (Antichrist) of the united systems, the two pestilential
clouds of Popery and Islamism may simultaneously pass away, and the horizon of Truth be enabled to expand serenely on all sides at once, and be lit up with the fast approaching glory of the Redeemer's reign.

It is on the occasion of the "war" against the Witnesses that the first mention is made of the "beast" by St. John; and by calling him emphatically "the beast," it is evident that he alludes to a beast of whom in Prophecy the Church had already heard;—where, but in the book of Daniel,—the "little book open" of the preceding chapter?* This "beast from the bottomless pit" we are to remember is particularly described in Rev. xvii. 8, as the seventh "Head" of the one great "Beast" of Daniel. We found him, though springing out of Charlemagne, to have his individuality and impersonation in Napoleon the great, who, as Head of empire, not only stood next in succession to Charlemagne, and was more than he the representative of the "kingdom of iron"; but was also (as every monarch is taken to be) the exponent and expression of the spirit of his own time. When it should happen that the spirit of the age is "not yet come" (Rev. xvii. 10) to its exemplification in the Head, the utmost that a writer could pronounce of it would be, that it is rising; and on this account the prophet says—"the beast that ascendeth (not has ascended, or shall ascend, but is in the act of ascending) out of the bottomless pit"—"το θηρίον το ανασαζόντων." It was during his ascent to power,—during the expectance of his bodily manifestation in Napoleon, that the infidel Beast obtained his Satanic victory: and we ask—does not this language, referring to the period continuing after 1775, with inimitable grace tap the shoulder of the "reign of terror," when, notwithstanding the recent release of the Saints from thraldom, every witness to Christ was lying for the moment lifeless in the dust!

* "This use of the Article (says Dr. Wordsworth, p. 245) is a proof of the writer's inspiration, and of Scripture unity; for it indicates the object (not yet described by himself, but either described already in Scripture by some other inspired writer, or to be described hereafter by himself) as already visible to the eye of the writer"; and brings all times into "one present."
Now, as it is a reasonable opinion, and agreeable to common sense, that every prophecy, bound up in its terms with one of these numbers—these gigantic measurements of time, requires the full amount of the measurement for its completion; and as, in the present instance, the text has taken us beyond the bounds of the first number, ending in A.D. 1775, into the territory of the next, ending in 1848, it is reasonable to suppose this half-century and upwards to be necessary for the completion of the prophecy. And this will be found to serve most happily for the verification of its remaining clause. It is written (ver. 13):

"And the same hour was there a great earthquake, and the tenth part of the city fell, and in the earthquake were slain of men seven thousand: and the remnant were affrighted and gave glory to the God of heaven."

"The same hour" means during this short period. "The tenth part of the city" points to France. It is difficult to explain logically the word "remnant"; but as there must have been two parties to produce these convulsions—denominated an "earthquake," and as of one of them it is elsewhere said (Rev. xvi. 11) that "they repented not of their deeds," it is a reasonable inference that the "remnant" means the other party—the British Nation. The term bears a resemblance to that of "the rest of men." Of this "remnant" it is said—not that they turned in disgust from the infidel and antisocial spirit of the times; but that they were "affrighted." It will be well remembered that among the highest intellects of our country in that age, there were many who at first beheld in the French Revolution the political regeneration of mankind and the dawn of universal freedom: thus of Mr. Fox, who "had long held, by his ardent and impassioned eloquence, the post of leader of the Opposition," Alison says (p. 38, epitome) that "his uncompromising devotion to the popular cause now led him to advocate, with all the fire of his oratory, those frantic innovations of which the neighbouring country was the scene." It was but a transient admiration;—the sanguinary course of events that followed its first outbreak soon led, in this country, to a juster estimate of the atrocious spirit that was abroad. Mr. Burke, "distinguishing the real nature of the
movement, had by his celebrated pamphlet ("Reflections on
the French Revolution") called upon his country to pause,
er e she lent her hand to such a cause." (Frere—p. 50.) The
sound judgment of the people returned. "The remnant
were affrighted, and gave glory to the God of heaven."

But how did they "give glory to the God of heaven"?—
It was not only by humbling themselves before Him in the
appointment of national fasts and days of humiliation, but in
the active endeavours just then set on foot, and which have
ever since abided, for the promotion of God's kingdom,—by
the translation of His word into every accessible language of
mankind,—by the call to the ancient stock of Abraham to
turn into the "old paths" of truth,—by sending forth
devoted missionaries among the heathen nations,—and by all
the glorious institutions, ever multiplying in our land, for the
mitigation of every physical and moral evil.

We have done with these Numbers. On comparing the
subjects they refer to—the measuring of the Temple in the
Eastern empire of Rome, and the raising up of Witnesses in
the Western, it cannot fail to be seen that they describe the
same thing under a diversity of figure—the solicitude and
provision of the Lord Jesus for the preservation of His faith-
ful and elect Church.

"The second woe is past, and behold the third woe cometh
quickly." (Ver. 14.) The last word of this passage is much
to be noted. "Quickly" is interpreted by some (Mr. Frere
and Mr. Elliott, for instance) to signify, that the third woe
follows immediately upon the heels of the second:—on what
ground we cannot see. It is surely more agreeable to the
common sense of words to suppose an interval; and as an
interval is necessary to the scheme we pursue, we shall pre-
sume it to be intended,—an interval (be it remembered) not
between the woe trumpets, but the woes. "Cometh quickly"
responds, in fact, to the words indicating a delay, in the sen-
tence "in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he
shall begin to sound." The second woe trumpet, regarded as a
measure of time, terminates at the latest in A.D. 1848; and
the third woe, involved in the seventh trumpet, commences
in 1878:—and thus it happens that the word "quickly,"
pointing to the interval, overlays the period of thirty years, appointed for the humiliation and cleansing of the "holy people."

On the "seventh trumpet" we may venture a few words, albeit it has no other connexion with the Numbers of the chapter than as owing its commencement as a measure of time to their outflowing; its description is as follows:—

(15) "And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever.

(16) And the four and twenty elders, which sat before God on their seats, fell upon their faces, and worshipped God, (17) Saying, We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, and art to come; because thou hast taken unto thee thy great power, and hast reigned. (18) And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldest destroy them which destroy the earth. (19) And the temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament: and there were lightnings, and voices, and thunderings, and an earthquake, and great hail."

As we find ourselves here in the region of the future (for the sounding of the seventh trumpet is not heard until the year 1878) it will be prudent to attempt no more than an examination of the terms of the description. The first thing to be noticed is, that the "voices in heaven" (ver 15), and the "four and twenty elders" (ver. 17) speak of things that have already taken place—"the kingdoms are become"—"thou hast taken unto thee thy power." It is clear that these words are spoken in an advanced period of the trumpet; and the circumstance is an additional testimony to the truth, that there are two divisions of this trumpet; for the magnificent language cited would be inappropriate in, at the least, its first thirty years (1848 to 1878) while the saintly nation are under inflictions of trial. They are spoken in the
triumphant "time of the end"—the last forty-five years of Daniel; and a little reflection will perhaps shew that they are spoken at the very end of that period. But let us inquire a little further into the duration of this trumpet.

It has been observed that its measurement in time, as calculated from Daniel, is 75 years, viz., from 1848 to 1923. But Daniel's testimony, on a point referring to a "trumpet," is by itself inconclusive; and we are to remember that John's "times" (as calculated from Rev. xiii. 5) continue to the year 2042 (viz., 1,242 years beyond A.D. 800). And if any one should contend that this, consequently, is the proper end of the trumpet, because the end of John's "times"—giving an extra continuance to it of upwards of a century, we have no very peremptory reason to urge against the proposition, provided only it contemplates the trumpet as a measure of time; for as to its being a trumpet of "woe"—i.e., of vengeance, after the year 1923, this will not consist with the language of Daniel who speaks of that era as "blessed" (xii. 12)—blessed in the triumphs of Christ and His saints, especially in the recall to favour of His ancient people—the particular subject of that prophecy, and in the annihilation of the worldly Gentile "beast." Now it is the opinion of the writer that the "seven trumpets" is the measure of the "times of the Gentiles" under Christ,—the forecast historical outline of the Christian Gentile power. Each trumpet is a Jewish summons to this "beast" to surrender his dominion. Consequently, when we hear in the course of the seventh trumpet the shouts of victory and of thanksgiving to God for the establishment of His reign, as in ver. 17, we may take for granted that the reascendancy of Judah has begun. Thus (be it observed) we are called by each of the "beloved" ones, successively, to listen to the same "blessed" sounds of "thanksgiving"; and hence we conclude that the point of time in the seventh trumpet indicated by the figures of Daniel (1923) is the one from whence St. John's description is taken. The conclusion is not without importance.

To the like effect we may observe, that the mention by Daniel of an epoch of established "blessedness" must needs
have connexion with the general subject of the prophecy—the future lot of the Jews; for “he” that “waiteth” must primarily be the Jew; wherefrom we learn assuredly that, at that time, their days of blessedness will have arrived. Now, in like manner St. John’s seventh trumpet, treating of the same times, ends with the declaration (giving it as its own grand consummation)—that “the temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament.” We shall look more closely by and bye into these words: at present we shall only state that they announce the reception of the tribes of Israel into the Christian fold; in unison with the words of Isaiah (xxvii. 13), “And it shall come to pass in that day that a great trumpet shall be blown, and they shall come which were ready to perish in the land of Assyria, and the outcasts in the land of Egypt, and shall worship the Lord in the holy mount at Jerusalem.” Thus Daniel and John as usual correspond:—the last verse of the “seventh trumpet” throws an unmistakeable light on the last observation of Daniel,—the Jew is “blessed” (Dan. xii. 12) because he is again the inmate of “God’s temple” (Rev. xi. 19). It cannot be a doubt then that the great event of this trumpet is the re-establishment of the Jewish nation—“the time of the dead that they should be judged.” We have seen that throughout Christendom there is at this day a rising interest in their favour; and we think we have shown that in the year 1879 the beloved city will be relieved of the actual abomination within it. It is not too long to assign, as the times of their regathering into Palestine—perhaps only “one by one” (Is. xxvii. 12), the whole period of the “time of the end”; and for this reason again we are inclined to believe that the “great voices in heaven,” telling exultingly of what had been done, may be placed at the end of this period. Then will “all tears be wiped away” (Rev. xxi. 4), and the Lord Jesus be received at length with “blessing” by His own kinsmen (Matt. xxi. 9).

We turn now to the several expressions of this “trumpet.” The “great voices in heaven” may be interpreted as those of the higher princes and rulers of “this world,” (the expression
"this world" is proof that the scene is one of ordinary circumstances on earth,) who "cry aloud" (as it were) in the streets of the nations, inviting their people to embrace the true worship of the Redeemer, and flee from the idolatry of the Antichristian "Beast." Their shout of joy is, that their kingdoms belong henceforward wholly to the Lord,—that the dominion of erring saints and pardoning priests is at an end, also the sham claims of itinerant "highly-gifted" spouters of the Gospel; and that the well-ordered Church of "God's Christ"—those on whom the chrism of the Lord has truly been poured, is henceforth established. Griesbach has a various reading for "kingdoms"—η βασιλεία, in agreement with the Latin translation, "factum est regnum hujus mundi Domini nostri"—by some commentators thought an improvement, as more emphatic. We are on the contrary persuaded, that the very pith, in a prophetic point of view, here lies in the plural number. The scene is laid wholly in the "time of the end"—the time of the "toes" of the great image, those independent sovereignties which will have shaken off the withering grasp of Rome,—the time of those "ten horns" of the Beast (Rev. xvii. 17) which, after having sustained the Antichrist, will have broken away from his connexion:—with these symbols the word "kingdoms" most agrees. It appears from hence (as might have been anticipated) that the great Reformation of the nations of the Beast accompanies the progress of the Jews' restoration.

In unison with the rejoicings of earthly kings, the "four and twenty elders which sat before God on their seats"—i. e., whose labours are finished, and who occupy the thrones appointed them in Christ—give thanks to God, on the account that He had "taken to him his great power and had reigned." The "four and twenty elders" we conceive to be those of the two Dispensations, 12+12, chief pillars in the House of God; to whom it has been given, in their times, whether as writers or preachers of the Word, "apostles or prophets" (Eph. ii. 20), Christian or Prechristian, to sustain the temple of the Lord. The "reign of Christ" is the

* The "four and twenty elders" are considered by Dr. Wordsworth (though not without hesitation, we observe) to represent the "older
establishment of His truth, and the principles of His kingdom; and the "elders" give thanks for their wide extension, and for the overthrow of those "Bestial" maxims and ideas by which they had so long been perverted or opposed. "The nations were angry, and thy wrath is come":—this refers (we imagine) to the great Antichristian struggle now impending, in the joint attempt of many nations to uphold the false throne of the Antichrist—to accompany the entrance of the "time of the end," and to terminate it in an universal triumph of the reformed religion:—to issue also in "the time of the dead that they should be judged." There is but one word (the last) which suggests the possibility that this sentence may refer to the general resurrection and judgment; but taking into consideration the whole context, especially the last verse of the chapter which supposes a continuance of Time, it is the persuasion of the writer that by the "dead" is meant the Jewish nation—raised at this time (as it were) from the sleep of death. In their recall they may be subjected to the severe "judgments" of God, even as Daniel has written of them (xii. 2), that "some shall awake to shame and everlasting contempt."

The time is come too (say the elders) for "that thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants"—those of past generations who have borne testimony before men to the hope of the Mediatorial glory, whose names shall be as guiding stars in the heaven of high authority; "and to the saints and them that fear thy name"—those of the actual dispensation"; for the reason that the Old Testament Scriptures "consist on the whole of four and twenty books." As the Apostles of Christ are called in Scripture "The twelve" (Matt. xxvi. 20, &c.), so the body of the Law and the Prophets is often entitled by the Israelites, "The twenty-four," called in the Apocalypse elders, because they signify the elder dispensation (p. 118). It is as well to mention this opinion, though we do not find it borne out numerically by the list of either books or authors. Moreover it is not pretended that these books or authors are by appointment "twenty-four," as were the Apostles "twelve"; and therefore, had there been an accidental exhibition of that number, it may be questioned whether such would have been an appropriate subject for a Divine enigma. The idea reminds one of the Jews counting the letters of the sacred Scriptures.
generation, eminent in devotion, whose "reward" in this godly age shall be the higher posts of trust and of government:—the text resembles in design that of Rev. xii. 8—"neither was their place found any more in heaven."
"Small and great"—words which determine the matter of the scene to belong to the present constitution of things. The time is come too that thou "shouldst destroy them which destroy the earth"—them who are (it appears) still "corrupting" the earth; in other words—shouldest exterminate the "kingdom of the beast" and bring in that predicted "reign of righteousness" when (as Isaiah says) "the lion shall lie down with the kid." Now as it is clear that in this latter half of ver. 18, the awards good and evil of the present life are intended, we presume the same of the former half. And if we have judged rightly in placing the speakers in this scene at the end of the seventh trumpet (we mean in A.D. 1923) it will follow that this "reward" and this "destruction," spoken of prospectively, are beyond this trumpet's period, and of the "time of the end" of Daniel. "The time is come" (says the verse) for doing these things. The course of the events by which they shall be achieved we may not expect to be informed of: but let us open our ears with gladness to the instrumentality foreshewn:—on the last words of the elders being heard it is added, that "there was seen in God's temple the ark of his testament": that is—the tribes of Israel were seen as at that time summoned to Christ's immediate service. This is the glorious result to which the dispensation of the "trumpets"—i. e., of Christian Gentile government, with its "bestial" maxims of pride and violence, has been ever tending and will surely lead. We may here make the observation, that if Jewish ascendency be reinstated at the conclusion of Daniel's "time of the end" and of his prophecy (1923), it is a happy circumstance that the periods of a junior prophet should extend further into time—thus demonstrating that "the end is not yet"—the end (that is) of the present dispensation. Let us now more closely examine the terms of the last verse.

"And the temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament; and there were lightnings, and voices, and thunderings, and an earthquake, and great hail."
SEVENTH TRUMPET.

This language can have reference only to the ancient house of Israel, the symbols being taken entirely from the temple worship. The "temple" of God—the habitation of His holiness, is, in the figurative sense here required, the people with whom His more immediate presence is established. The opening of this temple indicates that it had been closed, and all ingress prevented; and its being opened "in heaven" seems to shew, that its living stones had been held in reserve and safe keeping, under the protecting providence of God. There is clearly to be perceived in this symbolism an act of especial benignity and favour; and it denotes, when coupled with what was seen within the temple, the return of mercy to the ancient people of Israel:—for the "ark," the ancient throne of the Deity, the emblem of His sure and unalterable mercy, is peculiarly a symbol appertaining to the Mosaic religion, as was the "temple" of those days a symbol of the people to whom the ark was committed. This is the only passage in the Revelation in which the word "ark" occurs; nor is the ark anywhere else referred to in the New Testament, except in the Epistle to the Hebrews: and we hence conclude that the "living" temple in which in symbol it was seen deposited must be the Hebrew nation.

But the ark here seen is not called the "ark of the covenant"—that which the Jews of old had in their keeping, but the "ark of his (God's) testament": and we are pointedly told elsewhere that a testament "is of force (only) after men are dead" (Heb. ix. 17). Now the ark, viewed symbolically, is the human nature—the corporeal presence of the Saviour, the strong custodium, and unimpeachable evidence of the truth of God's word—Himself that Word. The "ark of the covenant" in Israel was then, anciently, the Word of God in Israel, containing within itself the tokens of His everlasting rule—the "two tables" of His Law, and with them, as declaring Him the source of all life, the "manna" (daily bread) of the world's wilderness, and the dead "rod" that put forth the "buds" of returning animation. But that which, before the death of Christ, was a Covenant of obedience, became, by His taking on Himself in death obli-
gations to us impossible, His final will and "Testament"—a hope assured—a parting promise to sinners of a final inheritance with Him in glory. This (we know) is of the essence of true religion; and it is evident that the only appropriate "temple" in which to deposit such an ark—Ark of the Testament—must be a Christian edifice; and hence it is certain that the Jewish nation are to be viewed at this epoch as having become Christian; and therefore (according to the promises of old) entitled to be re-established as Christ's especial sanctuary and place of habitation. In a word—the times of Gentile pre-eminence are closed.

The question—of all questions the most intensely interesting—here starts to view, whether we may at all believe the Lord Jesus, at this time, to have returned personally to His people. The two following points of agreement—the one as usual from Daniel, the other from John—are all we can adduce in its affirmation. In Daniel the Prophet is thus addressed (xii. 13), "But go thou thy way till the end be, for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot, in the end of the days." Some commentators have seen in this a promise, that Daniel shall be reinstated, at his resurrection, in the "lot" he vacated at death, as a high minister of government among his people; but, putting aside this part of the enquiry, we can scarcely err in saying, that the words speak not only of his rising, but of his remaining in visible evidence, from the grave. When the Lord Christ first opened the chambers of the tomb, "many saints arose, and appeared to many"; but as His own re-appearance was only for a short space, so also have they though risen become to us invisible. But if we are to believe of Daniel, from the words cited, that "in the end of the days" he will remain visible on earth, we would ask—Is not the circumstance a sure proof that Jesus, the first-born of the dead, will be visible among us likewise? It is only as an assessor with Him that Daniel can possibly, hereafter, sit visibly on the judgment-seat. Again, St. John is reported to say (xi. 17), "We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, and art to come." Now Griesbach places the last clause of this passage, "and art to come," among those which he "absolutely rejects as spurious." We
SEVENTH TRUMPET.

understand that Scholz does the same. We ask then—May not the omission of this important portion of a well-known formula be considered as in itself asserting, that Christ at the time referred to is come? These views offer corroboration of the idea—no new one, that with the re-establishment of Jacob's seed in Canaan, and of David's regal line in Christ, commences what is called the Millennium—more properly, perhaps, the judgment-day. Undoubtedly, if we could arrive at a stronger conviction on this point, the words we have examined of ver. 18—"the time of the dead that they should be judged"—would require to be viewed in a more literal sense. Ver. 19, as announcing the re-establishment of the House of Israel, must ever impregnably stand.

There is in Prophecy a plan of construction, the perception of which—if not too strongly insisted on, will often help our endeavours:—it is, that a programme is given of what is spread out subsequently in long detail. On a large scale this plan is exhibited in the strictures upon the "seven churches"; which, if they set forth in symbol (as generally supposed) the seven (i.e., full) ages of the Christian Church, must necessarily find their full development in the remainder of the Revelation. As a specimen of the rule on a small scale, we may mention the three first verses of chap. xiii., as the indubitable programme of the chapter. Now there is a programme given of the "seven trumpets";—we find it in chap. viii. ver. 2 to 5; and it reads as follows:

"(2) And I saw the seven angels which stood before God; and to them were given seven trumpets. (3) And another angel came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer: and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer it with the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne. (4) And the smoke of the incense, which came with the prayers of the saints, ascended up before God out of the angel's hand. (5) And the angel took the censer, and filled it with fire of the altar, and cast it into the earth: and there were voices, and thunderings, and lightnings, and an earthquake."

Now if this be, as we believe, a programme, it will happen that the best verification we can offer of the last verse of chap. xi.—as relating to the Jewish nation, and as being the great consummation of the "last trumpet," (and of its not belonging, by the bye, as suggested by Bishop Newton, to
the next chapter—on the ground that “it appears to be the beginning of a new subject”) is this preliminary notice, which must naturally coincide in its ultimate result with this verse, in asserting the pre-eminence and priesthood of the Jews to be that result. In this programme the seven angels “which stood before God”—i.e., priestly ministers (and priests alone could “blow with the trumpet”—Num. x. 8)—are to be regarded as Jewish watchmen, in a certain sense presiding over as many ages; of which ages however there is nothing spoken in detail. It is simply said that these trumpet-angels are there—in other words, that the ages they foreshow shall be. But of the great consummation to which these ages conduct—the restoration of priestly Israel, the description is particular and detailed. The “another angel” (ver. 3) is said by some expositors (Mr. Elliott and Mr. Williams, for instance) to be the Lord Jesus, for the reason that, standing at the altar, He must be a priest, and Christ is “the High Priest of our profession”; but whether so, or whether He be not (as might be rather imagined) the Jewish hierarchy in that glorious age to come when all kingdoms shall bring up their glory to Jerusalem—“another” like to the preceding (and we would ask, May not the Lord Jesus be discerned in His work—“the golden altar” of His merits—the precious and essential foundation on which our prayers, to be acceptable must be laid?), it is clear at least that He offers the united worship of many nations. “There was given to him (the angel) much incense, that he should offer it with (or “add it to”—margin) the prayers of all saints”; wherein the “incense” identifies the Jewish nation; the “prayers of all saints” the worship of united Christendom. We have here a remarkable instance of there being either an intended distinction, or unquestionably an unnecessary repetition; for “incense” and “prayer” we know are type and antitype, according to the words of the Psalmist, “Let my prayer be set forth in thy sight as the incense” :-—it is not to be supposed that the sign and the thing signified are displayed at the same time. Verse 4 declares how acceptable to God was this united worship. The holy “fire of the altar” with which the angel’s censer was filled (ver. 5) is “cast into the
earth”—no doubt in compliance with the prayers so accepted: and hence we may be assured that “fire” does not here mean (as some have imagined) “war, pestilence, and famine,” and other scourges; but that it is to be received in the sense of enlightening and purifying the nations, who are thus “baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire”—refined with the doctrines of God’s Word,—“Is not my word like as a fire?” (Jer. xxiii. 29.) This casting of the fire of the altar on the earth means, then, the universal promulgation of the Gospel; and responds to the passage in the last trumpet (xi. 15), “The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ”; and this happy consummation will be brought to pass by the united efforts of Jew and Gentile; when (to accommodate a well-known text) “the envy of Ephraim shall depart, and Judah (the sceptred Gentile Christian) shall not vex Ephraim.” The consequences are “voices, and thunderings, and lightnings, and earthquake,”—heaven calling to earth, and earth in her responses bursting with the delight of returning vitality, in like manner as at the end of the seventh trumpet; thus shewing identity between these points of time. This preliminary notice tells at once the purpose of the “seven trumpets” as expressed in their great result:—with this consequently corresponds, at the end of the last trumpet, the account of the great result when attained.

As circumstances have led in our investigations to a partial notice of the “seven seals” and the “seven trumpets,” we beg leave to say a few more words on these symbols. The “book sealed with seven seals”—τὸ βιβλίον containing many βιβλία—have endeavoured to shew is the book of all the prophecies, antecedent to the prophecy in hand—the “Revelation” of St. John. The act of foretelling—that is, on the part of Christ’s Holy Spirit, of appointing events to come, is the great proof that He “reigns in the kingdom of men,”—“the testimony of
Jesus is the spirit of prophecy"; and thus the seven-sealed book, declaring the decisions of the Father, becomes the foundation-stone of His kingdom. The great principle of His rule is to extract good out of evil. In the paradise of God were seen "two trees in the midst of the garden," emblematic of the relation between the Father and the Son, and of the office of each, the distinction of the latter being "the knowledge of good and evil." It is to the Son of God supremely that belongs this "knowledge"—i.e., this power of wielding the implements and of controlling the mixed issues of good and evil, and of making them co-operate with each other to the production of the most excellent ends. It is on this system of antagonistic co-operation, of attraction and antipathy combined, of error and compensation, that He has framed the world. The physical result of death which attends the fall of man, is accounted for on the ground, that in his disobedience he was introduced into a sphere of knowledge that was too high for him—the opposing and yet commingling principles involved wherein he was unable to adjust and regulate. He was commanded to feed on "all the other trees of the garden"—emblematic of the freely-bestowed graces of the Holy Spirit; yet, having been seduced within the forbidden circle of a higher knowledge, it concerned the honour of Him who ruled supremely in that department of knowledge, to find in its suggestions a means of escape for His deluded creature; and this He effected by making the greatest reach of evil, in a creature-body duly prepared for himself, the counterpoise of His creature's greater good.

By the help of these considerations we are enabled rightly to apprehend and appreciate the character of the four first seals:—they represent the Saviour with His well-disciplined army of worldly evils—the double-edged sword of His power—the sable retinue of His all-conquering Majesty. As the fierce hound, the fleet greyhound, and the mastiff attend in faithful obedience the steps of man, so war, pestilence, and famine are seen in the Saviour's train. To Him only it belongs, while commissioning, to restrain the angels of the winds, that they "hurt not the earth, neither the sea, nor the trees" (viii. 3), i.e., that they spare the several grades of
mankind and their institutions, until the counterpoise and antidote of their inroads be arranged, and the servants of God have received the seal of protection. It is needless, after the minute examination the four first seals have received from many writers, to shew, that war, famine, the noisome beast, and pestilence are really described in them;—they represent in their fourfold form the whole array of evils springing from the pangs of suffering nature. They are spoken of by Ezekiel (xiv. 21) as having been the instruments of Christ's rule in past ages; and the prophecy before us declares that they shall continue the staff of His sceptre in all times to come,—subserving, at the will of Him who possesses "the knowledge of good and evil," the ends of His spiritual discipline among men.

The three remaining seals are the natural issues of the four preceding—the four preceding declaring the agencies which pre-eminently affect the course of human history, the three standing to them in the relation of an effect to a cause,—of a body to the vital principle that animates it. This will seem, perhaps, a gratuitous conclusion; but let us consider that a cause is no cause at all until its effect makes it so; that a law is without being until it is brought into operation; that war, pestilence, and famine are mere names until they can number their victims. Inasmuch then as cause and effect are necessary to each other's existence, so it is necessary to look beyond the four first seals—the instruments of the Saviour's rule, to those grand results by which they may be recognised as being so,—which are indeed the material manifestation of the power previously described, the necessary receptacle and proof of its own vitality:—thus does the union of the three with the four seals constitute them, what otherwise they would not be, a complete system.

The first of the three seals (the fifth—vi. 9—11) celebrates the achievements of Faith during the Patriarchal and Mosaic ages of the world. The souls being seen "under the altar," the place of the blood of victims, shews that they had all been the subjects of sacrificial dispensations. It does not necessitate that they should all have lived before the day of
Christ—who is the true Altar of sacrifice; and a reason immediately appears for believing that there was an exception of this sort; for we read that the souls present were bid "rest yet for a little season," until their fellow servants also and their brethren, that should be killed as they were, should be fulfilled. The "little season" here spoken of is interpreted by some writers to signify the remaining ages of the world—a very improbable idea! The word "quickly" in chap. xi. 14, we found to signify a space of thirty years; and the "short space" of xvii. 10 to mean ten years:—analogy therefore requires that this "little season" should be something of a not immeasurable nature. What its true solution is will be best understood under the next seal. White robes are "given" to the souls under the altar—an intimation that only when brought into their present asylum were they made acquainted with the full nature of their salvation, as saved by the righteousness of the Most Holy One:—we may here call to mind that Christ had said of His "other sheep which were not of this fold," that "them also He must bring," and that "they should hear His voice" (John x. 16)—meaning that they were ignorant as yet of the source of their salvation.

The "sixth seal" presents an awful description of the great day of the wrath and judgment of Almighty God. Compare with it our Lord's language in Matt. xxiv. 29, &c., as well as that of the several ancient prophets referred to in the margin of that scripture, and we cannot but be convinced that they all refer to the day of His final coming. Indeed, these predictions of the Saviour are given in answer to the earnest inquiry of His disciples—"What shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?"—(ib. 3.) But also it has been very justly observed, that the "sixth seal" is contrived in natural response to the preceding one, as if the vengeance called for in it were granted. Now this brings back its primary application to a more immediate scene—that of the day of vengeance at the first "coming" (ib. 42) of our Lord in the destruction of Jerusalem: in agreement with His own declaration (ib. 34), "This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled"; also
with the awful words (Luke xi. 50), "That the blood of all the prophets which was shed from the foundation of the world may be required of this generation." And (still more to the point) with the words in Matthew (xxiii. 35, 36), "That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood (i. e., from the time of the blood) of righteous Abel," &c.,—even "upon this generation." The Mosaic dispensation having been a prefiguration throughout of the Christian, it was to be expected that the final dissolution of that Church would foreshadow, in its kind and history, the catastrophe to happen at the winding up of the later one; and hence it is, that in meeting with what professes to be a description of the later catastrophe, or anti-type (the words of our Lord avouching it), we are called upon (it would seem) to transfer it to the antecedent or typical fulfilment of the earlier age.

Now we are to remember that the Mosaic dispensation was never formally closed, but that its continuance was rendered simply impossible by the destruction of the Holy City, and this did not take place till some forty years after the Crucifixion. We conceive, then, that in this circumstance we find the explanation of the "little season" of the preceding seal. Of the many thousand Jews dispersed throughout the world who never heard of the fame of Christ, as well as of those who had obeyed the Gospel call and formed the first Christian Church—though still adhering to the Mosaic worship, many we know were eminent at once for piety, and for zeal in defence of their traditionary religion, and (it is said) "were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held." Is there not in this passage a notice of two distinct claims upon their fidelity—"the Word of God," and "the testimony which they held"? Of this illustrious class of Martyrs were James the elder, and James Bishop of Jerusalem. It seems to have been the object of the Prophetic Spirit to record in these two seals, first, the blessed results of the sacrificial system of worship, and secondly, the sad result it nevertheless led to, through transgression, in the overthrow of the seat of its power; previous to introducing His notice of the Christian Church, which—while still within the
precincts of the sixth seal—he does, in the glowing scene of the seventh chapter.

The seventh chapter, containing the wonderful scenes of the sealing and of the palm-bearing multitude, requires every help from analogy for its due elucidation. As in the fifth seal the notice of the souls redeemed to Christ in the early dispensations leads, in the next seal, to the overthrow of those systems in the fall of Jerusalem; so again, in the same sixth seal, the glorious notice of the great and wide salvation effected in Christ in the day of His power leads, in the seventh seal (which comprises all the remainder of the Revelation) to the overthrow in a distant chapter of all His remaining enemies. The rule of construction which places the glorious scene before us in the sixth seal we are unable confidently to explain. It is something to observe that this scene holds precisely the same constructive relation to the sixth seal—as being apparently beyond its natural limits, that the scene in chap. x. does to the sixth trumpet; and this we found to be, chiefly, as containing parenthetically something necessary to be known, for the due elucidation of the subsequent portion of that trumpet. Again, the sixth vial differs from the rest, in being almost entirely a vial of preparation; and so has this scene of the sixth seal an entirely preparatory character (vid. vii. 3). Under guidance of these considerations, and from the place it otherwise holds in the prophecy, it is the opinion of the writer that this scene of sealing the hundred and forty and four thousand, though given in terms derived from the ancient economy, has reference entirely to the Christian dispensation. To this effect “the angel ascending from the east” (vii. 2)—the Lord Jesus Christ, the rising Sun of righteousness, whose glory of old “came from the way of the east” (Ezek. xliii. 2), and who alone carries the “seal of the living God”—is here introduced upon the scene. He restrains the “four angels of the winds,” the full array of ministerial agencies who wait upon His bidding—(the same powers, we presume, as are described in the “four first seals”) until He should have constituted His spiritual body the Church, and celebrated in glorious and sure anticipation (the spirit of prophecy ever recognising the end from the
beginning) its victorious career and universal extension. This Church, by being described according to the nomenclature of the preceding typical dispensation, is to be understood as organized in like manner with it, and endowed with the like powers of administration. Her "foundation is in the holy mountains" (Ps. lxxxvii. 1)—i.e., of Israel. A patriarch in Israel gives his name to, and thus re-appears in, every Apostle; and the vast enlargement, and the inherent holiness of this new institution, is described, by the number "three" of holiness being multiplied into the "four" of universality—thus destined by its constitution to grow up into a tree that shall overshadow the whole earth. The ascending from the "East" further asserts the Gospel to have had its origin in the earliest hours of mundane history; and the use of the names of the sons of Jacob further asserts the unity of the Church ("we be all sons of one man") under every dispensation and administration. The circumstance that while Christian saints are said to "wash their robes and make them white in the blood of the Lamb" (ver. 14), while to their brethren of the "fifth seal" (vi. 11) "white robes were given," is a glorious testimony that the merits of the Saviour reach to those who have never heard of His name; and to whom His righteousness is "given" (ver. 11) provided they are true to the testimony which, whatever it be, they are privileged to "hold" (ver. 9).

But we ask, have we not here an instance of the tripartite method of exhibiting great truths, peculiar to the "Revelation"? The twelve sons of Israel—the name and earnest of the Church in all ages, is placed between the fifth and the seventh seals, resting on the awful throne of judgment in the sixth; and from that central spot she is seen to stretch out her arms on either side—to the day of the first, and that of the Second Adam, and to enfold in them the whole company of the children of God. They are but one company, divided in its midst, each branch equally illuminated by the central light. They remind us of the text (Is. xix. 24), "In that day shall Israel (the Elect Church) be the third with Egypt and Assyria, even a blessing in the midst of the land";—the third it is called, but in position it holds the central place; in
like manner as, geographically, the land of Israel is placed between the other two—being the source of light to all lands.

The "seventh seal," at which we now arrive, speaks by its number of the Day of the Lord—the Christian dispensation. When opened in chap. viii. 1, seven angels with trumpets present themselves, charged with summonses to the Gentile Church, whose failure is thus foreseen. Notice is first taken of the "Early Jewish Church in Jerusalem," in the words (presently to be explained), "there was silence in heaven about the space of half an hour" (ver. 1); then a short notice, of the Gentile Church, in the act of "giving" to the priestly angels, sons of Aaron, trumpets of war (ver. 2); then (looking rapidly forward to the end of the expanding horizon, as when one gains the summit of a hill) the grand consummation of the new Dispensation is described in the distance, in the restored pre-eminence of the children of Israel, and the united worship of Jew and Gentile (vers. 3 to 5). Such is the immediate sketch presented of the events and concluding results of the "seventh seal."*

Of this series of martial trumpets the sixth and seventh contain the "seven vials," or "last plagues,"—the seventh vial of unmitigated wrath, and the seventh trumpet of transcendant victory, appearing to have a marked collateral relation to each other, as occupying in great measure the same times. The trumpets of Jericho inform us what is the real meaning of this symbol in the "Revelation":—each blast of the trumpet is a summons of priestly Israel, or of God's elect church (they may be regarded on the occasion as one—being in the relation of type and anti-type) to the domineering "Beast" to surrender his position, and relinquish his maxims of violence and pride—the strong towers of his present apparently invincible strength. These, all, at the last trumpet-sound, fall. The hosts of Antichrist succumb: the saints

* It is in this sense that the "seven trumpets" really do spring out of the "seventh seal," i.e., are the same with it; but that the "seven vials" spring again out of the "seventh trumpet" is a mere case of fanciful analogy. The burden of the seals (i.e., of the "seventh seal") is all of the "Revelation" that follows its opening.
reign: "the meek inherit the earth." At this crisis of History terminate the "times of the Gentiles;" for with the notice of the "last trumpet" (but detached from it—not forming part of it—vide Rev. xi. 19) we find it historically mentioned, that the reinstatement of the Jewish polity will then be complete. To these trumpets, then, our attention is invited; and the reader is requested before proceeding to read chap. viii.

Before the trumpet angels begin to sound, we read (viii. 1) "there was silence in heaven about the space of half an hour." This delay obviously corresponds with the words (ver. 6) "the seven angels . . . prepared themselves to sound": a certain time was consumed in preparation and observation, and the question arises—how was it consumed?—Now if the views just propounded be correct, whereby the "seven trumpets" become the prospective records of the Gentile Church; there arises a very sufficient reason for this "silence in heaven about the space of half an hour": it denotes the time occupied by the Early Church of the circumcision in Jerusalem, which is said to have been about twelve years; * neither respecting whom—though occupying their place in the Christian dispensation, nor to whom—for they are not one of the "seven churches," does the book of "Revelation" speak. This in the present case is very sure; for the "seven angels" of the trumpets were Sons of Aaron (Num. x. 7)—i.e., Jews: they were called to sound against their supplacers—the Gentiles; and had no

* "That the Apostles continued at Jerusalem for many years after the ascension of our Saviour is manifest; . . . nor can it be doubted that their stay there was in consequence of the Divine command. The reasons on which this Divine mandate was founded are, I think, readily to be perceived." . . . "Clement in the second, and Eusebius in the fourth century, have recorded a prevailing tradition that the Apostles had been directed by our Lord not to leave Jerusalem for twelve years; from which it is plain that the Church in general saw nothing either injurious to the Gentiles or inconsistent with Christ's commission, in this marked priority given to Jerusalem and the Jews. To the Gentile world it proved a source of blessing, &c." (Cartwright's Hebrew Church, p. 30.) Gibbon says somewhere that this Christian Church continued the Mosaic rites at Pella for nearly a hundred years.
message of vengeance against their brethren. These "first fruits" of the Gospel—the early Jewish Church, at the time of John's receiving the "Revelation" in Patmos, had literally retired into the regions of "silence":—it was extinct. It came to an end—certainly not through the operation of the Divine displeasure, as that displeasure was expressed afterwards to the "Seven Churches"; and at the destruction of their national State and polity, there is the appearance of their having been preserved mysteriously, and reserved—like Elijah, in heaven, to re-appear (Rev. xi. 19) at the end of many days,—again to claim precedence of the recreant Church of the Gentiles; when "Michael the great prince" shall stand up in their behalf.* This delay, while "preparing" to sound hostily, is further consentient with the "little season" of the fifth seal; if indeed it may not be that "season" in its full amount.

At length the trumpets sound. The first trumpet (ver. 7)—the first summons of the elect church, addresses itself to the first obstruction in the way of the Gospel—the ascendency of Judaism. "Hail and fire mingled with blood" describes the violence and suffering its supporters every where underwent, particularly in the fall of Jerusalem. The "earth" of this trumpet, as contrasted with the "sea" of the next, must mean the chosen land, as distinguished from the lands of the Gentiles. The "third part" of "trees" (the full-grown institutions of the country) were destroyed, and "all green grass" (the existing generation of men) were (as it were) extirpated. The "third part," in these trumpets, we consider to mean the chief and most eminent portion of the things mentioned, in the locality alluded to,—that locality being Judea (the "earth") in the

* It is perhaps on this idea is founded the remarkable figure of speech (Rev. xxi.) of "New Jerusalem coming down from heaven." If the early Jewish Church be hidden in heaven (and such would be an appropriate figurative account of their withdrawal to make way for "the Gentiles") it is from heaven they must return, if they are to be reinstated in their ministrations. And thus "New Jerusalem coming down from heaven" would signify a New Dispensation of the seed of Israel kept in reserve:—a figure of speech not so startling.
first trumpet; but generally the wide extent of the Roman empire. The expression—if any stress is to be laid upon its quantity—may also denote the predominance of mercy, in the midst of the heaviest tribulations.*

The second trumpet is a summons to the lofty "mountain" of Heathenism, "burning" with cruel and persecuting rites:—it fell into the agitated "sea" of the ignorant but now roused populations, and was extinguished,—its spiritual vitality failing when it was fairly exposed to the kindling beams of the Gospel. Ruin fell upon the "third part" of their ships—i.e., of their gorgeous temples and places of worship ("navium")—for the original heathen temple was constructed—particularly the holy cell—in imitation of the Ark of Noah (vide Faber on the Cabiri).

At the sound of the "third trumpet," Ariel—the flaming star of error, fell from the "heaven" of Christian truth, to the religion which springs from the "earth"—i.e., which sees no need of a Mediatorial sacrifice—no need of the "new and living Way" to the throne of grace. Mr. Williams has the following excellent observation (p. 147):—"Falling from the sky like a burning lamp is descriptive of a meteor, which falls as it shines, and only shines in falling. What seemed of heaven is found to be of earth." In the same ages arose the divers forms of heresy whereby, more than in any subsequent age, the Church was disfigured: the constituted "fountains" of truth—the priestly orders, gave forth waters impure and insalubrious.

The fourth angel (ver. 12) announces destruction to the Imperial rule of Rome. The "Sun," the seat and source of the empire—then in the East—is smitten from its orbit:

* We have much doubt whether this term has ever any relation to quantity, but only to quality. "Three" and "the third" (says Mr. Hartwell Horne (iv. 545) signify "greatness, excellence, and perfection:—thus (Isa. xix. 24) 'in that day shall Israel be the third with Egypt and Assyria'; that is, as the prophet immediately explains, great, admired, beloved, and blessed." Thus in the above sentences we should understand the sense to be—the most valuable "part of trees," the most noble portion of "the creatures which were in the sea"—i.e., among the nations, the higher grades of "the fountains of waters"—i.e., of the established ministry.
the diadem is tarnished: the light of law and order universally fails. But not only does this happen to the Eastern "Sun"; but moreover, the Western "Moon" shines no longer with her borrowed light: and the Stars (satraps) of the provinces, are universally engulfed in "darkness." The "day," and the "night likewise"—the Eastern and Western worlds—are thrown into an universal anarchy. These four "trumpets" then set forth in broad historical relief about the six first centuries of the faith; and for their illustration are chosen the four events—the fall of Judaism, and of Heathenism, the prevalence of Heresy, and of Anarchy resulting from the downfall of the empire—which more than any other had an influence in impeding the progress of Christian truth. After these come (ver. 13) the trumpets of the three long-enduring "woes," which reach forward in time even to the "crack of doom."

These "woes" are announced (ver. 13) as especially affecting the "inhabitants of the earth." In the first trumpet the "earth" has been found satisfactorily to signify the land of Palestine; and we can discern no reason for supposing a change of signification in the woe trumpets:—but it is as the Seat of the Eastern Church,—"the pleasant land" of Daniel—overwhelmed, as that prophet informs us, "because of transgression." And as this sense of the "earth" has been justified by the instances of the first two (or Mahometan) "woes," we the more readily entertain a like expectation, in consonance with other prophesies already considered, regarding the third woe to come. The sixth trumpet, as an Eastern woe, we found to cease in A.D. 1774–5; but its times underwent a prolongation even to A.D. 1848. This device was adopted (as we interpreted) in order to bring the times of Mahometanism and the Papacy simultaneously to an end. The interval was occupied exclusively by the vials in the Western empire. And we might have added another commanding prophetic reason for the "postponement," viz., that as the six first trumpets address themselves chiefly and primarily to the Eastern empire, it was necessary somewhere in the course of the "sixth trumpet," in due respect to the arrangements of Daniel, to bring pro-
minently into view the migration to the westward, which in the course of it had taken place, of the "Beast with seven heads and ten horns."

Of the "seventh trumpet" (xi. 15) it is needless further to speak. In its "times" we stand: its "woe" is "quickly" nigh. Its description in chap. xi. makes it terminate in the restoration of Israel (ver. 19)—the "Ultima Thule" of all these prophecies,—in that glorious age when Jerusalem shall be the sanctuary of all nations;—when "ten men shall take hold out of all languages of the nations...... of the skirts of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go up with you: for we have heard that God is with you" (Zech. viii. 23);—when "many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob." (Isa. ii. 3.) In further support of this belief, and with reference to the text Rev. xi. 19, there is an observation of Dr. Wordsworth's (p. 252) which, as it is of no value to him in his manner of interpretation, and of great value here, we may as well appropriate:—he points out that in the preparations for the fall of Jericho, it was arranged that the ark should follow immediately after the trumpets. (Vide Jos. vi. 8.) Parallel with this in the Apocalypse, is the circumstance of the "Ark of the Testament" coming into view, when the last trumpet is dwelling upon its sound. And as on the first occasion the Ark of the Covenant, so on the second that of "God's Testament," in custody of the same hands, will lead the true Church into the land of rest. At its approach, the Jordan of Divine graces—the baptism of repentance for the house of David, the spirit of grace and of supplications, the mourning and the bitterness as for his firstborn (Zech. xii. 10)—must open for its reception; when, in due course of necessity, the walls and defences of all existing systems will fall. As erst with physical strength guaranteed by heaven, so again with the invincible arms of the Spirit, will the sons of Israel invade the idolatrous Canaan—the Christian "kingdom of the beast"; the strongholds of which (to speak in the language of the book of Joshua: chaps. xvii. and xxii.) shall fall before them,—false doctrine "and her towns" (Rev. xii. 4)—persecution "and her
towns” (ib. 13)—worldly state, and spiritual ambition, “and their towns” (Rev. xiii. 4): and after these—universal rule, infallibility, clerical celibacy, plenary indulgence, holy office, priestly absolution, immaculate conception,—“seven cities and their suburbs.” (Ib. 5, 6.) At length the gorgeous Babylon, the metropolis, will succumb; and the “holy apostles and prophets will rejoice over her” (Rev. xviii. 20); and “the four and twenty elders, and the four beasts will join in the great alleluia” (xix. 4); and the “marriage of the Lamb” with his bride arrayed in righteousness will then come. (Ib. 7, 8.) Thus Israel recalled becomes again the fountain of religion, and the pure streams of Truth go forth as heretofore from Jerusalem. The utmost tribes of men are brought to Christ, and the wide earth becomes a Holy Land. It is generally considered that the children of Israel did not fully complete their settlement in the land of Canaan until the time of David: and thus in their spiritual settlement in the “kingdom of the beast,” it is to be expected that, not until David’s Lord shall personally return to his own—He who shall have already destroyed the wicked one with the mere antecedent “brightness” of His coming (2 Thess. ii. 8)—will their predestined work of occupation be perfected.

NUMBERS—REV. XII. 6, 14.

In obedience to the injunction in the last verse of chap. x., “to prophesy again (i.e., to commence anew) before many people, and nations, and tongues”—undoubtedly in consequence of the special aid to be derived from the “little book open” of Daniel, St. John in his twelfth chapter commences a fresh history of the Christian dispensation:—the injunction may legitimately be further interpreted to signify, before other people, and nations.* We have to investigate in this

* We made a mistake at p. 380, in saying that the 1260-year periods of each prophet (Daniel and John), taken separately, terminate in the order in which the events they forehew occur; not calling to mind the circumstance of the command to “prophesy again.”
chapter, on the present occasion, its measure of 1,260 years; and perhaps it will by this time be apparent to the reader, that without the hints supplied by the book of Daniel, neither this number, nor the symbol of a “beast with seven heads and ten horns,” could by possibility be accessible to our investigation:—hence the futility of writing treatises on the book singly of the Revelation.

It is the peculiar feature of the vision here set before us, that it is given in two collateral scenes during a large part of it—viz., from ver 1 to 6, and from 7 to 14; and we are to observe, that in each portion the number appears—in each unquestionably the same, differing only in its expression. But if the number is the same on both occasions, with only an external variation, it is presumable that the same relation, approaching identity, will be maintained throughout the two entire portions of the piece; and that the two portions will no further differ from each other, than as being separate treatises on the same subject. In a certain church in Rome may be seen two competitive master-pieces of the pictorial art, drawn in fresco on the opposite walls, the subject the same—the martyrdom of St. Andrew, the one by Guido, the other by Domenichino; wherein the incidents chosen by each master are totally different, though the historical event is one. Just so it is in the present instance,—the thing represented is one, though given in two scenes. Hence, in order rightly to understand the vision, it becomes necessary to take an united view of its two collateral portions. The reason of this form of prophecy we concluded to be (see p. 153-5), that the vision might harmonize with the form of the Roman empire—the platform of its action, consisting of the Greek and Latin sections of mankind—the “legs” of the great Image, and giving birth to the distinction of the Greek and Latin churches. The chief incident of the vision is the flight of the woman; and as this, as well as the number, is referred to in both portions of the prophecy, we hence infer that it took place, equally and simultaneously, in both divisions of the empire. But now, as to the date of this flight?

If we should submit to be guided in this important ques-
tion by the expressions found in the first scene only of the prophecy, it does not seem possible to avoid the conclusion, that the woman fled into the "wilderness" immediately on the ascension of our Saviour. The "dragon"—the spirit of Heathenism embodied in the Roman empire, is represented as awaiting a particular event—the birth of Christianity; and on his endeavour to crush the Truth so soon as born, it was miraculously saved by the resurrection and ascension of Christ. Then did the "woman"—the true Church of all ages, who had been privileged to impart to Christ His human nature, seek refuge in the "wilderness"—whatever that wilderness may import. This is near about the view taken by some writers (see especially Auberlen), and it is the natural explanation of the first scene regarded by itself. But as we have no right whatever to deem of the flight of the woman mentioned in the second scene (ver. 14) as being distinct from the one mentioned in the first scene (ver. 6), it follows that the whole matter of the second scene must be taken into account,—that the two scenes must occupy together the field of vision, if we would arrive at a clear deduction regarding the time of the flight. What then does the second scene declare?

We learn from ver. 7, that there was a fight between "Michael and his angels" and the "Dragon and his angels." We cannot imagine of this figure but that it refers to the bitter contentions between the Christian and Heathen priesthoods, which signalized the first ages of the new Religion, in support and in deprecation of its claims. Indeed we are told (ver. 11) that "they (Michael's angels) overcame the dragon by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony," and that they lost their lives in the hour of their victory,—a plain intimation that this was an intellectual contest:—and which again leads further to the inference, that this "war" had a continuance of many generations. But we learn from ver. 8, that not only did the Dragon's angels "prevail not," but that "their place was no longer found in heaven"—the heaven (that is to say) of high rule and authority. Now we know of a certainty that the Heathen priesthood maintained their irresistible power until the days of
Constantine; and that to the last day of Diocletian his predecessor, in the beginning of the fourth century (even almost more than at any former period) they verified the character of persecution ascribed to them in the eleventh verse:—hence it follows that the palm of victory is not awarded in the prophecy to Michael's angels, until the days of Constantine. But ver. 13 informs us, that "when the dragon was cast unto the earth"—that is, was doomed to tarry among the ignorant lower classes, he commenced a persecution of the "woman" (the "war" had been between him and the "man-child")—who thereupon, and not before (ver. 14), fled into the wilderness. The nature of this persecution we shall learn presently from the history of the times; but we are told in ver. 15 that, on the woman commencing her flight, the serpent endeavoured to overwhelm her with "water cast as a flood out of his mouth." There are two views taken of this figure; it may allude to the Arian heresy, or to the inundations of the northern nations; or it may cast a glance—at once spiritual and material—at both of these; but the important thing for us to observe is this—that neither of these evils is to be recognized to any extent in history, before the days of Constantine. Again, we should not fail to discriminate between the dragon's proceedings, as they are described severally in the two scenes (vers. 4 and 13)—viz., that in the first scene he "stood before the woman which was ready to be delivered;" but in the second, that "when he was cast into the earth, he persecuted the woman which brought forth (i.e., had brought forth) the man-child." The distinction here is obvious; it is between the periods before, and after, the fall of Heathenism from power, i.e., before and after the imperial adoption of the Christian faith. We arrive then fearlessly at the conclusion, that, not until Christianity was lifted into the imperial throne in the person of Constantine, did the holy woman flee to the wilderness. As clothed with the sun she is seen first, indubitably, in the days of our Lord's ministry; and from that time to the days of Constantine, her children—"male" in power of mind and resolution, were continually subjected to
the more than ordinary violence of the vigilant adversary; but she herself ever remained in the scene.

Let us at this place call to mind that the command to "prophesy again" was preceded by "a loud cry as when a lion roareth," on the part of the mighty King of Israel: which we have interpreted with much confidence to be an announcement of the "seven vials of wrath," to be poured out—after the lapse of many centuries, in the West. It was natural then, in commencing to prophesy again from the beginning of the Dispensation, and before many (i.e., other) people—the Western nations, that the prophet should wish to lead attention at once, notwithstanding the distance of the prospect, towards the West;—hence a good reason arises for the duplex configuration we have adverted to of this prophecy—a picture in itself of the actual scene of action, in the "kingdom of the thighs." The duplex scene occupies the ground of time for 800 years; but in the next chapter, containing the vision of the "beast from the sea"—five centuries after Constantine, the scene is single, being laid wholly in the West; and this for the reason that imperial ascendancy had by that time migrated westward, and a new Head of empire was to be manifested in Charlemagne. These two scenes—emanating (as it were) from the "little book open," lead up to, and include—as respects the measurements of time, the results of the "loud cry." And if the "seven vials" (these results) issue from the command to prophesy again—a command given after six out of the seven trumpets had sounded in the East, does not an explanation hence arise of the remarkable resemblance noticed by commentators, between the moulding of the "seven vials"—viewed as a dispensation, and that of the "seven trumpets;"—for instance, in the circumstance that, in each series alike, the first four are directed against the earth, the sea, the rivers and fountains, and the sun? Is it not that the command to "prophesy again" was received as an intimation, that the inflections already undergone in the East were—in their kind, still more in respect of the particular estates of men on whom it was destined they should fall—to be viewed
as an image and exemplar of what should take place in the West?

Below the frame-work (as it were) of the two collateral scenes in this picture, are appended three additional verses, as if written at the foot, or on the margin of its surface; in accordance with an ancient custom some time since adverted to, as exemplified on the rocks in many places of the East. These afford a general sketch of the fortunes of the external church, during the "woman's" seclusion;—the two first describe the influx of the northern nations, and especially the strategic purpose of the "dragon" in these terrific enterprises; the last leads the eye onward to the great Reformation—to take place when the time for the woman's liberation should draw nigh.

It will now be our endeavour to shew the occurrence which gives its date to the prophecy, and the exact point of time when the woman is said to take her flight, placing herself for this purpose on the imperial eagle's wings. It may be premised, that though the figures of Scripture manifestly extend in their references, in all instances, over large spaces of time; we are not to suppose that a less precision of application is on that account admissible, when they are declared to hold connexion with number. There will ever be definite events appointed, to mark the ingress and egress of a definite space of time. We have announced in a previous page that the egress, in the present instance, will be found in A.D. 1535:—let us proceed to examine the initiatory mark of the period.

It was in the year 311 that Constantine, who had not yet embraced the Christian faith, informed of the levies and preparations of the tyrant Maxentius at Rome, and of their being intended against himself, determined to anticipate his designs by the immediate march of his army from Gaul—the seat of his government, into Italy. Revolving in his mind to which of the gods he should commit his cause, it is said he saw at midday the apparition of a cross in the sky; and that in a dream the night following, he was admonished to inscribe the shields of his soldiers with the celestial sign he had seen, whereby he should secure to himself success in the
impending struggle. He crossed the Alps in the spring following; and after a march signalized by many victories, he arrived before the capital in October. On the 29th of October the battle of the Milvian bridge was fought; the troops of Maxentius were completely routed, and himself drowned in the Tiber; and the supreme power of the Western empire passed into the hands of Constantine and his colleague Licinius. Whether Constantine saw the cross in the heavens, or it was a delusion; and whether he was a sincere proselyte to the new Faith he forthwith professed, or clung likewise for some years (as has been thought) to the old religion of the empire, admiring rather than heartily accepting the Christian confession, it does not much concern us at present to know:—our inquiry is into the consequences to the Christian Church of the famous victory he had won, and from his ascribing it, as he certainly did, not to his own conduct or strength, but to the aid of that God who had communicated with him: in evidence whereof he caused a statue to be erected to himself, holding a cross in the right hand, in the heathen city to which he had brought deliverance. Great was the joy of the persecuted Christians at this noble accession to their body. It was the ninth year of the great Diocletian persecution, which had been raging all that time in the provinces of the empire with increasing fury (Univ. Hist. xv. 563): and among the first benefits conferred on the Church by Constantine, was an edict in the joint names of himself and Licinius putting a stop to the violence of the heathen governors, and directed to Maximin then sole ruler of the East—"the most implacable enemy the Christians ever had" (ib.). Constantine did not remain in Rome beyond three or four months; but this brings us into the year 313, the famous year which gives its date to the prophecy.

During the short period of his stay the emperor conferred great privileges upon the clergy of Rome, to the extent (some writers say) of exempting them entirely from the payment of taxes (ib.). He built several churches, supplying them with vast riches, and adorning the altars with magnificent offerings. (ib.) In this year also he granted great privileges to the churches in Africa, which had suffered under the tyranny
of Maxentius. In a rescript addressed to the proconsul, he commands him to exempt the clergy belonging to the Catholic Church from all civil employments, as "nothing (said he) will more contribute to the welfare of the State, than their applying themselves wholly to the worship of God" (ib. 569)—a good hint for our spiritual lords of Parliament! It may be mentioned, that in subsequent years, in proportion as Constantine visited the provinces of the empire, the same reverence for the religion he had embraced prevailed with him to repair and rebuild at his own cost the numerous churches that had been pulled down in the late persecution; to reinstate in their former condition all who on account of their religion had been condemned to exile, or the mines; to forbid the consecration of any new idol; and to command the restitution of all places where holy martyrs had been interred. Great was the prosperity of the Church, and great the external peace of her children.

But the prophecy we are concerned with requires a specific date,—some significant transaction which shall embody in itself all this generosity of the imperial convert, and wherein may be indubitably recognised the rising on the Church of the sun of worldly prosperity:—this is to be found in the famous Milan decree, issued by the joint emperors, in the month of March A.D. 313. As an historical event, there does not usually occur in the course of centuries one, on which so much of the well-being of mankind, both spiritual and temporal, depends. The object of this imperial edict was to pronounce, throughout the wide empire of Rome, an universal toleration in matters of religion. In that age the spirit of such a decree was altogether in favour of the Christians, and in reversal of all the persecuting edicts that through many generations had accumulated against them.

This important edict, the great charter of religious liberty, merits that we transcribe from Gibbon the account he gives of it. He says (chap. xx.):—

"About five months after the conquest of Italy, the Emperor made a solemn and authentic declaration of his sentiments, by the celebrated edict of Milan, which restored peace to the Catholic Church. Constantine by
the ascendancy of genius and power obtained the ready concurrence of his
colleague Licinius; the union of their names and authority disarmed the
fury of Maximin; and after the death of the tyrant of the East’ (which
happened this same year—313; as likewise—remarkable to say—did that of
Diocletian) ‘the edict of Milan was received as a general and funda-
mental law of the Roman world. The wisdom of the emperors provided
for the restitution of all the civil and religious rights of which the
Christians had been so unjustly deprived. It was enacted that the places
of worship, and public lands, which had been confiscated, should be
restored to the Church, without dispute, without delay, and without
expense: and this severe injunction was accompanied with a gracious
promise, that if any of the purchasers had paid a fair and adequate price
they should be indemnified from the imperial treasury.’

Gibbon continues—

‘The salutary regulations which guard the future tranquillity of the
faithful, are framed on the principles of enlarged and equal toleration;
and such an equality must have been interpreted by a recent sect as an
advantageous and honourable distinction. The two emperors proclaim
to the world, that they have granted a free and absolute power to the
Christians, and to all others, of following the religion which each
individual thinks proper to prefer, to which he has addicted his mind, and
which he may deem the best adapted to his own use. They exact from
the governors of the provinces a strict obedience to the true and simple
meaning of an edict, which was designed to establish and secure, without
any limitation, the claims of religious liberty.’

By this edict of toleration

‘were removed the temporal disadvantages which had hitherto retarded
the progress of Christianity; and its active and numerous ministers
received a free permission and liberal encouragement to recommend the
salutary truths of Revelation by every argument which could affect the
reason or piety of mankind.’ (Ib.)

Who shall say that we are not, even in this distant age, however indirectly, participating in the benefit of this
great decree? And what Christian of that age would not, and what Christian of the present age will not, join in the
exultation of the heavenly voice (ver. 10) ‘Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and
the power of His Christ; for the accuser of our brethren is cast down’? Unquestionably, by the force of this decree,
the imperial seat of Satan was overthrown.

Now, seeing that such was in this age the triumph of the
Church; that gladness was within her walls and prosperity
within her palaces; how came it to pass that the "woman"—the Lord's wife—the hidden Church, could not join in the exultation of her brethren?—could not abide to be with them, but was compelled to make her way to the "wilderness"?—Here we are invited by the prophecy to look at the reverse of the picture. It is the sad and irrefragable testimony of History that external prosperity was quickly productive within the Church of internal discord and contention; and that these were the days peculiarly, if of triumph, so also of envy, hatred, and schism. It was the especial feature of the times that "envy and strife" begat "confusion and every evil work." Nothing could be more opposite to the idea of a "city that is at unity in itself," than the Church in these her halcyon days; nothing less illustrative of St. Paul's statement, that "God is not the author of confusion (tumult), but of peace, as in all churches of the saints."

We cannot do better than confine our contemplations on this part of the subject to the character of Constantine himself, in order to obtain a just view of that of his age. If the emperor was tolerant in his views and righteous in his dealings towards his heathen subjects, wisely assigning as the principle of his moderation towards those "who still refused to open their eyes to the celestial light," the invincible force of habit, of prejudice, and of superstition (Gibbon xxii.)—he was far otherwise towards those who, within the pale of the Christian profession, dissented from the Church's standard of Catholic truth.

"The edict of Milan (says the historian)—the great charter of toleration, had confirmed to each individual of the Roman world the privilege of choosing and professing his own religion. But this inestimable privilege was soon violated:—with the knowledge of truth the emperor imbibed the maxims of persecution; and the sects which dissented from the Catholic church were afflicted and oppressed by the triumph of Christianity. Constantine easily believed that the heretics who presumed to dispute his opinions, or to oppose his commands, were guilty of the most absurd and criminal obstinacy; and that a seasonable application of moderate severities might save those unhappy men from the danger of an everlasting condemnation. Not a moment was lost in excluding the ministers and teachers of the separated congregations from any share of the rewards and immunities which the emperor had so liberally bestowed on the Catholic clergy. But as the sectaries might still exist under the
cloud of royal disgrace, the conquest of the East was immediately followed
by an edict which announced their total destruction. After a preamble
filled with passion and reproach, Constantine absolutely prohibits the
assembling of the heretics, and confiscates their public property to the
use either of the revenue or of the Catholic church."

The sects against which this severity was directed were
certainly those, to which history but little invites our
sympathy; they were the Montanists, the Novatians, the
Marianites and Valentinians, the various sorts of Gnostics,
the Manicheans—daring speculators all of them, more or
less, in holy things. "Some of the penal regulations insti-
tuted against these heretics were copied from the edicts of
Diocletian; and this method of conversion was applauded
by the same bishops who had felt the hand of oppression, and
had pleaded for the rights of humanity." (Ibid.)

But other sects and schisms there were, of wider spread
and more specious doctrines, in the age we are considering.
The Donatists of Africa "afflicted that province above three
hundred years, and were extinguished only with Christianity
itself." (Ibid.) By the theological disputes of Arianism
the whole Roman world was rent into factions. The ani-
mosities and resentments to which they gave rise embittered
the lives and destroyed the peace of Christian families, during
this and several succeeding reigns. The zeal of parties
became vindictive in its objects; and what the historian says
of the secular head of the church will apply to its body in
its utmost extent—"The sublime theory of the Gospel had
made a much fainter impression on the heart than on the
understanding of Constantine: as he gradually advanced in
the knowledge of the truth, he proportionably declined in
the practice of virtue." (Ibid.) The general character of
these Christian sects, and their conduct towards each other,
does in fact furnish the general character of the age; and
these consequently we may presume to have been in the eye
of the prophet, in respect of the influence they would have
upon the conduct of the holy "woman." The historian
thus sums up his comments, directing attention specifically
to the epoch commencing with the year 312.

"The simple narrative of the intestine divisions which distracted the
peace, and dishonoured the triumph of the church, will confirm the remark of a pagan historian, that the enmity of the Christians towards each other surpassed the fury of savage beasts against man;—as likewise the lament of Gregory Nazianzen, that the kingdom of heaven was converted by discord into the image of chaos, of a nocturnal tempest, and of hell itself."

The hostile sectaries assumed and bestowed at will the appellation of orthodox and heretic: but whether Arians or Athanasians, they were all alike (says the historian) "actuated by the intolerant spirit, which has been extracted from the pure and simple maxims of the Gospel." What a picture of triumphant Christianity! How is it possible the "woman"—the meek spouse of Christ, should live contentedly and usefully in so miserable a fog of dispute and uncharitableness as is here described! The Gospel is lifted up as a light to the heathen; but unhappily on the light tower of a worldly priesthood, and in a day of universal hate and obloquy; and they who alone know how to reflect its living rays beneficially on the consciences of men are driven away to the friendly but unproductive wilderness of seclusion, and poverty; there to tend the lamp of its wisdom, until a long distant and more promising day shall invite them to more happy exertions. * We contend then that, in A.D. 313 the "woman" took her flight.

Now, by the declaration that the "woman" shall be fed in the wilderness for 1260 prophetic years, it is intended to say that, at the end of that period, she shall come forth from her retirement: for there are ever in these numbers both mark and countermark,—an equal regard to the initiation and the outgoing of the times. But what is meant by the idea we have expressed as "coming forth"? What else, than that she shall manifest her hidden life to the world?—

* It would be an error to suppose that a disputatious spirit among the Hierarchy was all that, in that early age, was capable of disgusting the holy "woman." Christian morality sometimes exceeded the bounds of propriety as much as Christian temper. In proof of this, it may suffice here to adduce the story of Paul of Samasata—the profligate metropolitan bishop of Antioch, who in A.D. 270 was degraded from his episcopal character. (See "Gibbon," ch. xvi.)
that she shall no longer continue the proscribed of a fierce
domination, but (to speak familiarly) shall show front?—
shall live (as was said of Ishmael) "in the presence of all her
brethren":—in a word, shall demand a recognized status in
the family of God?—Like John the Baptist she shall at last
"wax strong in spirit," remaining in the deserts no longer
than "till the day of her showing unto Israel." Twelve
hundred and forty-two years—(1260 reduced to the pro-
phetical standard) added to three hundred and thirteen, gives
the year 1555—that great and memorable year when the
Protestant religion was legally established in Germany—the
immediate seat of the imperial "beast." We feel no scruple
in offering this event as the true solution of this mystery;
and as it is an event of foremost importance in the illustrious
age to which it belongs, and (we may add) in the annals of
the Christian faith, it will be desirable to give a short sketch
of the circumstances out of which it sprung.

But a previous inquiry must first be satisfied,—Is there
any antecedent reason growing out of the prophecy (looking
away for the moment from the bright star of the Reforma-
tion which in the age we have named was rising to the zenith,
and to which we naturally look to affirm our speculation) for
thinking, that Germany was the most probable "place
prepared of God" (v. 6) of the woman's original retreat, and
in which region we should consequently expect her to
reappear? The woman was borne into the wilderness on the
"two wings of a great eagle." On the ground of this
particularity we have conjectured in a previous page, that
not only does the "wilderness" point to the moral and social
condition of humble poverty, but denotes likewise locality.
Now the "wilderness," like all other apocalyptic terms, is a
term of comparison or contrast. The residence of the true
church, ever since the commencement of the "times of the
Gentiles" in Nebuchadnezzar, has in all ages been within
the dominions of the most civilized and ascendant nation,—
herself at once the pupil and the tutor of that civilization.
For three hundred years we have seen her domiciled within
the empire of Rome—the mistress of the world, among her
highly polished, luxurious, and cultivated people; and she
now flees to the "wilderness";—what else can the wilderness be, but the barbarous regions beyond her boundaries? Now the boundaries of the Roman empire towards the North in the Augustan age, as likewise in that of Constantine, were the courses of the Rhine and the Danube, with the imaginary line that joins the sources of these rivers; and which last the emperor Probus, in the year 277 (we beg attention to the epoch) united with a wall of nearly 200 miles in length. It appears then that the localities wherein in after times arose the towns of Spires, Worms, Augsburg, Ratisbon, and all the other places most famous in Lutheran history, were in the borders of this "wilderness"; and as it was in them especially (as we hope to show) the holy "woman" in the predicted era came forth to view, so is it a fair speculation that thither she may have at the first retired.

But can we recognise in History the prophetic fact, that in that very region, in the age of Constantine, God had "prepared a place" for her reception and sustenance? This "place" (call it first—condition of circumstances) is found in the remarkable avidity with which the Gothic nations, all issuing from Germany, appropriated to themselves the customs, the literature, and the general civilization of Rome, from the moment of putting foot within her borders; evincing that it became an habitual point of their ambition to be accounted, themselves, a "portion of the Roman empire" (Tregelles, ut supra); but still more in the wonderful aptitude with which they embraced every where the Christian faith. How different is this latter circumstance from the unyielding repugnance which Heathen nations have everywhere evinced, during the last thousand years, to the reception of the Truth! Even in the midst of the fiercest exultations of conquest, an admiration of Rome guided the counsels of the victors, leading them to consider as the best spoils of war the gains they derived from her intellectual and spiritual superiority.

Now to prepare a place of refuge of which advantage was to be taken in the beginning of the fourth century, pre-supposes that, during the course of the preceding century, it was under a process of preparation:—let us see how far History
sanctions this idea, looking at the annals of that age in their relation to the states both of peace and of war. First then, it is in this century we for the first time hear of the Runic characters of the ancient Germans—those first efforts to escape from the perpetual darkness of barbarism. "These characters have been thought (says Gibbon, chap. ix.) to be nothing more than the Roman letters, with the curves changed into straight lines for the sake of engraving;" and "the oldest of them are supposed to be of the third century." "The use of letters (Gibbon justly observes) is the principal circumstance that distinguishes a civilized people from a herd of savages, incapable of knowledge and reflection." And as we consider this to be the first manifestation of a desire, on the part of the barbarians from whom eventually have descended the most cultivated nations of Europe, to profit by the arts of the neighbouring civilization; so perhaps may this desire be accounted the first act of the all-directing Mind, in preparing the "place" we are seeking for.

We must take heed not to be led away by the very gratuitous hypothesis of some writers, that before the age we have designated the religion of the Gospel had been introduced, to any appreciable extent, among the tribes of the "w wilderness." It cannot be disputed but that "the conquests of Rome prepared and facilitated those of Christianity" to the extent even that "before the reigns of Diocletian and Constantine the faith of Christ had been preached in every province, and in all the great cities of the empire" (ib. chap. xv.)—the empire, truly! But as regards the idea of its further extension, Gibbon treats it as follows:—

"According to the primitive Fathers, who interpret facts by prophecy, the new religion, within a century after the death of its Divine Author, had already visited every part of the globe. 'There exists not,' says Justin Martyr, 'a people whether Greek or Barbarian, or any other race of men by whatsoever appellation or manners they may be distinguished, however ignorant of arts or agriculture, whether they dwell under tents, or wander about in covered waggons, among whom prayers are not offered up in the name of a crucified Jesus to the Father and Creator of all things.' But this splendid exaggeration, which even at present it would be extremely difficult to reconcile with the real state of mankind, can be considered only as the rash sally of a devout but careless writer,
the measure of whose belief was regulated by that of his wishes. But neither the belief nor the wishes of the Fathers can alter the truth of history. It will still remain an undoubted fact, that the barbarians of Scythia and Germany, who afterwards subverted the Roman monarchy, were involved in the darkness of paganism; and that even the conversion of Iberia, of Armenia, or of Ethiopia, was not attempted with any degree of success, till the sceptre was in the hands of an orthodox emperor." (Ibid.)

It was entirely by being brought into contact with Rome, that this great end was achieved among the Germans; but as it is necessary to the support of the proposition we have advanced, (viz., that the "place" spoken of was found already "prepared" at the time that the woman took her flight) that Christianity should have penetrated their borders (even if no more than penetrated) somewhat before the conversion of Constantine, in like manner as the infantine efforts above alluded to of the Runic characters were found to be before that date, it becomes necessary to remind the reader of history that the great historical drama of the irruption of the Gothic nations—the means of contact, had its commencement in precisely that very age. The "first considerable occasion in which History mentions this great people (the Goths) was" when "Decius was summoned to the banks of the Danube" to oppose their invasion (Gibbon x.):—this was in A.D. 250. Here then—just in the age we could have wished to find it, commences that intercourse—if of hostility, so also oftentimes of friendship, and always of imitation on the part of the conquerors, which led to the results we have supposed.*

Now while causes are thus conspiring, in an age duly selected for the end in view, at once to strengthen the hands and open the hearts of the people of the "wilderness," it is more than usually instructive to find the following information in chap. xxxvii. of Gibbon, on the subject of the "Conversion of the Barbarians":—

"The progress of Christianity has been marked by two glorious and

* Cniva, the Gothic King, turning suddenly upon the pursuing Romans near to Philopopolis, "their camp was surprised and pillaged, and for the first time their Emperor fled in disorder before a troop of half-armed barbarians." (Ib.)
decisive victories, over the learned and luxurious citizens of the Roman empire; and over the warlike barbarians of Scythia and Germany, who subverted the empire, and embraced the religion, of the Romans. The Goths were the foremost of these savage proselytes;" . . . . "A great num-
ber of Roman provincials had been led away into captivity by the Gothic bands, who ravaged Asia in the time of Gallienus; and of these captives many were Christians, and several belonged to the ecclesiastical order. Those involuntary missionaries, dispersed as slaves in the villages of Dacia, successively laboured for the salvation of their masters. The seeds which they planted of the evangelic doctrine were gradually propagated; and before the end of a century, the pious work was achieved by the labours of Ulphilas, whose ancestors had been transported beyond the Danube from a small town of Cappadocia."

Now Gallienus came to the throne in A.D. 260; and Ulphilas, as apostle of the Goths, bears the date of 360.* Thus we are furnished with an historical account of the inworking of Gospel truth in the Gothic mind, and on the banks of the Danube, for the space of a whole century, in exactly the age our theory of the "locale" of the woman's retreat requires:—of which century the first half, being the half-century directly preceding the conversion of Constantine, may be received as the precise space of time when the "place" was a "preparing." Such was the provision made by Him who alone determines results, for the extension in that age, and in that particular quarter, of the Christian name; and in that extension to constitute a refuge for the indignant "woman"—fleeing the corruptions of the imperial court. She was borne on the "two wings" of the Roman eagle—its arms, and its learning. Now in like manner as the "man-child" she had given birth to was continually suffering death and persecution for 300 years; so she is ever fleeing into the wilderness, or lengthening within it the cords of her tabernacle, for 1,260 years. Hence she was led at one moment to alight from her aerial seat on the crags of Piedmont, and at another to extend her wanderings to the British isles, to Scandinavia, Muscovy, and the mountains of Kourdistan. Yet it is but a "place" God provides—an

* Ulphilas "executed the arduous task of translating the Scriptures into the Gothic tongue—a dialect of the German or Teutonic language." (Ibid.)
exact and well-defined measure of terrestrial extent:—hence the circumstance that while the above-named nations may be recognised for many ages as the “prepared” garden in which the Lord plants his chosen ones, the vast regions of Tartary, and China, and for the most part all the dwellings of Shem and Ham, are excluded from its boundaries.

It is intended, we presume, in the prophecy to say, that the woman having taken away with her into the wilderness the torch of a living faith, she will be found on examination to have discharged the duty assigned her of keeping that torch alive—it may be, oftentimes, with but a sadly slender flame:—in other words (derived from another figure) that God has ever been able to count as many as “two witnesses” in the “place” of her abode. It seems further to have followed as a consequence, that she has left behind her, in the imperial court, a lingering gleam only of the original light; in which have ever since flitted, like birds obscene, the grotesque delusions of a superstitious judgment and a dis-tempered imagination. Furthermore, we may admire in this history the peculiar rule exercised by our Father in heaven, in that the very events the Dragon is described as having brought to pass—the influx of the northern nations upon the degenerate empire, and for the special purpose of over-whelming the growing Church (ver. 15), He overruled to the end of constructing by their means a safe asylum for his chosen ones.

Having now shown that the banks of the Danube is the “prepared place” of this prophecy—equally so from whichever end of the 1,260 years the question is considered, let us now, by the means of a slight historical sketch, examine the countermark we have proposed to the year 313.

Of all the potentates whom the “kingdom of the beast” has produced, the one into whose lap at his accession, perhaps beyond all others, were cast the means of extensive spiritual good or evil, was the Emperor Charles V. He chose the evil part, and constituted himself, during his long reign of thirty-six years, the great opponent of the Protestant cause. It was fortunate that his lust of dominion was a still more ruling passion of his mind than even his hatred of the truth;
or the Protestant religion would scarcely have been able to make head against the concentrated rancour and violence of the imperial authority. It is a remarkable fact, as springing from this exorbitant lust of empire—overruled by Providence to its own righteous ends, that, notwithstanding the true Romish orthodoxy of the Emperor's faith, and notwithstanding the unbending nature of his disposition, the "eternal" city itself was never so sternly visited, pillaged, and profaned, as by the armies he himself sent against it; nor did the Protestant religion, on the other hand, ever become, before or since, possessed of rights so valuable, as were extorted eventually from this emperor. In the year 1519, Charles was elected to the throne; and in 1520, the first act of his administration was to convene a Diet at Worms, for the purpose of checking the progress of "those new and dangerous opinions which threatened to disturb the peace of Germany, and to overturn the religion of their ancestors." ("Russell's Mod. Europe," i. 536.) It was peculiarly the age of the revival of religion, and of the open manifestation of Gospel light and truth:— and "while the advocates of Papal despotism" (says Milman in his "History of the Church," iv. 579) "were endeavouring at Worms to take away the life of the great Saxon theologian, his books, which had been dispersed in abundance among distant nations, and translated into various languages, were producing the most surprising and happy effects." In various countries sprung up faithful preachers; and notwithstanding an edict whereby Luther was delivered over to Satan, as well as all his adherents and favourers, who were to lose their goods by confiscation unless they should immediately leave his party and receive absolution, the Reformed doctrines only rooted themselves the more deeply under these violent measures of persecution.

During the ten years that intervened between the Diet of Worms and the famous Diet of Augsburg (1530) the struggles of the nascent religion were as noble as they were incessant; and as iniquitous as they were desperate were the devices set on foot by the Papal court for the extirpation of the "heresy." Of the celebrated "Confession of Faith" presented by Melancthon at Augsburg, at the instance of
the Protestant divines, and which has ever since remained
the symbol of the German Reformation, we can only here
observe that it gave rise to an infamous decree, not only con-
demning the tenets of the Protestants, but withholding all
toleration from those who taught them. "The Diet of
Augsburg, in 1530 (says Milman) forms a sort of era in the
history of the Reformation:"—the imperial decree that
ensued "was in effect severer than that of Worms,"—and
"some of the most wise and pious of the Protestant theo-
logians were so oppressed by the prospect of the calamities
which threatened the afflicted Church of Christ, that they
were almost ready to abandon the contest, and give them-
selves up to melancholy and lamentation." Eleven years
after this (1541)—the Protestant divines having in vain de-
manded a general council, to which the Pope was always
averse, we find Charles assisting at a conference at Ratisbon
between a select number of the divines of each party. It
led to no good result. But we may observe at this juncture
a gracious interference of Providence in favour of the
struggling Church, viz., in so determining the position of the
Emperor's affairs—(alarmed by the progress of the Turks in
Hungary, and by the corsairs of Barbarossa on the seas) that
he found it necessary to make large concessions to his Pro-
testant subjects, promising a general diet of the empire, in
order to give final judgment on the whole controversy.
Five years later (1546) we find the Emperor, in furtherance
of his untiring resolution to humble the Protestant princes,
agreeing to a dishonourable truce with Solyman the magni-
ficent, and at the same time entering into an alliance with the
Pope for the complete extirpation of heresy.

"A general council had been assembled at Trent, by the authority of
the Pope, in order to regulate the affairs of religion. But the Protes-
tants, although they had appealed to a general council, refused to acknow-
ledge the legality of this, which, they were sensible, was convoked to con-
demn, not to examine, their opinions. The proceedings of the council
confirmed them in this resolution; they therefore renounced all connexion
with it; and as they had discovered the Emperor's ambitious views, they
began to prepare for their own defence." (Russell i. 591.)

The great reformer died this year,—"his opinions (truly
observes the historian) were now so firmly rooted, as to
stand in no further need of his fostering hand." Luther
found the Christian world steeped in a pulseless unanimity;
and it may be said with truth, on a general survey of his
exertions, that the two great parties into which he succeeded
in dividing it, were represented respectively by the great
Diet of Augsbourg on the one hand—demanding the free-
dom of religion, and the Council of Trent on the other—
denouncing all exercise of opinion, and demanding an entire
subjection of the conscience to the Roman see:—in this state
of division the Roman empire has ever since remained.
The history goes on to show, that the noble firmness of his
Protestant subjects tended only to increase the Emperor's
exasperation against them, and his determination by every
means to enforce their obedience to the established church.
We feel an almost irresistible inclination to enter into the
full particulars of this momentous period; but as our legiti-
mate object is limited to the desire of exhibiting the spiritual
complexion of the times which led up to the great event in-
dicated by the prophecy, we shall proceed at once to the
circumstances immediately preceding that event.
The same year (1546) distinguished by the death of the
great reformer, saw also the first appearance on the stage of
history of that young prince, Maurice of Saxony, who was
destined to obtain the appellation of the deliverer of
Germany. In looking at the brilliant feat of arms of the
year 1552,—on which occasion, after long and difficult pre-
parations, Maurice was enabled suddenly to appear in the
field at the head of a Protestant army, to surprise and
overthrow the veteran forces of Charles, and to obtain for
the Protestant cause all that had been demanded and refused
for so many years,—it would be well, were it possible, to
overlook the infamy of his previous career. In 1546 he
regularly sold himself to the Emperor, agreeing to receive,
as the price of his services and his treachery, the territories
and dignities of his own relation and friend the Elector of
Saxony. The consequences that flowed to the Protestant
cause from this base transaction were in the highest degree
disastrous. The members of the Smalcaldic league, not
only formidable but invincible in their union, were led of
necessity to look to their separate interests, and this effective barrier against the further progress of Charles's ambition fell presently to atoms; and thus the whole power of Germany, its liberties, and ancient constitution, were at the mercy of the imperial despot. It is not without a reason, as will presently be seen, that we allude to these particular circumstances.

The manner in which this disjunct condition of the Protestant cause was retrieved is thus related by Russell (i. 607). Speaking of the year 1552, he says,

"These tyrannical measures" (i. e. of Charles V. in enforcement of the decree of the Tridentine Council) "fully opened the eyes of Maurice of Saxony and other Lutheran princes, who, allured by the promise of liberty of conscience, and the prospect of farther advantages, had assisted the emperor in the war against the confederates of Smalcalde. Maurice in particular, who had long beheld with jealous concern the usurpation of Charles, now saw the necessity of setting bounds to them; and he who had perfidiously stripped his nearest relative and benefactor of his hereditary possessions, and been chiefly instrumental in bringing to the verge of ruin the civil and religious liberties of his country, became the deliverer of Germany. Or, we should rather say, finding a new opportunity of personal aggrandizement, deserted the imperial party with as little scruple as he had formerly shewn in quitting the cause of his religion and his country. The policy with which he conducted himself in the execution of his design was truly admirable."

But into these particulars it is not necessary here to enter.

In consequence of the successes here alluded to the Council of Trent broke up; and a conference on matters of religion, between the Protestant party under Maurice, and the Catholic party headed by the King of Rome, was appointed to meet at Passau. It was attended by the ministers of all the Electors, together with deputies from most of the considerable princes and free cities. Maurice limited his demands to three articles, of which two of a public sort were —"the public exercise of the Protestant religion, and the re-establishment of the ancient constitution of Germany."

After further fruitless attempts on the part of the emperor into which we need not enter, a peace was concluded on terms, of which those that had reference to religion were as follows—
"A Diet shall be holden within six months, in order to deliberate on the most effectual method of preventing for the future all dissensions concerning religion; in the mean time, no injury shall be offered to such as adhere to the Confession of Augsburg, nor shall the Catholics be molested in the exercise of their religion: . . . . and if that diet shall not be able to terminate the disputes respecting religion, the stipulations in the present treaty in behalf of the Protestants shall continue for ever in force." "Such (says the historian) was the memorable treaty of Passau, which set limits to the authority of Charles V., overturned the vast fabric which he had employed so many years in erecting, and established the Protestant Church in Germany upon a firm and secure basis."

But it will be observed that the year of this famous conference anticipated by three years the date marked out by the prophecy; and yet, the leading stipulation agreed upon was, that "a diet shall be holden within six months," in order to give a final effect to the treaty. Events intervened to create the delay; but they are of so very slight importance in an historical point of view, that it is the duty rather than the judgment of the historian that records them. But remembering that we know nothing of the unseen importance of events, which is regulated by wisdom unfathomable, may we not now discern that these events were interposed, in order "that the scripture might be fulfilled"? Albert of Brandenburg—a prince of restless ambition but inferior talents, and who had refused to be included in the treaty of Passau, was in the early part of 1558 proceeding in a course of exaction and violence in the provinces adjacent to the Rhine. Against this disturber of the public peace the imperial chamber issued a decree; and a league was formed against him, of which Maurice was placed at the head. The hostile armies met at Silverhausen; and after an obstinate combat, victory declared for Maurice (9 July, 1558); but this young prince received a mortal wound, of which a couple of days afterwards he died, at the early age of thirty-one. Albert of Brandenburg was defeated in a second engagement; when, subjected to the ban of the empire, he was obliged to take refuge in France, where "he lingered out a few years in indigence" (ib.).

In the years 1554-5, while war with its attendant miseries
was raging in the neighbouring countries, between the adherents respectively of Charles V. and the King of France,

"Germany (says Russell) enjoyed such tranquillity, as afforded the Diet full leisure to confirm and perfect the plan of religious pacification agreed upon at Passau, and referred to the consideration of the next meeting of the Germanic body."

A Diet had been summoned to meet at Augsburg soon after the conclusion of the treaty of Passau (vid. supra); but the commotions excited by Albert of Brandenburg, and other causes, had hitherto obstructed its deliberations. The following stipulations were at last settled, and formally published:—

"Such princes and cities as have declared their approbation of the Confession of Augsburg shall be permitted to profess and exercise, without molestation, the doctrine and worship which it authorizes:—'the Popish ecclesiastics shall claim no spiritual jurisdiction in such cities or principalities, nor shall the Protestants molest the princes and states that adhere to the Church of Rome:—no attempt shall be made to terminate religious differences, except by the gentle and pacific methods of persuasion and conference:—the supreme civil power in every state may establish what form of worship it may deem proper, but shall permit those who refuse to conform to remove their effects; ... and if any prelate or ecclesiastic shall hereafter abandon the Romish religion, he shall instantly relinquish his diocese or benefice, and it shall be lawful for those in whom the right of nomination is vested to proceed immediately to a new election.' These were the principal articles in what is called the 'Recess of Augsburg,' the basis of religious peace in Germany." (Ib. i. 640.)

May it not be truly said that in this signal triumph of justice—the completion and confirmation of the treaty of 1552 in the year 1555—the great Reformation received its crown? This great event renders the year 1555 illustrious in the annals of the world, and fulfils (as we venture to believe) the anticipations of prophecy. There was one dissentient from the general joy diffused by the treaty—the Pope of Rome Paul IV., who, says the historian, "full of high ideas of his apostolic jurisdiction, and animated with the fiercest zeal against heresy, regarded the indulgence given to the Protestants by an assembly composed of laymen, as an impious act of usurped power. He therefore threatened the emperor and the king of the Romans with the severest
effects of his vengeance, if they did not immediately declare
the Recess of Augsburg illegal and void:—but Charles
showed no disposition to comply."

There are certain circumstances attending this great event,
to which perhaps we may be pardoned in calling attention.
When considering the period of 1260 years which, in the
middle of the last century, terminated simultaneously with
the intellectual day of Voltaire, it was pointed out that,
instantly upon the philosopher's letting fall his pen, the bold
and destructive Society of German Illuminees made their
appearance, offering themselves (as it were) as so many
battering-rams and catapultas, to demolish the antichristian
edifice which he had doomed to destruction. So in the
present instance, though Luther was called to the honour
of being the mouthpiece of the Lord, another sort of instru-
ment was necessary to lead to the material completion of the
great theologian's aspirations. Perhaps in the counsels of
heaven some reason may have operated, for permitting him
only, as from Mount Nebo, to behold the promised land
afar off. In the same year then that the Church mourned
for Luther, the supplanter and traitor Maurice was raised
up, to compel in the kingdom of the "Beast" (the kingdom
of brute force) the subordinate act of human legislation.
Again, the delay which succeeded the treaty of Passau—in
order (as we imagine) "that the scripture might be ful-
filled"—led likewise to the removal by death of this sup-
planter, who, though having laid the foundation of his
country's liberties in the field of arms, was apparently
deemed worthy to assist in the assembly, wherein they
were to be secured and confirmed. Again in the year
1554, the emperor concerted a marriage between his son
Philip and our "bloody" queen Mary: England received the
papal absolution for all her glorious sins: the fires of Smith-
field were lighted for the purifying away of her last dross:
and just at the very time when the "Recess of Augsburg"
was signing the act whereby the true light of the Gospel is
for ever secured in Germany, the bodies of Ridley and
Latimer were "lighting up a flame in England, which, with
God's blessing, shall never be put out." Again, is it not
remarkable that the great emperor—whose mission apparently was, like that of a blacksmith's bellows, to keep in constant brightness the perishing embers of truth by the blasts of persecution, during a long reign of thirty-six years—should, the very next year after his great discomfiture, have resigned his crown; and that he who had been up to that period the mainspring of his time, should have wiled away the remainder of his days in mending the wheels and mainsprings of clocks and watches:—was it not as much as to say—"The years that were allotted to me for the good of my brethren are at an end, and there remain to me only the counting of a few undeveloped days, the measuring of a few objectless hours;—in the purpose for which my time was given I have been found wanting!"

The edict of Milan (A.D. 313) secured the external profession of Christianity from the violence of Pagan Rome: the edict of Augsburg (A.D. 1555—the end of the measured period) delivered the hidden and spiritual church from the more virulent persecutions of Papal Rome. At the first epoch, the holy "woman" escaped into the wilderness, from the brawling multitude who were quarrelling on every point of Christian truth: at the conclusion of her long retirement, she comes forth to awake from the fatal torpor into which its disputations had subsided, a self-gratulating and death-encompassed world.

In Rev. xiii. 5 occurs the last mention of the famous measure of 1260 years. On the subject of the number as here cited very little can be said: for if it commences in A.D. 800 (as required by the present scheme of interpretation) when the "Beast" was established on his "holy" throne in Charlemagne, the termination of the period is too remote to speculate upon. It is observable, moreover, that no direct sign to date from, such as has accompanied all the
preceding numbers (for instance the "Saints being given into his hand," "doing away with the daily sacrifice" &c.) is here afforded:—it is simply said that "power was given unto him to continue forty and two months." It is a mere matter of duration; —unless indeed we should deem the verb "continue" to require a subject after it in an active sense; and then, the subject will be what immediately precedes—viz., "blasphemies"; certainly not "to make war," as stated in the margin. The meaning we consider to be in a general sense—power was given him to maintain the character described of him, to the end of his allotted period. And this mere continuance of an ineffective character accords well with what Daniel says of the same sacro-secular power—"they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end" (Dan. vii. 26).

It would be satisfactory however, notwithstanding that we cannot look for confirmation of the usual sort in respect of the year 800—as being the true commencement of the 1260 years, to find in the prophecy some equivalent sign of the correctness of the opinion. This (as intimated in a previous page) seems to be held out to us in the position of the ciphers, just at the very centre of the prophecy. Be it observed, and be it our guide, that these ciphers are placed in the midst of notices of blasphemy. The proper place for a mark depends upon the object to which it is to be attached, and the subject of the mark itself. The word "Mystery," signifiative of character, is written on the forehead (Rev. xvii. 5): a red-cross Knight would wear the emblem of his faith and calling on his breast: a coat of arms is displayed on the centre of a panel:—in each case the spot chosen has reference to the purpose of the mark. Now the reason why the present mark is not placed upon the forehead of the "Beast from the Sea" obviously is, that it is not a mark of character, but of duration. And as from ver. 5 to ver. 8 is rather a history of the beast than a description of character, we ask—is it not upon the central spot of a history we should expect a mark to be placed? Is it not upon the central spot of the cover of a book one would naturally print the title?

Now the ciphers being placed thus at the centre of the
subject treated of, instead of at the end, (as in both the instances of the preceding chapter they are, and we might add—as in both the instances of chap. xi. also) our conjecture is, that it was intended hereby to *guide the verification* of the measurement: for it must be evident—if the period should commence at a date which does not admit of the lapse of 1260 years before the time should arrive, fixed in the counsels of heaven, for its mystery being known,—that some unusual means of verification must be provided. In the present instance then, (as we imagine,) by resorting to the *centre* of the period instead of its outgoing for the necessary tally, the spot of time is obtained, when the *chief evil foreseen at its commencement* is found to have attained its full development and greatest intensity. The period began in *blasphemy* ("upon its heads a name of blasphemy" ver. 1); also the numeric *mark* (ver. 5) is surrounded by *notices* of blasphemy: and by appealing to history we find (as shewn in our previous investigation) that just at the centre of the 1260 years this evil had reached its *full proportions.* Hereby then the double testimony to truth is as usual obtained; and the method approves itself to the judgment as both dexterous and suitable. By this arrangement we are brought to the year 1421-2 (viz., by adding to 800 the half of 1242), and this we found, by a reference to a few years on either side, to be the central spot of Satan's kingdom. According to the calculation on which this date depends, the termination of the forty-two months will be in A.D. 2042-3.

It is by this number we are led to the persuasion—presenting itself as it does to check the conclusions which the latter portion of the chapter would otherwise, perhaps, lead to,—that it is not with L. Napoleon *personally* that the Roman empire will terminate (although he will personally, according to all precedents, be great as a *Head,* and will personally come to "*perdition,*" Rev. xvii. 11); but that in him as the risen Head, the reign of the Roman "beast" is reconstituted, for a further continuance of a couple of hundred years:—not in the character, perhaps, of a *sacro-secular* beast as heretofore; for the beast and his coadjutors "will hate the whore, and be ever eating her flesh, and
burning her with fire" (Rev. xvi. 16). And this view (we conceive)—as contrasted with the wild and somewhat prevailing notion, that the very age we live in will witness the fulfilment of all the announcements of prophecy,—will commend itself by its reasonableness to those who, through the same word of prophecy, have embraced the expectation of extensive changes, still to come, in the condition both spiritual and temporal of the nations of the earth; and have learnt from history that events which have been the subject of prophecy do not, on that account, lose the character of ordinary events; but come to pass with no miraculous or startling display, being made dependent, like all others, excepting to the eye of Omniscience, on the contingencies of things.

THE SIGN 666.

There remains now to decipher, of the numerical enigmas of the Revelation, the name of the Antichrist—that Head of the Beast "ος ὑπερωτει κακους παντας τους εμπροσθεν" (who shall exceed in wickedness all who have gone before him—Dan. vii. 24. LXX.)—as described in the sign χξξ (666), recorded at the end of this same chapter (Rev. xiii.). From this signature, as if it were the signature of an epistle, is derived the whole value and guarantee of the Vision; and accordingly we find it short, plain, and unequivocal. It happens however, from the mystical sense of the alphabet in which it is written having passed from human memory, that it will require almost a dissertation to arrive at the right reading.

In stating that this numerical signature enfolds the name of Louis Napoleon, it may be repeated that this—the last head of the seven-headed beast, is the only one except Cyrus the first, which Prophecy has written at length; also that this is not the seventh head, but an "eighth" (Rev. xvii.). These circumstances taken together afford an answer to the very natural question of an objector—What reason is there
for entertaining the notion that in these remote days the name of an individual would be given in Prophecy? It is given—not to speak of the more obvious reason of its being a peculiar warning—as an evidence that the scheme of Prophecy is prepared in accordance with the general scheme of things in nature, as submitted to the perceptions of mankind. All things (says the Book of Wisdom xi. 20) are prepared "in measure, number, and weight"; that is—all things, even Prophecy, are contrived in obedience to those rules which the science of man has instituted, or his discoveries have made familiar to him. There is nothing more commonly perceived than that the eighth in universal harmony is the return of the first:—indeed must be so, if named in a work like that of the Revelation—fashioned throughout in series of seven. For instance, if "one day telleth another," it is not only that the first day telleth the second, but more emphatically it telleth the eighth,—every Sabbath telleth the one to come. And if the "beast" be limited essentially to "seven heads" as the necessary measure of his existence, and it is professed notwithstanding that another head meets the eye of the observer, that head (the "eighth") must, if we would listen to consistency, be the return of, at least, a former one:—and this we conceive to be one intended solution of the words ἐκ τῶν επτά εἰσιν (he is one "of the seven"). Thus there springs an elucidation from the very form and fashion of Prophecy; and system itself becomes a guide, by warning us of its own exigencies. The Antichrist is written, and written as an "eighth," to shew that—the octave being complete by the return of No. 1. of the impassable series of seven—the present headship of L. Napoleon, whether it prove of one or many ages, must not be expected to be superseded by another.

It would be a sorry conceit to imagine that the number 666 is the accidental sum of the letters of the Antichrist, in like manner as 577 is of Robert, and 815 of Richard. Six hundred, sixty, and six is a description, a portrait of character; and it is by virtue of a Providential arrangement which pre-determined their numerical value, that the names of Napoleon and L. Napoleon are found to fulfil the prophetic sign. In what manner we should regard this sign
in its construction; whether, for instance, granting it to be emblematical, the number is to be held invariable as six hundred, sixty, and six; or whether this may not be in the first instance the sign of another number to be extracted and developed from it—the number so obtained harmonizing with the description of the beast as contained in the length of the chapter, is that which is the proper subject of our investigation. It is to the latter of these views we shall make our present appeal. To suppose a correspondence between this "number of the beast" and what is previously related in this chapter of him, seems never to have struck even Irenæus, who lived so near the prophet's day; yet, as a proposition, surely nothing can be more reasonable:—"The beast which I saw (says St. John ver. 2) was like unto a leopard—unto a bear—unto a lion"; why should not this description be taken into the account in the endeavour to decipher a name given of him (a name being always, if rightfully viewed, a personal description) even though it should be exhibited in numerical characters?

It will be worth while, however, to advert in few words to the ideas of Irenæus, to show that, in these early efforts, the Church was allowed to approach as near and no nearer to the truth, than in any subsequent age up to the present time. He says to the effect that,—

"It was in the six hundredth year of Noah that the flood destroyed the earth and its wicked inhabitants. Afterwards, in aid of idolatry, Nebuchadnezzar set up a golden image on the plain of Dura, which was sixty cubits high and six cubits broad. Put these three numbers together, and we have 666—a representation, or symbol, of the extreme wickedness of Antichrist, whose name is concealed in the mysterious 666. For we learn from this uniform adherence to six, that the apostacy which is to come under Antichrist will be a repetition of that which took place before the flood, in middle ages, and in after times." (Stuart 784.)

We do well to smile at these curious notions; which are as the gropings of a man in a dark room, who yet is aware of the general direction of the door. They show that the ancients, in their observation of the sign, took into account both its material—the number six, and its construction.

The first thing to be done is to examine the sign in the mystical import of its component parts; and with this view
it will be necessary to inquire into the relative qualities which the ancients were wont to consider as expressed by the different units of number. We propose, to this end, to take in order the following numbers—One and Ten; Three, Four, and Seven; Six and Eight.

The unit one is the emblem of Deity; it is single, and indivisible. It has not properly the quality of "number," but is the parent of all numbers; in like manner as God contains all things in Himself,—the sole source of the numerical creation. The Great Eternal was the τὸ ἑν (the sole entity) of the Greek philosophy—the one self-existent being—the single "I am" whose presence is everywhere essential.

Akin to this unit is the number "ten." Whilst "one" sets forth the Eternal Father, "ten" presents to the imagination the Great Creator, ever engaged in raising witnesses of His majesty in the works of His creation. From the earliest periods of history "Ten" has been the great multiplier among numbers:—"until seven times? I say unto thee, until seventy seven times seven." (Mat. xviii. 22.) "Peradventure there shall be forty found there"—"there shall be thirty"—"there shall be twenty"—"there shall be ten found there." (Gen. xviii.) "If Cain shall be avenged sevenfold, truly Lamech seventy and sevenfold." (Gen. iv.) Hence it follows that the number "ten" is not simply chosen by mankind as a convenient instrument of increase, but that its power in this respect is peculiar to itself, and is an original part of the system of creation; entitling it to be distinguished among numbers as the multiplier.* Regarding the signs of "ten,"

* The Jesuit Athanasius Kircher in his "Arithmologia" speaks of Ten as the most perfect of numbers, and soul of harmony:—he says, "Denarius harmonicus est, et inter omnes perfectissimus; omnes enim numerorum parium impariumque differentias, omnes proportiones harmonicas, complectitur." The following is a curious speculation, "Ultra denarium unus numeros nisi replicantus dari non potest, redeunte unitate ad suum principium; suprema mens juncta novenario rerum creatarum denarium conficit; quem et veteres Mythologi per novem Musas et Apollinem haud inscite exprimebant. Hoc pacto noveni Angelorum chori in tres hierarchias disparitati, cum Deo omnium complemento denarium conficium." Hence Ten, as well as One, stands for God.
it deserves remark that what stands for "one" with us (1) is the Greek for "ten" (is this an accidental alliance between the two numbers?); and that too—not as the result of the iota being the tenth letter of the Greek alphabet, but from there having been introduced the figure σ (stau)—seemingly the root of σταυρός, the cross—to express a preceding unit, viz., "six" whereby it becomes the tenth. In these latter ages its sign (10)—a pillar and a circle, is exactly descriptive of the character we have assigned to it, presenting to the imagination the Lord Creator, at the head of the multiplied works of His hands. The writer remembers somewhere to have seen the pillar (1) placed within a circle to signify "ten,"—wherein we may still more evidently observe the number as pointing to the Creator, surrounded by the works of His hands.

The units "three," "four," and "seven" carry each a separate allusion; but we regard them as most significative in their combined relations. "Three" by itself, denotes things spiritual,—"there are three which bear witness in heaven"—which Three are One; "there are three (relating to the first three) which bear witness on earth": thus eternity and infinity are brought within the range of its allusions. Or we may say of "three," that it is in number the reflection of God's image observable on all his works both spiritual and physical; and that as a rule or measure, it enters, as evidence of the Divine handicraft, into the constitution of all things. "Three (says Stuart, p. 753) is the first number which constitutes a full concrete unity. The number one constitutes simple unity: two has been widely regarded as the index of separation and antithesis: but the number three, having a beginning, middle, and end, and being indivisible, represents a perfect composite unity." We are reminded by this observation that the sunbeam, though single, is threefold in nature, whilst yet undivided; and that the chord of harmony, though one in sound, is essentially three. Among the heathen this number is spoken of as the image of the Divine effluence—the repository of all wisdom (Kircher 248). "Four" refers entirely to things material:—it is the great fountain of nature. "Four corners of the earth"—"four
winds of heaven"—"four seasons of the year"—"four phases of the moon"—"four rivers of Paradise"—"four kingdoms of the Beast." It expresses material fulness; also the quality of solidity, as distinguished from those of form and beauty—the results of the heavenly "three."

The number "seven" was considered of old of all the most full of mysteries. It has this remarkable property ("singularem eximiamque præ cæteris rationem") that it neither begets, nor is begotten of, any other numbers included in the first decenary; whence it was received by the Pythagoreans as the symbol of the Great Ruler of all things.* It may be called the Divine stamp of perfection in the works of creation ("rerum omnium sigillum") being chosen by the Deity in all arrangements of system—whether applied to things material or immaterial. It should be regarded, first, as compounded of "six" and "one"—the "one" being the crown of things already completed in the number "six," as in the days of creation. But in its character of perfection, in the sense of supreme excellency, it claims to be viewed as forming the combination of "three" and "four,"—in which relation, in the preceding pages, it has mostly commanded our attention. In this point of view "seven" sets forth the union of earth with heaven, of solidity with form, of strength with beauty, of matter operated upon by mind,—a numerical illustration of the words, "the spirit of God moved upon the face of the (chaotic) waters." Thus "seven" becomes the sign of a covenant state—a consideration which accounts for the "seven bullocks and seven rams" of Balaam's and other ancient sacrifices. Among other methods used of old to express this number, we find that of three lines and a circle divided into four parts to denote the Heavenly Seven, and three lines and a cross the earthly †—a remarkable illustration of the use made of it in Scripture;

* Plutarch describes the Deity as, "Semper unus, stabilis, motu carens, ipse sui similis, aliorum dissimilis, septuplo entium choro stipatus. Eam ob causam Pythagoræi hunc numerum Minervæ ex Jovis capite genitæ, semper virgini, sine matre natæ, symbolum posuerunt." (Kircher 272.)
† "Egypti septinarius celestem sic exhibebant III ☯—per tres lineas et circulum quadripartitum; et septinarius sublunarem sic III ⊙—per
for the reader will not fail to be reminded of the like distinctions in the "seven seals," the "seven trumpets," and (as we have endeavoured to show) the "seven vials" of the Revelation. A further confirmation of this view is found in the ancient sign of the Tetractys, or *quarternarian* principle, in subjection to whose laws all created things were said to be placed; which is nothing else than the equilateral triangle. This figure is arrived at (says Kircher) by extending from the vertex (the "monas") of a pyramid, the planes of its sides, whereby the base will exhibit the form of the Delta (Δ) or *Triangle.* But the Delta, being the fourth letter of the alphabet, is likewise the sign of *Four.* Hence, from the close alliance subsisting between the "three" and the "four"—the intimate approach (as it were) of Heaven to Earth, are derived the constitution and character of the *perfect* "seven."† With this accords, in the form of the symbol, the "nomen tetragrammaton" of the Jews—the "ineffable name" of *four* letters, inscribed in a *triangle.*

The first of every numerical series, when taken as a series, is usually of superior importance to those that follow, as in "the first day of the week"; but it is not always so in the series of "seven." Being declaratory of *system,* of which tres lineas et crucem; quâ occultè denotabant septinarium seu universalem supremi numinis virtutem tûm exerci, cûm ex triade in tetradem; et primo in eœlestem, deininde in sublunarem movetur, et revolutione factâ sibi restituitur." (Iib.)

* "Initium ducit a puncto, seu Monade, Pyramidis, et per duo qualibet latera in basim extenditur, quà Δ constituitur, sacra illa et tot antiquorum scriptûs celebrata Trias, verum Platonicum triplicis mundi exemplar et idea: . . . pyramidis mysticae fundamentum, fons et origo corporum, quà ad mysticas significationes, et reconditas rerum explicationes, nihil uberior." (P. 248.)

† We must excuse ourselves by the example of Kircher in making reference—as a curious illustration of this rule (4 + 3)—to the seven stars composing the "Great Bear" ("septem Ûrœ stellas in navigantum commodum"):—the circumstance (we presume) in which originated the observation in Hudibras,—

"Cardan believed great States depend

Upon the tip of the Bear's tail's end."

The triplex images of Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva, having often *three heads*—the perfection of mind, have always *four arms*—the irrational instruments of power and energy.
oftentimes the centre is the place of honour, the fourth point is frequently the most distinguished; according to the expression of Hippolytus before adverted to "ο τεταρτος ο μεσος των επτα" (the fourth the centre of the seven). On this account, we presume, the Sun—the centre of a system—was created on the fourth day. We much question whether an illustration of this truth is not presented in the ancient Dracontium. This serpent temple, as exhibited in the remains of Abury in Wilts (Vide Bathurst Deane) was an avenue of enormous stones winding over the undulations of the land for several miles, in representation of the progress of the "holy" reptile; but just about the centre, which passed over a small hill, it formed a circle—a coil of the serpent, which was the most holy place of sacrifice. As the whole of this sacred system would undoubtedly have been expressed numerically as seven, this circle must have been the four of the series—the place of fire, i.e., of general illumination. The head of the serpent—No. one, rested on a small eminence, now known by the name of Hak-Pen (Hag's head).

Between "six" and "eight" there seems to be a certain fellowship, arising out of the mutual though opposite relation in which they stand to the sacred "seven";—but let us first consider them in their separate significations.

In nature, "six" is the most perfect of the original units, being the best specimen of what are technically called perfect numbers, i.e. "whose aliquot parts added together make the whole number" (Enc. Brit.). "Six (says Kircher 270) is the Coryphæus of perfect numbers." With it the Egyptians bespangled the throne of the Most High ("senario numero solium Supremi Numinis polymorphi decorabant"). On this account we imagine this unit to have been employed formerly to express the idea of relative superiority, whether in reference to a good or a bad cause. On the sixth day God finished the most excellent of His handyworks: the sixth day witnessed also the most perfect of His works of grace. The giant son of Goliath of Gath had six fingers and six toes. Six steps led up to Solomon's throne, with twelve lions upon them—six on each side: "there was not the like made in any kingdom" (2 Chron. ix. 18). It is the sixth
sign—Antiochus, by whom the privileges of the “glorious land” are perfected (Dan. xi. 16). It is the sixth of the “seven churches”—that of Philadelphia, which receives the greatest praise; the only one of which the Saviour says “I have loved thee.” We conceive its allusion in the “Revelation” to be, primarily, to the Lord Jesus Christ—in His human nature the most excellent of the creation of God.

But if “six” belongs of right to the Lord Christ, it belongs also by virtue of usurpation to Antichrist; whose spirit now supremely reigns in the kingdoms of the world—though under the Christian name. The only other place in the Bible, besides in the “number of the beast,” where the three-fold form of six occurs, is in 2 Chron. ix. 13, where we read, “the weight of gold that came to Solomon in one year was six hundred, and three score, and six talents of gold.” Unquestionably in this place the gold of Solomon is mentioned, not to his dispraise, but to the approval of his magnificence and prosperity;—hence we derive the belief, that the same numerical device, when applied to the “beast,” must be assumed in presumption, or given in irony.

Of the number “eight,” as denoting restoration, and as being the same as “one” in its return, we have already spoken. When uncleanness was contracted under the Jewish law, it lasted usually seven days, and on the eighth day purification, i.e., a return to the purity forfeited on the first day, could be completed. Circumcision on the “eighth” day should be viewed in this light as a return to the purity of a previous state of existence, forfeited in the first of birth. After seven sabbaths counted from the morrow after a sabbath came eightly the feast of Pentecost (Lev. xxiii. 15). After seven sabbaths of years the trumpet of Jubilee sounded, when, beyond this septenary period, the acts of grace peculiar to the season were proclaimed (Lev. xxv. 8, 10):—these are, all severally, applications of the law which constitutes the eighth the acceptable time of return to the Divine favour.

As regards the fellowship between the “six” and the “eight,” in reference to the “seven,” it consists, if at all, in this—that the former is incomplete in the power of its series, or system, without the crown of “seven,” the latter is the
exhibition of power progressing from the seven,—each therefore, equally, resting its social claims on the “seven.” But in this speculation we are perhaps too much under the guidance of what we imagine to be an exemplification of it in the Vision now before us (Rev. xiii.)—the vision of the “kingdom of iron.” In this kingdom Charlemagne and Louis Napoleon depend equally for their prophetic importance upon the great Napoleon—the central point of its perfection;—which latter chief, as head of the system, is sustained by them in the appointed ages of their respective “kingdoms,”—the three forming the members of a tripartite sign.

Let us now proceed to derive what benefit we may from these considerations, some of them perhaps too fanciful, on a long bygone system of communication.

The first thing that strikes us in the numerical “name of the Beast” (666) is this—that it is framed on a pretence of sanctity, taking as its foundation the sacred “six”—the unit of the Holy One:—or, if this speculation be not received, at least it denotes an undue assumption of superiority. The quality enshrined in the “six” is brought under the influence of the sacred “ten”—the great multiplier, and emblem of creating Deity:—a further pretension to holiness. Thus we obtain 60: and the operation continued to the third term gives 600. Now the series thus obtained (6, 60, 600) might go on ad infinitum; and must be understood to do so if considered in the fulness of its meaning. But cannot some symbolical expression be found, in its nature short and exact, wherein the features of the series—especially that of its infinity—may be preserved and exemplified? Exchange enters essentially into the nature of symbolical representation. This is achieved by simply adding together three terms—not less nor more than three—of the progression; whereby 6, 60, 600 becomes 666—i. e., 600, 60, 6—an inversion of the progression: or—(to make use of a well-known method of the ancients)—whereby the expression

\[6 \times 60 \times 600\]

becomes 60. We here enter upon the property of the triangle. If three lines — — — be placed alongside each other, we behold in each an example of unity; and if we put
these lines artistically together in the only form of figure their number admits, we obtain a triangle, which still is unity: for (as was observed just now) the number "three" is a "concrete unity": and it is too well known to require proof, that in every age of the world the form of the equilateral triangle has been received as the symbol of one in three. Now the figure 60, a reversed triangle framed from the three first terms of the progression, is the arrest of the progression. Moreover its perpetuity of progress is stopt at the moment of arriving at the triad form—the form of infinity. And as this result is obtained from the addition of its parts, it is obtained by a process analogous to that by which the triangle was obtained from the given lines.

We are then to conceive of 60, or its equivalent 666 (XG), as being, first, an exhibition of composite unity,—in its composite state as much single as the unit "six": and secondly, as being a representative figure, or symbol, containing in itself every quality of the series it represents. It declares, and in itself enforms an infinite progression of $6 \times 10$: *—and further it may be said to present, taking into consideration its materials, a mystic figure of false sanctity, i.e. of hypocrisy, in perpetual progression.

Now the "beast" described in the chapter before us (Rev. xiii.) is Daniel's fourth kingdom—the "Holy Roman empire"; as we trust has been sufficiently shewn. "The beast which I saw (ver. 2) was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion:"—these are notices, respectively, of the third, the second, and the first kingdoms. The prophet continues, "and the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority"—gave them to him, of course, at the moment when, "standing upon the sand of the sea," the

* Among the Hindoos, a triangle with the point downwards is the symbol of Vishnu, with the point upwards of Siva:—this is remarkable when we take into consideration that Siva is the person of their Triad who represents destruction—or the ever-progressing doom of things natural; and Vishnu the person representing reproduction—or the return of life.
prophet was a beholder in the scene:—that is to say, the "power" and the "authority" spoken of had then their commencement. This then is the simultaneous notice of the fourth "kingdom"; and which notice is expanded into the form we find it in in the length of the chapter. It is clearly then to this Beast, or this phase of the entire Beast, that the prophet invites our attention. "I saw him (he may be supposed to say) rise out of the sea, and receive his seat and authority from the dragon:" his ancestral number is 666: hence find out the name of the person in whom, or of the age in which, is the climax of his power. To this very fair invitation we may surely attach the inference, both that success shall attend the examination, and advantage the discovery.

Let us now observe the perfect propriety of the figurative expression 666—i.e., 600, 60, 6 (χξς). "The beast was like a leopard"—600 (for be it remembered that St. John, placed in the day of Charlemagne, beheld in the reverse direction of history; for the leopard was historically the third in order: vide Dan. vii.); "he was like" in a limited degree "to a bear"—60: "he was like a lion"—6, with a "mouth speaking great things." The whole figure was 60, the prophet speaking of the parts in the order wherein they met his eye; only that the several beasts, so separated as in Daniel, were united; for St. John says "the beast which I saw":—which beast consequently, as to its body, was a "leopard"; but with "feet" (i.e., beyond the body,) of a "bear"; and with the "mouth" (the furthest point in the distance) of a "lion." And now, by the means of this union, the "fourth beast," compounded of the other three, and in that shape receiving authority, becomes 666.

This analysis raises some gloomy anticipations in support of the interpretation we have ventured to give of the "Image" of this chapter (ver. 14), as signifying an Eastern—the image and offspring of the Western "kingdom"; for the two empires together would be the exact measure of the Persian, the Grecian, and the Roman "beasts." We have observed the beast to rise originally in Cyrus out of the
swamps of Babylon (after having been prefigured in the life of the Chaldean king): he travelled westward and became the Macedonian: and further westward he became the Roman,—thus having shewn himself, in the course of time, as the lion, the bear, and the leopard—6. 60. 600. But St. John sees him rise again out of the ocean, not as a distinct and homogeneous beast, but a composite beast, consisting of the previous three—i. e., as 666. There was no more territory given him, (our East Indian possessions are safe) and therefore he was not a distinct beast with a distinct name (vide Dan. vii. 7); but he is formed by an union of all the preceding, in respect of territory, as likewise in respect of a combination of all their faculties—"iron teeth," &c. With these characteristics agree admirably the further language of Daniel (vii. 7. 23)—"he was strong exceedingly: he stamped the residue" (i. e., all that remained of the preceding ones) "with his feet": "he was diverse from all the beasts before it" (query, in being a compound beast): "he shall devour the whole earth"—that is to say, shall absorb into himself the whole—the subject of these several visions. This terrific "beast," which has been walking in the Western quarter of the old Roman empire, ever since his rise in Charlemagne, arrives in our day at the meridian of his power in the Napoleonic dynasty; and especially (as it has been our chief object to shew) either in the person, or the "kingdom," of Louis Napoleon.

Let us now endeavour from the enigmatical expression 666, to decipher the name. The invitation to do so runs thus, "Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man: and his number is six hundred three score and six." "Let him count"—i. e., calculate—not simply add, but examine and compute. Let him calculate "the number of the beast";—not the name of the beast, but the "number" that describes him. This distinction is essential: and that it is a just one may be learnt from observing the very same distinction asserted in the preceding verse—"the name of the beast, or the number of his name." The name is that of "a man," and it will be involved in the "number" that is to be calculated; for we
read immediately "for it is the number of a man,"—still a number, but containing the numerical description, or value, of a man's name.

But how comes it to pass that we are invited to calculate "the number," when, presently after, we are informed that the number is 666? It is obvious from this consideration that the number to be calculated cannot be the number given (666):—except it be in this sense, that it may be another form of this number—an expansion or some conversion of it. In support of this conclusion, let us observe the effect of reading the following passage, with only a comma between its parts, as in the Greek,—"for it is the number of a man, and his number is 666"—the two parts being thus brought under the same relation to the word "for";—or again, of excluding for a moment the first of these parts,—when the sentence will read "Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast, for his number is 666." The feeling alone may here inform us, that the two cases of "number" cannot be identical:—the supposition is an absurdity.

The number to be calculated is (it is said) "the number of a man." We beg to ask—should it not be "of the man," in conformity with the rule adduced by Mr. Tilloch regarding the Greek article?—But let that pass. * But what man (and whether it be a man, or the man, does not affect this question)—what man (we ask) can this possibly be, other than the representative and exponent of the "kingdom"—here the "fourth kingdom"? What "man" is any where in prophecy.

* Not being competent to enter upon a critical question of this sort, the writer must content himself with naming the work where it is learnedly discussed. The following extract, however, seems to our purpose:—"For example (says the Author, p. 313) to ἀρμον, THE LAMB. The first place in which this name occurs in the Apocalypse, is in ch. v. 6, 'And I saw in the midst of the throne, and of the four animals, and in the midst of the Elders, ἀρμον, a LAMB,' &c. Here, conformably to the rules of the language, this noun appears without the article, being its first introduction. The recurrence of the same Lamb would require the article." (The italics are introduced.) It should follow—as ἀρμον in the text cited unquestionably means "the Lamb," that ἀυθρομονυ must mean "of the man."
seen in connexion with a *prophetic kingdom*, but he who is its founder or otherwise its *head*?—But it so happens (as has been shown long since) that this representative imperial Head of the “fourth kingdom,” is the *seventh* of the Great Beast—the preceding “kingdom” having had four (Dan. vii.); and this Head was seen to be Napoleon. What the prophet bids us calculate, then, is, the *number* descriptive of the *last of the seven heads of the beast*—i.e., of Napoleon; observing for our guidance that—while the number *given* (666) is the expression of the whole beast in *four kingdoms* and with *seven heads*; the number *required*—which is that of the *head of the fourth kingdom* especially, is equally that of the *seventh head of the beast*.

But it will be said—“If this seventh Head be the exponent of the fourth kingdom of Daniel, his numerical designation—being of course the same with that of his kingdom—must be 666.” This has a semblance of truth in it; but only for the reason that the number 666—being descriptive of the *whole beast* from the time of Daniel—describes likewise, territorially, the “fourth beast” in particular, who absorbs all into himself. It is evident that, in the capacity of *seventh head*, he must have a designation assigned him which expresses that capacity,—a designation descriptive of his *successional* position. And here we touch the key of the mystery. As the “four kingdoms” of the Great Beast pass, in the progress of ages, under “seven heads”; in like manner, the concentrated sign of the four kingdoms (666) must be *resolved into seven terms*; and the seventh term, representing the seventh period of rule, will be the “number” required; which, in obedience to the prophetic word, should enfold in itself the “name of (the) man.” Let us then prepare the way for this operation, by unbinding the sign 666, and viewing it again as the inverted triangle $\frac{600}{6}$. From this position of triangular *unity*, we take another step backwards to $\frac{60}{6}$—the *state of progression* of the Sign: and therefrom we allow the progression to advance to the *seventh term*. Thus arranged, the computation leads to the following
result. The first head of the bestial power, Cyrus, is Six. The second head, Alexander, is Six multiplied by “Ten horns” of increasing evil—(“evils were multiplied in the earth”—1 Mac. 1—9). The 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th heads, Augustus, Constantine, Theodoric, Charlemagne, are \(60 \times 10 \times 10 \times 10 \times 10\) (600,000). And then, the seventh head, (or the sixth, seventh, and eighth heads in their mystical union) Napoleon, is Six-million. The bestial progression, everlasting in its nature, but restricted in the prophecy to “seven heads,” or stages of increase, is thus seen to assume the following form:—

1st Head (assumed sanctity) . . . 6
2nd ,, (evil increasing) . . . 60
3rd ,, . . . . . . . . . . . 600
4th ,, . . . . . . . . . . . 6000
5th ,, . . . . . . . . . . . 60000
6th ,, . . . . . . . . . . . 600000
7th ,, . . . . . . . . . . . 6,000,000

Hence the numerical name of the seven-headed beast, under his last headship, is 6,000,000. Six million is the final development of “Six hundred, sixty and six”—the full dimensions of the “beast with seven heads and ten horns”; the sevenfold progress of his growth being exemplified by the “number,” which relates to every successive headship of his dominion, being multiplied by the “ten” of ever-increasing substance and strength. With respect to the social view of Daniel’s “kingdoms,” as exhibiting a “continual declension in the purity of government”—to which speculation we have added a “perpetual increase of spiritual hypocrisy,” have we not a warrant for imagining both of these to be hinted at, in the combination the Beast has, throughout, exhibited of them:—the “divine right” conferred on the rule of Nebuchadnezzar leads to a deification of the potentate—its first decline (Dan. iii. 5); * and thence the evil descends through successive stages of sanctimonious and ever-widening corruption in the springs of government, to that depth of blasphemy which is expressed (as represented

* This step is not exhibited in the numeric pyramid, which is of the post-Nebuchadnezzar kingdoms; but it will be explained in another page.
in the figure six-million) by the words "Vox populi vox Dei."
The progression herein obeys the general rule of increase:—
if a light be applied to the dry heather, it will be found
that the fiery devastation, obedient in its course to the wind
assumes the form of the vertical section of a cone; and so
in the above pyramid, after seven stages of increase, the
head of the apostacy is again said to "exceed in wickedness
all that had come before him."

One word more upon the "Six." It must be evident that
the interpretation of this prophecy does not depend upon our
ability to define with certainty the mystical meaning of this
unit. If required to define it in a single word, we should
be disposed to say it means Government—"the government
shall be upon his shoulders":—(in heathen figure) "Six
shall be the ornament of his throne" (vide supra). The
progressive mixture with the "Ten"—the many classes of
the world all seeking power, would represent first the en-
croachments of the higher orders, and in later ages the inroads
of the masses (as said above) upon the department of im-
perial rule.

The increase of the Six is seen to be limited to seven stages—
the mark of the perfect state. This method may be abundantly
illustrated from Scripture. The one candlestick of the Lord
(Ex. xxv. 31) becomes, when spreading its light beyond the
single nation, the seven candlesticks of the Gospel (Rev.
i. 12). The one mount Zion—the elect but recreant church
of Israel, becomes the seven mountains (Rev. xvii. 9) of the
degenerate church of the latter days. But not to build on
the conversion of one into seven, we should seek rather
instances of one being first converted into three, and the
"three" so obtained into seven—as exhibited in the construc-
tion of our numerical pyramid. The best illustration to be
found is that of the constitution, as declared to us, of that
Almighty Being, whose sceptre of righteousness the Beast
has ever falsely pretended to uphold; and in imitative agree-
ment with whom, we may imagine his own constitution to be
appropriated,—the indivisible Trinity, from the throne of
whose Triune Majesty proceed "the seven spirits of God
sent forth into all the earth" (Rev. v. 6)—manifesting them-
selves in sevenfold gifts among men (Is. xi. 2). In the works of nature likewise we are reminded, that the solar ray, in obedience to this rule, consists intrinsically of three rays invisible in their union, and forming but one ray; but, when brought into contact with the refracting substances of earth, exhibiting itself in seven colours, separate from each other, and spreading themselves over the whole face of nature. In like agreement, the quality of Harmony—the soul of Music, is produced by three notes only of the seven, sounding as one in their union—a "concrete unity"; while the seven sounds, to become intellectually appreciable, must follow separately in their order, like the seven headships of the Beast's dominion; and like them must be recognised in a sevenfold diversity of ever increasing power. The development of the Sign 666—the triune name of the Beast, is thus abundantly illustrated, as obtained from the reinversion of the triangle 60, and its consequent expansion into seven separate and consecutive terms. And the interpretation we have given of it we conceive to be vindicated, first, by its exact agreement with the written description of the Beast to whom it alludes; and secondly, by its harmonizing as a Sign with so many other signs which the same Divine hand has instituted; and by which it appeals to the perceptions of mankind in all times.

Now we are to call to mind—what has been shown in its proper place (vid. p. 232)—that for the complete solution of this numerical enigma, there are requisite two responses; the one declaring the "mark" of the Beast, the other his "name." The head was wounded to death, and his deadly wound was healed"—showing two stages of existence; and consequently (it may be presumed) two parallel calls for a designation. And it may be added, as a guiding recollection, that the "healing of the wound" was attended with increase of power. From this imagery it is presumable (as both the "mark" and the "name" appertain to the seventh headship) that the "mark"—a thing of more general application, belongs to the Beast's first term of existence; the "name"—of more intimate use to the second. Let us then pursue first the
mark—the first yield to be expected from the "number of the beast."

On the subject of this "mark," the learned Dr. Wordsworth has expressed his opinion, that it will prove to be some abridgment of the Beast's name; some selection (it may be) of the leading letters—such as any farmer would naturally place upon his corn-bags or instruments of agriculture. He says, "it is designed to express such a kind of engraving as denotes property and subjection; such, for instance, as is implied by a stamp, seal, cypher, or monogram, impressed upon an object. We may compare the Latin impressions used by Virgil,—

"Durum procudit arator
Vomeris obtusi dentem, cavat arbores lintres,
Aut pecori signum, aut numeros impressit acervis."

It was with no small delight the writer read this opinion, after he had proposed in the little pamphlet alluded to in his Preface—and he now again with undiminished confidence proposes it—the following "mark" of Napoleon:—

N. P. L. N.

i.e., 50 × 80 × 30 × 50 = 6,000,000.

These figures are multiplied into each other—not added together—in obedience to the construction of their numerical type (6,000,000), and the law of perpetual increase in which that type is founded.

The dynastic age of Napoleon has been shown to be that in which, according to the great Image of Daniel, the grasp of tyranny, and the yells of democracy—the iron and the clay—combine to direct the helm of affairs; and we are thus led to expect—History being in necessary agreement with Prophecy—that in examining the events of the age thus characterized, we may find among them some testimony to the correctness of the mark 6,000,000. But with this view, we must take into the account the whole Sign (Napoleon and Louis Napoleon) in obedience to the expression "The head was wounded to death, and its deadly wound was healed": and hereby we shall further identify the latter half as belonging to the former.

It is in itself a very striking fact, that we behold in the
great Napoleon the first instance of the elevation of a Western emperor by means of the suffrages of the universal people. Four million of votes placed him on the throne. The early Roman emperors rose by military election: and they of the early "kingdom of iron" by violence, or by hereditary claim: but Napoleon was the issue, and the image, of the sovereignty of the people. Now add to this the consideration that this dust-raised sovereignty was exercised and enforced under the grinding millstone of despotism, and we have the most complete image the mind can conceive of the "iron and the clay" attempting, but in vain, to combine. The remark of Alison on the subject is perfect. "History (he says) affords no instance of a nation so unanimously taking refuge in the stillness of despotism." (Epit. 222). And we shall do well to add his further observation, that "the desire of Napoleon that the Pope should be present at his consecration, arose from the anxiety of this new Emperor of the West to recall, as he was wont to do on every occasion, the memory of Charlemagne."

The next step in the historical exposition of the Sign is in the election of L. Napoleon in 1848. We should here call to mind the many prophetic measurements that converge in the year 1848, pointing it out as the time marked for the "healing of the wound." Accordingly, the voices of six million of electors lift L. Napoleon into the seat of power: and it is the reverse of a defect in this application of the number, that this seat of power was not a throne, for we may remember that to L. Napoleon, in the first instance, they refused "the honour of the kingdom" (Dan. xi. 21). But if the elevation of L. Napoleon by six million was the "healing of the wound," where are we to look for the like sign at the infliction of the wound:—for a wound has two sides; and like the scarp and counterscarp of a vast foss, they should show a correspondence of construction? It is recorded then in that excellent publication "The Apocalypse popularly explained," p. 51, that the Infidel chief (Napoleon) "revelled in blood from side to side of the Papal earth, until, they say, in his wars as Emperor . . . . . he brought six millions of
them to an untimely grave." Thus we have the beginning as well as the end of this portion of the Sign: on the one hand, it is that of six million slain, with their Head falling lifeless on the ground; and on the other hand, of six million springing up from their root, "repenting not (Rev. xvi. 9) of the deeds" of their fathers, and taking for their Head one who retains, like themselves, the germ of the original life. Thus "the deadly wound was healed"; and thus L. Napoleon becomes the image of six million.

But the picture is not yet perfect. The "vile person" (le parvenu) was "to obtain at length the kingdom by flatteries." Evidence of these flatteries was not wanting in his re-election in 1851 to the same inferior position; but as no new step was then gained, and that the period is not noticed in prophecy, we need not further advert to it. But in 1852, four years (a fulness of time) after his first election, he is called to the throne by the suffrages of eight million. This number is fully as decisive in its testimony at this point of time, as the number six in 1848:—it is that whereby the imperial election of 1852 is made directly to conjoin, and become one with, the election of 1804 by the four million,—for, again, the mean between four and eight millions is six million. Thus are the great Napoleon and Louis Napoleon shewn to combine in unity; and thus is the stamp of six million prominently and unmistakeably displayed under every view of the Napoleonic age.

We are now to investigate the "name of the beast,"—the Antichrist. This "name," which appertains like the "mark" to the seventh headship—in respect of the "head" being slain and revived, is yet the name of what is otherwise known as the "eighth head," in whom all the powers of the preceding headships accumulate—the great Consummator. And although on the first ground it might have been expected that the "name," as well as the "mark," would be the yield of the sign of the seventh head—6,000,000; it is rather by reverting to the original sign of the "four kingdoms"—666 (this new head being destined to absorb them all), that on
THE SIGN 666.

the second ground we may expect to find it. The sign 666 will thus be found the source of the "numbers"—both of the "mark," and of the "name."

The attention of the reader is here again called to that very singular contrivance of symbolism, wherein an individual is described as the same as a forerunner, and yet another:—it naturally raises the expectation, as does every peculiarity, that some benefit will accrue from it to the interpretation,—in all probability from an interchange of characteristicks therefrom resulting. The following is one immediate benefit. In chap. xiii. the Great Beast, though described as having "seven heads and ten horns," is measured by "kingdoms," according to the kingdoms of Daniel,—the chief purpose of the chapter being to depict the "fourth kingdom." It would consequently have broken the harmony of the whole piece, to have extended unnecessarily the number of the Heads; and instead of saying "I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death and his deadly wound was healed" (ver. 3)—whereby the Beast is restricted to his original seven heads, to have said "I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death, and another spring up in its place":—not to mention the superior beauty, if available, of the first imagery. This however is exactly what is done in chap. xvii., where the age of the Beast is counted by Heads only. Now this is a very important circumstance; for to have rigidly viewed the revived "Head" as ever the same as the seventh, in respect of being a part of him, in obedience to the tenour of the figure in chap. xiii., would have been to remain hopelessly in the dark, so far as regards the object we are in search of—his "name." It is essential to this object that the "healed head" be regarded as an "eighth," as in chap. xvii. But how can this be done if the imagery of chap. xiii., wherein the name is given, does not permit it? We answer this objection thus. There is a link between the scenery of chaps. xiii. and xvii. in the words (xiii. 18) "for it is the number of a man" (the man), by the help of which the reader is enabled to step across (as it were) from the measurements by kingdoms to the measurements of chap. xvii. by heads,—the "man" spoken of being evidently a
Head of empire. The same may be said reversely, of the expression (xvii. 11) "even he is the eighth, and is of the seven"; whereby a commentator is enabled, should his argument require it, to consider the mention of an eighth head in this place as not irremediably overruling the original constitution of the Beast, with "seven heads."

Now why are we thus anxious to regard the Beast, when resuscitated, as an "eighth" Head of empire? It is because in nature, and therefore in the mystical constitution of numbers, the "eighth" is (we repeat) the same as the first; and consequently, in the sign 666, from whence the number of the "name," as well as of the "mark," is to proceed, we are invited to take in the way of exchange its first term (seeking it out as best we may) as the true root of the name we would obtain, in the same manner as "six-million"—its seventh expansion, is the root of N.P.L.N—the "mark";—to examine the foundation stone of the building, as being the same in fashion as the "chief stone of the corner." This proposition (be it remembered) is in agreement with every historic illustration of the Beast we have met with, which has ever pointed to the "Head" that appears at the end of the bestial reign, as the chief and (as it were) first of the line, and exponent of the system; as being in these latter ages the child of a long gestation of the Antichristian church, who collects into himself every principle of evil that had marked his sacro-secular course from his birth; and who comes, as true head of the entire beast, last, as in the natural birth, into the world. Observe:—if he, being the last of a series, is still the first, it is clear that he must include in himself the whole series:—does not the last note of the descending octave include in itself the preceding seven? Observe further on this point that the "eighth" is said in the text of Rev. xvii. to be—not, of the seventh (as virtually in the imagery of the chap. xiii. he is) but—of the seven: from whence it results that he must be, as "eighth," the first also; for he could not possibly be any unit of the series other than the first, in obedience to any natural rule that can be suggested.

As regards the opinion here expressed of the position in
history, both moral and physical, of the Antichrist, we are glad to find an eminent writer of the present day taking the same view:—*

"Thus Origen describes 'the Antichrist' as containing within himself all evil, culminating and concentrating in him, the very child of the devil, in like manner as all goodness in the Son of God." "Distinct mention of 'the Antichrist' does not occur in the Apocalypse, yet he is represented throughout under a variety of figures,-according to the varied aspects of evil which he assumes. The Scriptures which speak of Christ, speak of the Antichrist also." "It may be the case that such mention of a person would be inconsistent with the historic or prophetic character of this Divine book, but that the individual unseen, that incarnation of evil which is to be, supplies the symbols, and is, in fact, contained in them." "This opinion of the individual Antichrist . . . . . . might seem almost implied in that gathering to a head of all wickedness for a little season at the end of all things." "The Patristic opinion of Antichrist has been laid down by some persons to be this: that this mysterious principle of evil, working in great multitudes of men, will at last be developed in a head or leader; that of this there are continually occurring minor fulfilments, as shadows or types going before, of evil gathering and affecting whole nations, and then appearing concentrated in a person."

Concluding then, from these views of the final Antichrist, that it is nothing preposterous to consider him, though named the "eighth" emphatically, as the head and exponent, and thereby the quasi-first of a series of seven; the one to which all the rest contribute and converge; what (we ask) is the first term—the root—the original thought of the sign χρς? This is the grand difficulty:—and it is a difficulty which (as the writer believes) human reasoning would never have surmounted—if even it had recognised its existence; but which is at once solved for us, as soon as presented, by the "varia lectio" of the "number of the beast," accidentally (if the word be not blasphemous) preserved in Griesbach's New Testament. Let us be reminded that, as 666 is a sign, so its original conception must be extracted as a sign: also that, in obedience to the general framing of the Revelation, the sign we seek must be exhibited in three parts,—for (as Professor Stuart observes) "three stands conspicuous in the whole plan of the Revelation—is an indelible stamp on every part of the production":—also that these three parts

* Williams on Apoc. pp. 415, et seq.
must be understood in triunity, in agreement with the form of the parent 666. It was observed, when speaking of the text (ver. 6) "his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven," that its tripartite form not only is in consonance with the book of Revelation generally, but may be recognised in the common practice of the world; both of which authorities equally determine, that of these parts one is to be held of superior rank to the others, from which the others commonly proceed as recipients of its peculiar grace. And further it was observed, that there are ever two ways of expressing these signs, depending upon whether they are addressed quiescently to the eye, or actively to the ear; if to the eye, that the more important portion—the residence of power, is placed in the middle, having the others one on either side, either placed indifferently, or according to some byelaw; if to the ear, or if seen in action, that this same portion becomes a leader, and first expressed, of the series. Thus in the well known sign of the Christian life—"faith, hope, charity;" if, instead of being addressed to the ear, as here it is, it be addressed to the eye, the "cross" of faith—the source of all other virtues, has its proper place between the "anchor" of hope, and the "heart" of charity. And in the instance above mentioned—"His name and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven," the name—the source of all good to the church militant on earth on the one hand, and the redeemed in Heaven on the other, would be placed in the centre, like Christ on the cross between two malefactors, if exhibited like this last, as the sign of Redemption.

Scripture offers as many illustrations as we could wish of this constructive rule. "Balaam taught Balac to cast a stumblingblock before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed unto idols, and commit fornication" (Rev. xi. 14): the tripartite expression is here addressed to the ear. So likewise in the following text—"measure the temple of God, and the altar, and them that worship therein" (Ib. xi. 1). So likewise in the following—"the dragon, the beast, and the false prophet." (Rev. xvi. 13.) So again in the text—"the spirit, the water, and the blood." It must be evident in each of these instances, that the first term is the source of
power, or it is the external shell, of the other two; and that if the three terms of either were fashioned into a visible sign, the one which is first would hold its place in the centre. Every one must perceive the significant difference of position of the chief term, in the scriptural expression "απὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ερχομένου" (from Him which is, and which was, and which is to come: Rev. i. 4)—from what it holds in the Heathen expression relating to the same subject—"εγώ εμί παν το γενονός, καὶ ου, καὶ εσομένου" (I am every thing that has had being, and that now exists, and that shall be)—the former representing an active state—God conferring benefits upon His people; the latter a still state—that which is proposed as an object of contemplation. But above all we should notice the thrice-holy name—"the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost"—an expression which sets forth the fulness and perfection of Deity:—if it were desired to convert this appellation into an object suited to the eye of contemplation, it would be necessary to treat it in the usual manner:—for the Eternal Father sits supreme on His throne in the centre of His creation, and His Almighty power co-operating with eternal Love—the Holy Spirit, begets the Son, to whom He assigns the post of power on His right hand.

Now it is obvious enough that iota (10) and stau (6) are the ingredients of the sign we are called upon to construct, or to investigate, and we have to do it in the use of these materials, in observance of the above invariable rules. Every instance of the use of either the "ten" or the "six" by the Antichrist is to be regarded as usurpation: they especially represent the Creator, and the most excellent of His works the "Son of man." Of greater reason therefore our undertaking must be guided by the last-cited instance of tripartition, in conformity with the pretension of the Antichrist set forth in Scripture to appear as God himself. The "ten" and the "six" must be placed collaterally with each other, the "ten"—the source of power—on the right hand; and of these is begotten the "sixty"—the Son, to which is given the place of honour on the right hand of the "ten." Thus the "ten" sits supreme
between the "sixty" and the "six," and the sign is complete. We have not here a legible number: it is a sign—60.10.6 ($\xi\varsigma$), the scriptural history of which, so far as it goes, has been given in the prefatory address. If other views may be imagined of the right method of putting together this sign, at least we cannot be much in error in taking for our guidance the marvellous feature of the Antichrist we have chosen, as described in both Jewish and Christian prophecy—that of his aiming to sit in the throne of the Most High God; and which seems to be ever mentioned as the highest summit to which human pride and wickedness can attain. The number $\xi$ is the individual Antichrist, and—as "the Son," takes his place on the "right hand of power," being the "first-born among many brethren," "le fils aîné de l'église." And if, as "Son," he is the head, so also in the like capacity is he the issue of the whole Antichristian system: and the "i" and the "s" become respectively the principles—energizing and energized, of that system.

This sign, when viewed in the light of its impious results, conveys the idea of the sacro-imperial authority of man (10) taking to itself as a means the Word of God (6), and producing the hypocritical "beast"—violence and piety combined; wherefrom comes forth, at the end of "times," the "man of sin" (the 60)—destined to wield with all its force the system from which he springs. Or we may vary the idea by saying, that the ruling motives and maxims of the world ("ten") place Christ ("six") on their left hand, and Antichrist the supplanter (the "sixty") on their right;—religion on their left hand, and pretence and hypocrisy on their right. But let us not indulge too long in this roving sort of observation:—that which alone we contend for is, that the numerical sign $\xi\varsigma$ (60, 10, 6) is the produce of a just analysis, exhibiting the first exercise of thought—the first operation, in the construction of the great sign $\chi\xi\varsigma$ (600.60.6); differing from it mainly in this—that the energizing concealed principle (10) of the greater sign, is here brought out to view.

Now, how to read off this sign?—This is the last and most difficult step of all. We know of a certainty by this time,
that to read off the active Antichrist, the terms of the sign must be transposed, and appear in the order 10.60.6; but the question is—by what legitimate process can this form of the sign be converted into a single number, so as to be capable of rendering the name required? Here the writer will deem it best to introduce at once the chance discovery he made six years ago, and given in vain to the world in his pamphlet.

Let us then suppose the number 1066 to be the consolidated substance of the sign 10.60.6 (\(\xi\)). The following result is obtained from a comparison of its numerical value, with that of the name of Louis Napoleon:—

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & 30 & N \\
o & 70 & \alpha & 1 \\
v & 400 & \pi & 80 \\
\iota & 10 & \omicron & 70 \\
\upsilon & 200 & \lambda & 30 \\
\epsilon & 5 & \omicron & 70 \\
710 & \nu & 50 & 356 = 1066 = \xi \\
\end{array}
\]

Now as to the process by which this discovery was lighted upon, and which is given in the pamphlet, it is no more worth the mentioning than would be what may have suggested the true answer to a charade. The process of defending it as the thing intended is the important matter; and we can only hope that what may be advanced on this account, may not appear inordinately fanciful; bearing in mind, as we are bound to do, that the sacred enigma is altogether an appeal to the imagination. As to there being an error in supposing the sign 10.60.6 to contain designedly the name indicated, the writer cannot admit the thought for a moment, however unskillful he may have been, or may further be, in its treatment. In it, he says, with the utmost confidence, the name of L. Napoleon as a black diamond is purposely enshrined. Let any one accustomed to calculate chances say, what were the odds in favour of, or against, a person finding the name of Louis Napoleon in a numerical sign such as this, under any reasonable and defensible management of it; having moreover been led to the search by other forcible considerations, a search wherein the failure of a single unit would annul the
value of the whole speculation; unless the sign were really constructed with reference to this name:—the chances, we believe, were at the least six millions to one against the finding.

In defence then of the number 1066 as the true practical reading and individuality of the triune sign 10.60.6, be it remembered, in respect of all tripartite signs whatever, that the part entitled to the central, or the leading, place (as the case may be) is always to be considered the source from whence emanate the qualities that distinguish the whole,—the fountain of that life by which the parts are animated; and the consequence is, that in combining the several parts of the signs into a single expression, the leading part (or Head) undergoes no change, whereas the other two are thrown together into one. Thus in reading off the sign over a shop door, e.g., "Jeweller, Payne, Silversmith," as thus—Payne, Jeweller and Silversmith, Payne stands alone, whereas the other two are thrown together into a mass, by the help of the interpolated conjunction "and": the equivalent of which interpolation, in the management of the sign 10.60.6, is, that the 0 is cast off from the 60, without affecting its value; but whereby the terms 60 and 6 are conjoined: this first step produces the form 10—66. If Queen Victoria sits on her throne, with the Lords on her right hand and the Commons on her left (as 60.10.6) there is presented the most complete Image (i.e., sign) of the British Constitution. What meets the eye is "Lords, Queen, Commons"; but what meets the ear is "The Queen with her Lords and Commons"—as 10—66:—in which process, as before, the two side pieces are so united, as to form (as it were) the train, and the evidence of the Queen's majesty. So it is with the sign 60.10.6, as converted into 10—66: and it may be viewed morally as an image of the Bestial rule—(taking into its service the agencies of duplicity, false sanctity, lust of power, expediency, and the)—Whole train of vanities.

Lastly, there is the attribute of unity in the original 60.10.6, as likewise there is in all the above illustrative signs: the two terms 10—66 are therefore simply to be joined together, being (as it were) the syllables of the name.

If the reader should find it difficult to accept this very
important step in the development—the conversion of the sign into a bipartite expression, let him call to his aid the following sentences from Holy Writ, descriptive of signs of exactly similar construction:—"I saw the Lord sitting upon his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him on his right hand and on his left." (1 Kings xxii. 19.) Here the "host of heaven" is one single body, although in the sign it is divided for the purpose of an appeal to the eye—"I saw," &c.: but the word of the Sign—its enunciation, or address to the ear—would evidently be a word of two syllables, or parts, of which "Lord" would be the first, and the host of heaven the second. Similar to this is the following, "And the candlesticks of pure gold, five on the right hand, and five on the left, before the oracle" (1 Kings vii. 49): on which Mr. Williams observes (p. 104)—"multiplicity, or one in many, may be predicted in the temple of Solomon, where the one (candlestick) is found as ten"—in other words, where the twice-five candlesticks make up one:—so that this "one," if the sign were converted into a vocal sound, would be the second portion of a dissyllable word expressive of the whole Sign.

Again, "What are these two olive trees upon the right side of the golden candlestick and upon the left side thereof" (Zech. iv. 11): "these are the two anointed ones that stand by the Lord of the whole earth" (ib. 14); wherein the two side pieces in each sign, corresponding with each other, would clearly—if the whole were converted into an oral expression—form again the latter part of a dissyllable word, the "candlestick," or the "Lord," the first part. So, Christ in the transfiguration between Moses and Elias, and Christ in the crucifixion between two thieves, it is clear are tripartite signs which, in the reading off, would form dissyllables, the Lord by Himself forming the first syllable—as in the word Christchurch. With regard to the three last examples, if it should be observed that in each case the first and the third portions differ from each other,—the "two olive trees" as denoting perhaps the Law and the Gospel ministering in succession; Moses differing from Elias in their symbolism; the two thieves in their hopes; so also, we reply, do the
numerical terms 6 and 60. And further, in all these cases alike, there is the same identity of nature between the parts adjacent to the central part, and the same principle of increase generally. Every analogy therefore declares that the 60 and the 6 should be joined together in reading off the Sign.

But further, this conversion of the Sign during development into a bipartite expression is essentially requisite (the Sign being of a Beast whose constitution consists of head and body) in order to bring it into harmony with all we have yet learnt of the "beast"; whose head is ever in the foreground, as exponent of the actual bestial system; and which head will therefore be the first of the two syllables. Now the "Head" is ever "ten." In the original sign 666, the head is concealed; the devil is working inwardly: and the development of the mystery must be the development of the "ten." Thus it may be considered a step in the development to write the sevenfold pyramid as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
6 \\
10 \times 6 \\
10 \times 60 \\
10 \times 600 \\
10 \times 6000 \\
10 \times 60000 \\
10 \times 600000
\end{align*}
\]

a method indeed which not only has the advantage of unmasking the inworking fiend; but the additional advantage of making more conspicuous the solitariness of the apex 6, representing Cyrus—the "Shepherd of the Lord," uncontaminated apparently by the "ten"; and to whom—though a "beast" as head of a heathen kingdom, "a man's heart was given." (Dan. vii. 4.)

This form of the pyramid (we may observe in passing) suggests another view of the place of the Antichrist in the system,—or rather, of the remarkable description given of him, "he is the eighth and of the seven." We have found his individuality to be expressed as 60 (10 × 6), which is also the numeric designation of the power of Alexander. May it not then be, that although as "eighth"—i.e., of a numeric system, he coincides with Cyrus, yet as one "of the seven"
which may be viewed as a reference to character, he coalesces with Alexander? There is no objection arising from the mystical nature of No. 2, but just the contrary, to the Anti-christ's holding personally that place in the series; for Pythagoras says of this unit, that it exhibits the first decline from perfection.* It would be a great hazard to say of the solitary "six"—the sign of excellence, and essential apex of our pyramid, that in its application to Cyrus—the Shepherd of the Lord (Is. xliv. 23) it was intended to convey reproach. The reproach is in the "ten" of worldly ambition. The "six" and the "ten" in union—as an expression of human character, will represent the combination of heavenly with earthly principle: of religion with ambition, the Church with the world, Jerusalem with Rome—which has ever been the peculiar characteristic of the "Beast." In illustration of this, we have seen in the preceding pages—of this very No. two of the series, Alexander—that he could undertake to defray all the expenses of God's worship at Jerusalem, and yet could crucify two thousand hapless prisoners of war, in one day, along the sands of Tyre. Miserable combination of Divine and worldly principle! Of this chieftain's headship it is specially said (1 Mac. i. 9) that in those days "Evils were multiplied in the earth"—in remarkable agreement with the symbolism which assigns to those days the first appearance of the "ten," as though they witnessed the first appearance of imperial degradation. Of the "kingdom" of Cyrus however, we are to remember that it was of those "inferior" to Nebuchadnezzar's "kingdom"; and this may probably be explained by saying, that his empire (6) to which he was called by God, and which was distinguished by the possession, as a principle, of laws—like the Divine laws—that "alter not"; yet—consisting of Medes and Persians (a suspicious numerical compound) wanted the unity as well as the universality of the Assyrian's kingdom.

Let us return. The head of an animal (we repeat) is always accounted to have a distinct existence—though con-

* "Dyas est primus recessus a Deo, . . . . quia primum ab unitate recessum exprimat. . . . . Non immetit a veteribus hic divisionis in omni disciplinâ censetur numerus." (Kircher, 248.)
joined with the body. Thus the figure 10—66, viewed in a
good and its most true sense, is as complete a numeric expres-
sion as it is possible to conceive of Christ-Church; and
equally perfect it is, in its usurped application, to express
that power of the Antichrist which is virtually denominated
the "dragon," with "the beast and false prophet" (Rev.
xvi. 13), in each case the compound power being made up of
the inspiring Head, and the instrumental body:—in other
words, the head is seen in the forefront of the host belonging to
him. And thus the number 1066, which is arrived at by
simple collocation (for there can be no continuance of separa-
tion of the head from the body), offers itself as the true
concentrated form in which it was designed that the original
sign should become capable of yielding a "name"; and
which name is thus arrived at, as a flower from its bud, by
the following successive stages,—first 60.10.6 (.lv), secondly
10.60.6, thirdly 10.66, and finally 1066.

There are various points arising out of the statements of
Scripture regarding the Antichrist, which offer a collateral
support to these views. In the first place, it might have been
anticipated that, in the construction of his name, the idea of
multitude would be conveyed. We may be sure that no indi-
vidual stands invested, in the eye of prophecy, with solely his
own interests; that no "Head" of the beast is regarded apart
from his "kingdom," no "Angel" of a Church apart from
the spiritual community confided to his care. Even the man
Christ Jesus is intelligently viewed only as the Head of His
Church, which is His "body"; whence the multitudinous
acceptation, frequently, of the word "Christ" in Scripture.
The Antichrist therefore, as the great exponent of the Anti-
christian system—and herein necessarily a symbol of multi-
tude, must be viewed as enshrined in a host; and the host,
consequently, should supply his designation. Hence the
several elements 60.10.6, conveying the idea of plurality and
increase, and bringing into view its means, are just the sort of
elements we might have expected of that sign, of which 1066
is the individualized form.

Again the great feature of the Antichrist, as pretending
to sit in the very midst of the throne of God (Is. xiv. and 2 Thess. ii.) might be expected to find its reference in the composition of the name; and we would ask—have we not a perfect representation of this idea in the figure ξε (1066); the materials of which, in the first place, are purloined from the treasury of heaven; and in which the ξ—the dread individual, may be seen seated as if in the midst of the heavenly throne.

We must venture a few more words on a point of prophetic resemblance just now adverted to:—the immense importance of the subject must be our excuse. The leading outline of Chap. XIII., which issues in the appearance of the “man of sin,” is this—that a “Beast” rises from the sea, to whom the “Dragon” gives power and great authority (v. 2): and to this beast—after revival from death—the “False prophet” (v. 11—as compared with ch. xix. 20) contrives to bring the inhabitants of “the earth” (v. 12) under subjection. The chief personages of the scene are then the “Dragon,” the “Beast,” and the “False-prophet”—a trinity of persons elsewhere spoken of (xvi. 13) as “unclean spirits,” who joined in a nefarious league and combined endeavour to produce a certain single result (ib. 14)—the result stated in v. 16, in the words “he (the angel) gathered them together into a place called Armageddon.” It is important to observe this, and to be convinced that the power

* If further illustration be wanted of the importance assigned of old to the central place of the three, and of the use made of transposition, it may be found in the earlier systems of numeration both Greek and Latin. For instance, in Greek, anciently (vid. Enc. Brit. voc. “character”) I stood for one, II for five, Δ for ten; and when the parts of the sign II “encircled” another letter, it increased the value of the inclosed letter five times:—thus ΔΙI signified fifty. So CX in Latin used to stand for 1,000—a mark of somewhat similar construction. ICI denoted 5,000, and CCIΩ 10,000, “ad imitationem Graecorum” (Kircher 21). CM was another mark for 1,000: also CCM—a good example between them of transposition. Another was CIΩ: and its half (its root perhaps) IO was 500 (ib. 30). Ingpen in his “Secrets of Numbers” mentions (speaking of the number five) that “Five is termed Signifer;” or Standard-bearer, because placed in the middle of the nine units, with a host on either side; and that it contains consequently more than common excellence.”
exercised by the three is one in object and effect. Now the sign 60.10.6—or rather (when adapted to the ear) 10.60.6, is (we repeat) the perfect numeric image of "the dragon, the beast, and the false prophet"; the "dragon"—the source of power, and god of the bestial idolatry—being the "ten"; the "beast"—θηριον the adversary of Ἀρνιον, receiving inspiration from the other two and so becoming their compound Image—being the "sixty"; the "false-prophet"—pretending to be invested with the powers of Christ, "two horns of a Lamb," in the exercise of both temporal and spiritual rule (vers. 12, 13)—being the illustrious "six." The most perfect illustration of this blasphemous trinity, in respect of its conformation, is the Most Holy Trinity, whose sceptre it would pretend to wield,—the terms "the dragon, the beast, and the false prophet" exactly corresponding with the terms "The Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." But as the power of the three (we say) is one; and as the "three" thus considered as a power are to be viewed in the singleness of triunity; it is evident on this ground alone, were none other at command, that the 10.60.6 become 1066,—a figure in which all the lineaments of the three, though blended together, are distinctly preserved; while their qualities and separate offices are practically combined. Hence (as said before) in χξς (666) we behold the wide spread church of Antichrist—the apostate nations of Christendom, subjects of the "beast"; and in ξς (60.10.6), resident (as it were) in χξς, may be discerned the ruling authorities of its malignant "kingdom"; of which authorities again the ξ (60)—the "head over all things to the church"—of whom that recreant church says "του γαρ και γενος εσμεν" (that is to say) with whose name we are sealed (xiii. 17)—is the manifested "man of sin."

Yet another word on the statement that 10.60.6 becomes naturally 1066; for in truth, as this is the ultimate result at which the whole argument aims, it would be folly to omit any possible point of view in which it may be regarded. Now be it repeated that the original sign 60.10.6 is not a number at all,—that its parts have no combined relation to each other, as have the parts of the larger sign. And further
we have just brought these figures together separately, each with reference to a separate object. Yet with them, as materials, we are required to construct a name—the name, consequently, so including them all. It will help us in this undertaking, indeed it is evidently the right thing, to regard these figures not so much as numbers, as numeric objects—objects stamped with numeric characters,—for instance, as bars of different metals and different lengths—silver, brass, and iron:—or (what indeed they are) as authorities of different rank and power. Now, if an artisan should be directed to put together the bars supposed, in such manner as to represent them as acting in triunity, would he think of fusing them together, and of dividing them afterwards into three homogeneous pieces?—Certainly not. This would destroy the distinctness—an essential feature, though it might effect the state of combination. There must be not only co-operation in the parts of a tripartite sign, but the distinctness of nature must be preserved which marked them in their separate state. Each part must remain responsible for the presentation of its own native qualities. And if this be so, it is surely no difficult hint to take, that numeric figures brought so unconnectedly together, presenting no immediate arithmetical relation to each other—though said to be complete as a sign, must be placed in combination by methods applicable to other materials than numbers. As the "United Kingdom," one in power, is yet to be recognised distinctively as containing within itself England, Ireland, and Scotland; so these figures must be exemplified in the distinctness belonging to triunity; and, as Dean Trench says somewhere of certain words, "conjungi non confundi debent." We submit that the figure 1066, wherein the chief parts are united by a simple juxtaposition, but in observance of such other considerations as we have indicated, fulfils completely these conditions; while it fulfils likewise the great object of the contrivance, in furnishing a numerical expression which contains the all-absorbing name. *

* Let us accept the hints the learned Heathen have to offer on several points of this investigation. Jennings, in his "Jewish Antiquities" (i. 466) mentions that "The Pythagoreans were used to swear by the
It was at the first view a difficulty of no small magnitude in the estimation of the writer, that the name of the Antichrist number four, which they wrote with ten dots, in the form of a triangle:

as thus, . . . . . —the Trigonon Mysticum of their philosophy.” This is another aspect of the Tetractys sometime since referred to. Kircher in his account of this mystery says, “The number four is in power ten, because by adding together the units 1 2 3 4 you obtain 10—the second Monad, a ray of the spiritual world. By squaring the 10, a third Monad comes forth—(100)—the opening of the great chorus of animated nature. If then you multiply 10 into a third Monad, there arises the cube, or solid body—the repertory of all things that are objects of sight, and to which attach the conditions of substance, quantity, quality, and place.” “Tetractys therefore is found in all things; and rightly it is said to contain all things, since the number four, being in power ten (the most perfect of numbers, and beyond which number does not exist) is the image of all things; and is consequently the emblem of God’s Providence, and the immensity of creation.” (P. 260.)

It is a remarkable circumstance that, among the marks in use among the ancients to express 1000, is found the ω; and we cannot but express the opinion that, although this letter came in time to signify 800, it really means 1000 in the phrase “I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last”—a phrase probably employed by the Deity as an expression in common use. At any rate it meant the “last”; and the last of all numbers in the Pythagorean philosophy was 1000. This consideration opens to view a peculiar coincidence—may we not call it affinity—between the chief objects of worship in the false and the true religions of ancient times: for whilst that Object among the Jews was Jehovah—the incommunicable Name, the chief Deity among the Heathen was written ΙΑΩ—the ruler of heaven (celorum princeps) pronounced (despite of its appearance) very like to Jehova. “ΙΑΩ non nisi ex nomine Dei tetragramato contracto, corruptoque, originem invenit, quo Jovem innuebant, quasi dicereunt Jova, aut Jehovah.” This Deity gave his name essentially to the principle we have been describing of the Tetractys:—and now let us observe the construction of this name. It is compounded of Α and Ω “the first and the last” of numbers, to which is prefixed Ι—the denarian Monad, the number significative of present sustentation and multiplication. Compare with this sign the two expressions in Rev. i. 8 (a repetition one of the other)—“I am Alpha and Omega, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come—the Almighty.” (We leave out the words “the beginning and the ending,” as they are rejected by Griesbach as spurious: they certainly clog the sentence.) In each part of this double passage there are three clauses exactly corresponding —“I am” is the first, corresponding with “which is”: the rest in each
should be a double name—Louis Napoleon. It will seldom happen, however, when in the right track of truth, but that are plain enough. Now IAO is the Deity in action: but if we transpose the sign—as thus AIO, it is impossible to imagine a more exact reflection than it will exhibit of the description given in the Revelation. The following remarkable words, corroborative of the view of a common origin between IAO and Jehovah, occur in Kircher (p. 210)—"In nomine IAO qui redemit animam meam" (in the name of IAO, who has redeemed my soul).

The worship of the true God was strangely mixed up among the Heathen, if it did not altogether degenerate into, the worship of the sun. The solar deity was known by the name of Ἀβραχασ (Abraxas)—a name whose letters in Greek, as do those of Μεθυρας (Mithra) of the Persians, count 365—the number of the days of the year. Abraxas was described on medals as a man with a Cock’s head—because of the sympathy of chanticleer with the Sun, and legs of the Scorpion—denoting his fiery rays; and on the reverse side, generally, but sometimes on the same side, were read in combination the words IAO—ΑΒΡΑΧΑΣ, as though written "Jehovah the deity of the Sun." Also there not unfrequently appears on one side of these medals what is called the square, or seal ("sigillum sive quadratum") of the sun—the centre of their planetary system, and represented in numbers by the unit six:—for to each of their seven planets was dedicated one of the units 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 (where "six" is in the centre), and to each of these again three other numbers were attached—naturally allied to the first, and springing out of it; making four to each planet, all held in great veneration. Here we find the number "six"—the chief theme of our exposition, in a strange connexion, as describing the solar deity;—a deity represented by a figure with the crested head of the Cock (Galli caput solaribus coruscum radiis), reminding us of the word "Gallia," and of the remarkable fact that the "sun," in the central Vial of the Revelation, was found to be Napoleon and his times. These are strange coincidences, but a more strange is to come. In the several series of planetary numbers above mentioned, each consisting of four, the first in order of the four being one of the above units—the second was its square: the third was the sum of the numbers in each separate column of a square formed of the contents of each square number, the lines being so contrived as that the numbers in them, whether counted perpendicularly, transversely, or diagonally, should render in every direction the same result: the fourth is the sum of all the forementioned columns, i.e., of all the numbers comprehended in the square. Accordingly, the unit "six" being the first number of the sun, the second was its square (36)—a number held in especial reverence by Pythagoreans, giving its sanction to one of their most sacred oaths. The third was 111—the highest
an apparent obstacle will prove eventually a means of support. This double name has already served to point out Louis power (see the writer's pamphlet) of which the No. 1, the unit of Deity, is capable in the Greek numeration table. The fourth was the famous number out of which this dissertation has arisen—the name of the Anti-christ, 666;—a most remarkable result, and obtained—in unison with the manner of constructing the sign in the Revelation, by taking for it the sum of all the preceding numbers in the system. The following figures are put together from the several illustrations of Kircher:—

SOLARE NUMEN.

"Scuticâ, loricâ, scutoque instructum."

SIGILLUM SOLIS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

=666

=111

These remarkable resemblances to the system of Divine truth as given in Holy Scripture, serve amply to vindicate the belief, that to the Heathen stores of ancient learning we must resort, if we would completely understand the numerical mysteries given into our keeping. Who, for instance, is so dull, as not to recognize the common origin in one system of philosophy, of the "trigonon mysticum"—framed by a triangular disposition of four lines of points (thus conveying the idea of a construction of seven), and so containing ten of these points; and of the "beast with seven heads and ten horns"? But also it may be questioned, from what has been said of the Alektrionomorphic man, whether the learned
Napoleon as at once "horn" and "head" of the Beast:—we propose to shew that it leads to a more complete recognition of him as the Beast of this chapter—the beast slain and revived, involving therefore in himself two periods of power,—or rather (to be as exact as possible) the power of each of two periods. If L. Napoleon, one in the union of his two names in 1066,—a designation which exhibits in its formation the two distinct parts of a ruling "beast," his head, and his body (10—66); if he (we say) represents likewise two spheres of power—his uncle's and his own; it might be expected, in the wonderful comprehensiveness of this Divine enigma, that these two spheres of power would find likewise, by the means of a comparison with each other, their expression in the "name,"—a name being always supposed to be a description of all the belongings of him who carries it. The expressions making up the number 1066 are 710 (Louis), and 356 (Napoleon). As then these numbers are to be viewed (we say) as separate powers—each being the power of the "beast" of the time; while also they combine to make up one power—that of the one Antichrist; it might be expected that they would divide between them the two factors of his numeric name—viz., the six and the ten. The "six" will rightly attach to that portion from whence sprung the original spirit—Napoleon, the "ten" to that portion wherein is evidence of revival with increase—Louis. Let us then detach these numeric marks from the two expressions of power before us:—there remain 350, and 700; the latter—in just accord with the expectations raised throughout this exposition, particularly as regards the double empire—being just double of the former. This, to say the least of it, is strong circumstantial evidence. We may add that, as the Saviour has a double appellation—Jesus Christ, so also it

Heathen, who before the birth of the Saviour had so strong an expectation of His coming as an Universal King, had not also an opinion, arising from sources now unknown, that there would arise in the latter days of the world an earth-born antagonist of this King—a "Man" (v. 18)—a "Man of Sin" (2 Thess. 11), in whom would be collected all the energies of Satan, in the endeavour to frustrate the Divine arrangements for the renovation of our race.
might have been expected the Pseudo-Christ would have; and in like manner as the first portion of that holy name is personal, and the second general, that so also it would be (and we find it is so) with the name of the usurper.

There is another small point to be noticed attaching to this name. The name of this emperor is, in reality, Charles Louis Napoleon:—is this an embarrassment? Let us consider. In being lifted up with the permission of Providence to his present high position, L. Napoleon becomes invested both with the majesty of France, and of the defunct Roman empire. By virtue of the first he is Charles—the name expressive of the first alone; by virtue of the second he is Louis Napoleon. He casts away the first, and the legitimacy on which it rests, and retains only that which expresses the popular will—the name of the "little horn." In accordance with this plan, or with this influence from below, he takes the title of Napoleon III.; and so ignores the interruption which history ignorantly speaks of, of the Napoleonic power. Or (to speak in the figure of prophecy) he considers the interruption a "wound," the times of which he equally represented, but of which he views in "Charles" the natural scab it formed, and which must be cast away. Is this a web of Fancy? Well but the positive rejection of the "Charles," whatever its signification, is a fact:—it is attested as such by no less a personage than the Pope himself, who, when ordaining prayers in his behalf, and when conferring on him the title of "Sacred imperial Majesty" writes only "Domine salvum fac Ludovicum Napoleonem." The same hand of the Church which signed him for Christ in baptism, naming him by the symbol of legitimate royalty, comes forward to erase the obnoxious impression,—thus (however unintentionally) promoting the fulfilment of the prophecy. It is usurpation's parody on the words "Cast out the bondwoman and her son, for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman"—Cast out the symbol of primogeniture, for it shall have no place with that which betokens the revived spirit of licentiousness, and the "free" election of the multitude.
Lastly, we would call attention to the remarkable correspondence in structure, of the sign 60. 10. 6, with the "image of gold" which "Nebuchadnezzar the king set up" in the plain of Dura in the province of Babylon, "whose height was three score cubits, and the breadth thereof six cubits." It must be evident on the least reflection, that these two expressions (60. 10. 6 and 60 by 6) are precisely the same; for in each alike the "sixty" becomes what it is by the operation of a "ten,"—the only difference being, that in the former the "ten" is manifested, in the latter it is not: a difference wherein is, indeed, the pith of the enigma. In both alike the "ten" is the agent of increase:—for if the breadth of the Image had been five, the agent would have been twelve: if four, it would have been fifteen:—it is clear then that the main object of mentioning at all the breadth of the image was, to shew that the ten and the six were in it cooperating to produce the figure 60—the true numeric sign of Antichrist. It has been observed of this "image," that it could not possibly be the image of a man, because of its proportions, which were those of ten in height to one in breadth; or (as applied to the human figure) to one in the length of the foot—for the length of the foot is generally about the seventh of the whole stature; so that, supposing the foot correct, the height should be no more than forty-two cubits. It has been suggested, in consequence, that the proportions must have been those of a pillar. So we shall consider it. And it may safely be believed that it was intended as a representation of the great monarch in the glory of his kingdom, arrogating to himself, through this his "image," the worship of all nations; its substance of gold being borrowed from the "head of gold"—applicable to himself, of the great image of empire, which he had seen in a vision nearly a quarter of a century before.

Now, are we to account of the correspondence alluded to that it was designed, or not? If designed; in other words (for such would be the consequence) if Nebuchadnezzar on the one hand when fallen into idolatry, and Louis Napoleon on the other—both of them describable by the same numerical sign 60.10.6 (or write it 60. I. 6—the pillar being the sign
in Greek for ten) are to be regarded as marking respectively the beginning and the ending of the great cycle of the bestial, i.e., of the Gentile domination, it is the most remarkable circumstance, and perhaps the most important, we have fallen upon in our investigations. The writer feels persuaded that such is the case, and that such is the intended development and issue of the combined prophecies of Daniel and John:—viz., that the pillar at Dura, and the head revived of the Revelation, are to be regarded as Nos. 1 and 8 of the great cycle of degraded human Government, under Gentile rulers, to which these prophets would unitedly call the attention of the Church, in this the day of its completion. But though thus persuaded, he is free to confess there is more of obscurity on the subject than he can hope satisfactorily to remove. He ventures however to offer the following remarks.

The life of Nebuchadnezzar has been invested by Daniel with a peculiarly typical character; and the four chapters devoted to him have, to the writer's mind, the appearance of a long vista, or of a shadow of the brilliant image seen by him in vision, reaching from the day when the illustrious king was declared the "head of gold," unto the day when his Successor in an universal throne—the Almighty King of saints, shall come to reign. To enter into this idea (that is—of Nebuchadnezzar the king, to whom it was given to rule over all nations (Jer. xxxvii.), being a type of Christ on His throne) it is necessary to separate in the mind the two very distinct conditions in which the Chaldean King is presented to our contemplation,—firstly as the "head of gold," the approved of the Lord, and sitting in a throne which the Lord had established (ii. 37); secondly as the idolater, who would compel towards himself the adoration of all "people"; i.e., would usurp the rights of Almighty God. Again it is necessary to give attention to the following dates and the circumstances connected with them. It was in the year 603 b.c. that the great Image of empire was seen and received its interpretation from Daniel; and the declaration regarding Nebuchadnezzar that he was its "head of gold," invested that monarch with the highest terrestrial majesty and glory. It
was twenty-three years after this that the King, by this time corrupted by pride, raises on the plain of Dura an image of gold, as an object for the general worship of mankind. Again it was just ten years after this that we find him cast out to feed with the beasts of the field; in which state remaining for seven years, he is then (b.c. 563) restored to his reason, on his "lifting up his eyes to heaven" (iv. 34); and then was "excellent majesty added unto him" (ib. 36). Thus exactly forty years are consumed in the exhibition of this allegorical scene; and to understand its import, we must examine separately its consecutive portions.

In the first chapter the King is seen to select with great care four of the most excellent of the Hebrew youths, whom he had lately brought into captivity, to train them "to stand before the King" (v. 5)—that is (we presume—judging by the results) to fit them for employment in posts of government (i. 20). It is close upon this occurrence that he sees the great image of empire, connecting his reign with the most distant age of the world—the age now close at hand; the imperial rule descending through a succession of ever-deteriorating kingdoms. It surely must have a connexion with that temper of mind which determined his headship to be of gold, that we find the monarch cherishing, as above, the chosen people of God, and prepared to advance them to power and dignity; whereby it happened, no doubt, that his government was carried on in strict accordance with the best lights the Almighty had as yet vouchsafed to man. Now if Nebuchadnezzar, thus seated on his glorious throne, *given him by God*—reigning universally (so to speak) over man, as Adam over the creatures, was a type of Him who "shall have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth" (Ps. lxii. 8), it must be admitted that the type is a very perfect one; for not only is the unbounded extent of the dominion foreshewn, but the more peculiar characteristic of the government being placed in the hands of the "saints of the Most High" (vii. 27). The Babylonian government was in fact, then, a complete picture in miniature

* See also Jer. xxvii. 5, 8, regarding the source and greatness of his dominion.
of that happy reign, of which it is promised that, in the last
days, it shall be established over, or among, all the nations of
the world. The circumstance of the saintly nation being in
captivity does not damage the type, but rather improves it;—
for not to mention that the saints are ever in captivity while
in the flesh, and cannot while in conflict with error sing
triumphantly "one of the songs of Zion;" it is certain that
the captivity of that age was a state of protection preordained
in their behalf,—as may be inferred from the evils which
befel those Jews who lingered in the land of Canaan,
refusing the asylum thus provided. (Jer. xxvii.) Further-
more, if it should seem unlikely that a king—however
vast and absolute his rule, who could so play the tyrant as to
command the priests of his religion to state a dream he had
dreamed—should be set forth as a type, even though only in
respect of position, of the great King of kings who is to
come; an observation of a modern commentator* removes
the difficulty:—he says to the effect that Nebuchadnezzar
was a sceptic in his own religion, and had sense to see its
vanity and imposture; and he appears to have demanded of
the astrologers this proof of their Divine mission, really
seeking occasion to exterminate them.

Nearly a quarter of a century after this, we find the same
—but now impious king, raising in the plain of Dura the
pillar of gold—the direct image of himself in his kingdom, as
well as (as proved by an examination of its dimensions) of the
great Antichrist of the last days. Herein Nebuchadnezzar
appears as the first Antichrist, claiming to himself the worship
of all "people, and tongues, and nations," as supreme king of
the earth, in like manner as the last Antichrist claims
(2 Thess. ii.) to sit in the throne of God as God. If the one
be a type of the other, as in the present argument is pre-
sumed, we should pay attention to its every feature, especially
that of the Chaldean King's casting the recusant "children"
into the burning fiery furnace—a picture of the trials in pre-
paration for the true Church in the coming day.

Exactly ten years (mark the fig. ten), after this act of

* Dr. Cumming on Daniel, p. 43.
cruelty, the King is informed in a dream (chap. iv.), under the figure of a stately tree being cut down, that the kingdom was on the point of departing from him; and that he should be driven out from men, and his dwelling be with the beasts of the field, until seven times should pass over him; and until he should know and confess that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men. It is to be observed that there is no immediate reason given,—no act of the King's referred to as a reason—for this decision: he is simply informed of the evil days coming upon him. But we collect from the interpretation which follows (iv. 27), that it was because of his sins and his unrighteousness. It is a reasonable inference then, that the sinful state here mentioned was the continuing state of tyranny and depravity of heart, in which he had been seen to erect the "golden image" ten years before. The "seven years" of the bestial state thus become the immediate consequence of the pride which led to the "setting up of the image": they were in fact enfolded in that long-abiding idolatry as effects in a cause—as the eggs of a cockatrice in their dam. Now it is impossible for any one of understanding to view these seven years of the bestial state, as presenting their testimony regarding the Divine government, after the measure and fashion of an ordinary event of history. They are signs. Nebuchadnezzar himself calls them "signs." (iv. 2, 3.) "I thought it good to show the signs and wonders that the high God had wrought towards me. How great are his signs! and how mighty are his wonders!" They typify the seven ages of inferior rule, the rule of the Beast, that should descend from him,—that in point of fact had thus begun in him in the day of Dura; affording unmistakeable evidence that his kingdom, like that of Adam on his fall, was no longer of bright but of tarnished gold.

Furthermore, as the ten years intervening between the setting up of the idol and the king's degradation are given as an exact measure in time of his idolatry, and the prolonged cause of the bestial state that followed, it may be truly said that these typical "ten years" are multiplied into the ages typified by the "seven years"; and that in them we behold the idolatrous virus that had come forth of the "head of gold," spreading
itself throughout the six remaining portions of the Image. Hereby, and not before—according to the imagery, was the whole image contaminated; and that which, aforetime, had only been of "inferior" quality in respect of government, became thenceforward the government of the "Beast,"—as we find set forth in the vision of the seventh chapter. Hereby does "ten" become the chief numerical mark of the imperial degradation; and (as we have before said) in this we may discern the important symbolical fact, that "ten" is the real head in every numerical term subsequently brought into use, descriptive of degraded headship or "kingdom." Representing the fulness of the Duraic idolatry, it may be said to represent morally, in the great Sign 666, the ever-increasing addiction of mankind to the worship of worldly rank and wealth—the golden Idol of every descending age.

But the kingdom is not for ever taken from Nebuchadnezzar: the days of his aberration are shortened. So soon as "at the end of the days" (v. 34), he began to "lift up his eyes unto heaven," his understanding returned to him, and he blessed, and praised, and honoured the Most High: then was his own honour and brightness restored, and excellent majesty was added to him. This is the consummation of the type. This last imagery is an obvious representation of the succession of the chosen nation of the latter days to sovereign rule, on the utter failure of the wild beast's dominion. Nebuchadnezzar the impious, the type of perverted imperial rule, is prostrated as a tree; its boughs are rendered tenantless, its leaves are shaken off, its fruit scattered; but the stump is secured with "a band of iron and brass" (iv. 15)—which (be it observed) are the special emblems in the great Image, of the two portions of the Roman empire; whose binding strength has been providentially appointed throughout its whole length, for the preservation of God's Church. And thus the kingdom is made "sure" to the monarch (iv. 26) in a more righteous day:—that is to say (without figure) the imperial rule of man shall acquire its pristine vigour and glory, when cleansed from the base principles of the Beast which at present reign. As the monarch's returning reason was manifested in holy fear of God, and his returning speech
in extolling the King of heaven; so it is declared that the
government of man, when purged of the deleterious maxims
of the Beast, shall rise to an enduring and ever-increasing
splendour—in furtherance of Christ's holy reign; and to this
work, as the collateral prophecies have explained, the "stone
cut out without hands"—the righteous nation, (whichever it
may be,) shall be called.

Let us now return to the original question, as to the
grounds for believing that the Antichrist of the last days is
foreshewn in the "image" on the plains of Dura, i.e., in him
whom it represented. King Nebuchadnezzar has been set
before us in two distinct forms:—first, as a king of universal
rule, wherein we have presumed him to typify the glorious
King of saints who shall rule on earth in a still wider do-
munion: secondly as the great Idolater commanding to himself
the worship of mankind,—wherein we have supposed him
to foreshadow the great Antichrist to appear. Now both of
these hypotheses must depend upon whether we may find
the means of verifying them, severally, by an application of
the rule that hitherto we have found unerring—the succe-
sion of "seven" terms, and an "eighth" of return:—whether
the Lord Christ can be shewn to be the returning unit
to No. 1, the Babylonian king; and whether the Antichrist
can be recognised as the "eighth" to Nebuchadnezzar the
persecuting idolater. This rule seems to be the appointed
test of the perfection of system; and after the preceding
remarks, its presence ought not to be difficult to recognise in
either of these cases.

With regard to the first, we have only to read attentively
the original dream (vers. 32.4) to be convinced that the reign
of the saints—i.e., of Christ, is the "eighth" to that of the
head of gold:—it is thus given,—

"This image's head was of pure gold, his breast and arms of silver, his
belly and his thighs of brass, his legs of iron, his feet part of iron and
part of clay. Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands,
which smote the image," &c.

Here nothing intervenes between the seventh portion of the
image—the "feet," and the kingdom of the "stone"; which
therefore is the "eighth." The eighth should at all times be
a reflexion of, or at least carry some mark of contrast, or of return, to the first; and it cannot but be conceded in the present instance that the "kingdom of the stone"—or holy nation, is the fitting unit of return to the universal kingdom of Nebuchadnezzar, appointed by God; the more so as we have shewn that the whole septenary series was, at its first appointment, pure—i.e., containing in itself no inevitable tendency to decay; partaking as a body of the purity of its "head." We will go further, and say—on the ground that the "head of gold" was personal (the only part of the image that was so)—that the "eighth" foreseen in the original conception was the Lord Jesus Christ Himself—the individual "Stone," the King of the chosen nation.

With regard to the second question, it is our belief that the prophetic Spirit, foreseeing that "the gold would become dim, and the most fine gold changed"; that the mighty and godly King of Babylon would turn to idolatry, as well as the "kingdoms" after him; thought fit to institute a provisional series of seven types, to meet the too probable case of the failure of Gentile government,—a series in unison with the degraded state at which they might arrive. Of this series—to be recognised as the Reign of the Beast from its typical establishment in the outcast Nebuchadnezzar, the No. 1. is this prime Idolater, numerically described as 60 by 6. After him descend the vitiated kingdoms, typified in the remaining six portions of the Image. And eighthly there is set before us the latter portion of the "divided" kingdom (ii. 41) which in a previous page, we have shewn to be that of the revived "Head" of empire—Louis Napoleon. Whatever may be the right interpretation of this "dividing" of the kingdom—whether the one we have offered or another, it is clearly an operation which takes place in the course of the history of the seventh portion of the Image. Therefore it is we do not find it mentioned in the original description of the dream (vers. 32—4); and consequently it now forms an eighth. In this "eighth" of the series a counterpart is found, exactly suitable to the No. 1,—both the one and the other representing only a part of a reign. From this deteriorated series, unfit to contain the Lord Christ, both He and the Chaldean king his proto-
type are excluded. But here we reach the reason of that remarkable piece of symbolism, the *dividing* of the "seventh term," in Rev. xiii., in preference to instituting a distinct "eighth":—it is that the eighth place, in the first institution by God of the political supremacy of the Gentiles, belongs rightfully to the Great King—the Son not only of David but of Adam, and therein claiming to sit supreme over all the earth; and is reserved for Him in the "future day of His power." A "divided" seventh—giving an "eighth" of prodigious evil, most harmonizes with a *divided first* of pride and apostacy. Yet do we look forward to the time when the terrestrial "Head" of pure and burnished gold shall find his responsive "Eighth" in the great King of *returning* righteousness, as typified in the returning sanity of the bestial monarch;—when the Sun of the Gentiles which rose in Babylon in golden glory shall, after a seven-hour obscuration in the live-long day, break forth again in evening splendour, with beams that are destined to shed an eternal lustre on man's nature, and on a renovated world.

Now it is not, we trust, presumptuous to enquire into the reason—the policy—of instituting this sign, wherein "seven years" of lunatic royalty represent the full measure of the Beast's dominion. It must be evident—if the *Head of Duraic gold* was destined to appear again in the earth in the shape of the *Revived Head* of Rev. xiii.; and if too it was intended to give to the later age a warning of his approach—that it became desirable to institute some unequivocal sign in evidence of his identity. Now by this sign, the Chaldean king is himself *personally* brought down *in type* to the very age in which his second self is to appear:—he lives (so to speak) in all the intermediate ages. He remains, we are told, in the scene, until "his hairs are grown like eagle's feathers (is it not of the Roman eagle?), and his nails like bird's claws" (is it not of the bird of Gaul?)—Dan. iv. 33. He is thus made to supply in type the promise, and foreshew the season of his own reappearing.

Here we conclude our observations. If what has just been stated of the pillar of Dura is not set before the reader
as clearly as perhaps it might be, let him not on that account hastily place it on the list of "remarkable coincidences"—as if it were nothing more. Unless the whole be a delusion, Louis Napoleon is personally the tally of the Chaldean idolater,—the responsive note to him, the No. 1 of the series,—the 60. 10. 6. of the latter days, the realization of the idol 60 by 6, which was set up for the early worship and "wonderment" of the Gentiles.

Lastly, do the prophecies at all explain, by word or type, how the great consummation predicted—of the immediate exaltation of the chosen nation on the fall of the Antichrist—shall be brought to pass? Now we are to remember that the resuscitated head of Rev. xiii. proceeds so closely in his imitation of the acts of king Nebuchadnezzar on the plain of Dura, as to raise an "image"; which we have interpreted to signify an Eastern Empire that he adds to his patrimonial dominions. And it is a natural supposition—if such should be the case, and if he be the 60. 10. 6. of the concluding age of the Beast's "kingdom," that he will erect his "image" i.e., will build his capital—at all times the symbol of empire, in the same plain of Dura, as where the first pillar 60 by 6 was seen. We cannot refrain from recording this as our impression. But it is the final clause in the typical history of the repentant king which brings this magnificent empire under the dominion of the saintly nation:—it is said of this nation that it shall supersede and swallow up not only the kingdoms of iron, brass, and silver, but of gold (Dan. ii. 45)—including (we presume) the territories of all. Hence it results, that this power will enjoy a far more extended dominion than even the original head of gold: of whom it is reported that in his march of conquest he completed the circuit of the Mediterranean Sea. If the question be asked—by what means can it be imagined this great end will be achieved, History has never but one suggestion to offer—the strivings of war, the revellings of the Beast; but we would call attention to some effective crisis in history, to be anticipated from Dan. vii. 18, wherein it is said that "the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever"—seeming to say, that the sovereign power shall be
transferred bodily and at once to them. Thus will Nebuchadnezzar the "Beast"—the present imperial rule of man—be found to have returned to his senses; to have lifted up his eyes from the gross pastures of earthly motives towards heaven; to be accepted again of God; and great glory to be added to him. And thus possibly will Nebuchadnezzar the glorious head of gold, whose kingdom was unrivalled and at perfect peace;—who was a "king of kings"—"ruler over them all" (ii. 37); be finally realised at the advent of Him—his true Successor, whose kingdom shall be from sea to sea, and in whose palaces Peace shall ever reign.

In the course of our investigations the Antichrist—himself a Roman, has been found to respond, in numeric symphony, to the three great characters of antiquity—Nebuchadnezzar, Cyrus, and Alexander—representing the Assyrian, the Persian, and the Grecian "kingdoms":—to Nebuchadnezzar, under the numeric mark of "60," in self-idolizing pride, and in numbering all the kingdoms of the vast Beast within his dominions:—to Cyrus, as the "eighth" term of an ever-descending series, commencing with him the No. one of an only "inferior" rule; and in being as to service the destined instrument for destroying the Babylon that is, and (it may be also) for reassembling in their rightful territories the sons of Israel:—to Alexander as bearing again the impress of "60"; and in "lifting himself up on one (his Eastern) side."

Of this quaternion of conquerors it appears then that three (i. e., Nebuchadnezzar, Alexander, and L. Napoleon) are distinguished by the blasphemous stamp of "60," and one (Cyrus) by the pure "six"—the one who was "lifted up from earth," and to whom "a man's heart was given" (Dan. vii. 4). These four chieftains make up together, consequently, the figure of the four-faced cherubim, having one of its faces of a "man." The figure of the Cherubim, when applied in its widest reference, signified (we apprehend) the

* A very peculiar resemblance subsists between Alexander and the Chieftain of these latter days, in that each is the Gallic (i. e., the Cock-like) Chief. The name of Alexander has the same derivation as Ἀλέκτωρ (the Cock)—viz., ἀλεκτω to guard; and thus does each chief alike fulfil the name of "Lucifer—Son of the morning" (Is. xiv. 12).
“Holy nation,” in united adoration with the many kingdoms of the Gentile world—all standing at their appointed distances around the throne of the Most High. When applied to the various ranks and conditions of men, it described the Priestly order in union with those of every other condition—the princely, the military, the laborious. And in the present instance we presume, in consequence, that the same comprehensiveness and universality is intimated of the “Bestial” power,—brought, notwithstanding, into the service of the Great Supreme (who ever “reigns in the kingdom of men”) by His having raised into man’s estate one of the “four beasts,” to be His representative in the celestial figure, and “the Shepherd of His people.”

The writer has now completed the task set before him, to decipher the “name” which, as appears from existing evidence, intensely excited the curiosity of the early Fathers, and has engaged the attention of a few believers in every succeeding age. He would fain avoid appearing so thankless, as not to record it as an honour to have been called to unravel this important enigma; yet can he only account it such, if the discovery may be for the benefit of his country:—such benefit as must result to it—in the exercise of holy fear and dependence upon God, from the sure anticipation of the Divine purpose and decree. Indeed he can truly say that he should not have felt justified in giving expression to some of the opinions contained in this volume, except under a sense of duty, which forbids to withhold what is given; and the conviction he holds that whatever is given is intended for the general good. The circumstance of this duty having been assigned to him illustrates a very usual practice of Providence, which so often chooses for its work not only the most undeserving, but the most unprepared, from among the denizens of the age in which the work is to be done. The fact itself of the long withholding of this secret, and of its being impenetrable by human learning, increases the probability, first, that the disclosure was reserved for a special occasion—a day of impending and unlooked-for evil; and secondly, that it would be imparted in such manner as most to have the appearance of a special warning to the people for whose benefit it was written. Let
no man, then, hastily shut his ears. It is possible the design of Providence in thus lifting up Louis Napoleon, may be nothing more than to give to the nascent age the warning of his name. Events as foreshewn in Prophecy might assuredly proceed without him; and he may be destined to pass as a meteor across the troubled sky, affording only a prognostic and a date. On the other hand, we must venture to say, it would ill agree with any portion of Prophecy believed to be fulfilled, and with the successive examples of those mighty ones of the earth—"Heads of the vast Beast"—who before have engaged the pen of inspiration, were he not to afford an unmistakeable and abundant vindication, in the overt acts of his Government, of the use made of his name. To sit quietly on the surcharged cloud is surely contrary to the design with which, by God's permission, the "dragon" has raised him to his eagle throne. And were he through his own in-temperance, or through treachery, to fall quickly headlong, it might be that, even in his fall, the ephemeral chief would act as a conducting medium for the pent up lightning, which (as we undoubtly believe) is destined shortly to shatter the nations.

Lastly, he would wish to address a parting word to his compatriots—not despisers of Prophecy, who, whether accepting his chief conclusions or not, at least believe (i. e., have "understood by books" Dan. ix. 2) that the day of God's judgments must needs be near at hand; and he would invite them to join him in a daily prayer, that God may be pleased to give wisdom and understanding to our Queen, and to all whom He is pleased to call to authority under her, enabling them to rule our Land in righteousness, and in righteousness to determine all our relations; so that if His heavy hand should fall upon us, we may hope it is not because of a national forgetfulness of Him who "rules in the kingdom of men"; but rather that thereby at "His coming," we may be found fitted to stand in His "kingdom"; and be privileged—according to the measure of His grace—to assist in the recovery of His universal throne.
POSTSCRIPT.

It is the remark of some eminent writer—we believe Bishop Newton, that no one has ever made Prophecy the particular subject of his study, without contributing something to its elucidation:—he might have added (as we think) that no one has so done without discovering, in the end, that he had been left in many points to entangle himself in error:—indeed the slightest reflection tells us that the two propositions, under the regulation of Him who dispenses in measure the light of truth, are in perfect accordance with each other. Now before closing this volume the writer feels himself called upon to state, that he abandons altogether the idea he has throughout endeavoured to uphold, of the individuality of the "little horn"; and that the doubt in which he propounded it in pp. 99 et seq. has grown with time into the negative conviction. The "little horn" of Dan. vii. is Romanism, in like manner as the "little horn" of Dan. viii. is the religion of Islam; and he now sees no reason why the former, any more than the latter, should be supposed to lead to a point of consummation in an all-concentrating individual head—the exponent of the system. Again, the "little horn" is assuredly the "man of sin" of St. Paul; and thus the various endeavours he has made to fix these characters individually upon Louis Napoleon fall to the ground. Other people however may think otherwise;—a work on Prophecy cannot aspire to be more than a consultation on Prophecy. There remains that L. Napoleon is the "revived head"—the redoubtable "eighth king" of the Revelation,—the "vile person" of Daniel; but without those spiritual pretensions which seem inseparable from the idea of "the Antichrist." Notwithstanding the above avowal, nothing is more clear to the writer's apprehension than that the
times of *outgoing* of the "little horn" and "man of sin" are identical with those of Louis Napoleon's "kingdom"; and further that—unless the numeric calculations he has given are altogether false—to Louis Napoleon himself will be assigned a large rôle in the introductory events leading to that great consummation. Louis Napoleon therefore cannot be divested of all connexion with the Antichrist—*i.e.*, with the instrumentality (whatever that may turn out to be) in which the spirit of Antichrist may be *finally* embodied; and it is to this view of him that we would wish now to call attention.

We are inclined to lay it down as an axiom, that though there may not be an *individual* Antichrist, there is yet an impersonation of the character (though the persons may be more than one) in some particular age and generation,—which is equivalent to saying, that the *leading actors* in the generation supposed constitute the head of Antichrist; and under guidance of the "numbers" of Prophecy, we repeat the persuasion that that age is the present one. Now in Rev. xvi. 13 is described that remarkable Power which, though *spiritually* of triplex nature, is in action single—"the dragon, the beast, and the false prophet." In that chapter the great undertaking of this league is alone given. But in the thirteenth chapter—the foundation-stone of this dissertation, we have in verses 11 to the end a more detailed account of its operations; and while the dragon, the beast, and (the "horned beast") the false prophet, are the sum of the *various* agencies there named, it is apparent that the secular object is *single*,—shewing that the Power is to be regarded as single. We conceive then the character whom we have throughout named the Antichrist, to be realized in this spiritually triplex, externally duplex, Power. Indeed, how is it possible to separate the *visible* instruments of this Power—the beast and the false prophet? The latter receives his inspiration (*δοθη αυτω*—ver. 15) from the *invisible* dragon, and with it he inspires the beast (*ib.*) urging him to persecution; and yet, even in the character of an *actor* he is the chief of the two, for he is said (ver. 12) to "exercise all the power of the
(other) beast before him." So that, if it were a certain thing that an individual Antichrist is set forth in this chapter, it is questionable whether the "horned beast"—or "false prophet" should not claim to be he, rather than the beast named in the numeric figure 666—but it is to the combined agency (we are persuaded) we should look.

Although L. Napoleon is not the "little horn," it is not to be passed over in his symbolism that he appears in his double name as a head of empire, and a horn of empire,—a circumstance that establishes a strong analogy between him and the great Alexander, who is described in Prophecy as both a head and a horn (vid. p. 92). It may perhaps have reference in L. Napoleon to the constitution of his "kingdom," which is of "iron and clay"; but we cannot find out any intelligible derivation of "Ludovicus."

Finally we conceive of L. Napoleon that he is to be recognised with all confidence in Rev. xiii. in his "kingdom," and in Rev. xvii. in a more personal sense. Also in Daniel, that his "kingdom" is described as the "divided" kingdom in chap. ii., and that his career in long detail is given in chap. xi. Respecting this latter chapter we are to observe, that the descriptions it contains are from the first of individuals; and consequently, that from ver. 21, where the "vile person" is introduced, it is a preposterous notion which some writers have adopted—a notion which presupposes in the prophetic picture a total neglect of singleness and uniformity of design, to imagine, in its subsequent portions, that great conquering Powers—each occupying the ground of History during many ages, are alluded to. In the length of the notice afforded to a single preceding head (vers. 10 to 19), the hint is given, that from ver. 21 all the way to the end relates to an individual—the eighth and thereby the last head.
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