

B52825

.E46

1862

v. 1

HORÆ APOCALYPTICÆ.

HORÆ APOCALYPTICÆ;

OR,

A COMMENTARY ON THE APOCALYPSE, CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL;

INCLUDING ALSO AN EXAMINATION OF THE
CHIEF PROPHECIES OF DANIEL.

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

WITH APPENDICES;

CONTAINING, BESIDES OTHER MATTER,

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

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

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

FIFTH EDITION,

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

VOL. I.

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

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

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

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE
ANTHONY, 7TH EARL OF SHAFTESBURY, K.G.,

ETC. ETC. ETC.,

THIS BOOK,

NOW IN ITS FIFTH EDITION,

WITH THE AUTHOR'S MATUREST THOUGHTS AND CORRECTIONS,

AND THE LITERARY EVIDENCE AND PROOFS

AT LENGTH, HE TRUSTS, MADE COMPLETE,

IS WITH HEART-FELT RESPECT DEDICATED:

IN HUMBLE THANKFULNESS TO ALMIGHTY GOD

THAT, AS IN THE EARLIER HALF OF THIS CENTURY

HE RAISED UP, AS A WITNESS FOR HIMSELF IN ENGLAND,

WILLIAM WILBERFORCE,

SO IN THIS ITS LATER HALF HE HAS SIMILARLY RAISED UP IN THE

EARL OF SHAFTESBURY,

ONE WHO, WITH EVERY NATURAL ADVANTAGE

OF HIGH BIRTH, TALENTS, AND ELOQUENCE,

ALL SANCTIFIED THROUGH DIVINE GRACE,

HAS,

ALIKE BEFORE THE CHURCH, AND BEFORE THE WORLD,

IN THE NATIONAL SENATE OF OUR NOBLES,

AND AMIDST THE LOW HAUNTS OF POVERTY AND WRETCHEDNESS,

IN THE TOILSOME LABOURS OF THE HOME-MISSION FIELD,

AND PROMOTION OF WORLD-WIDE SCHEMES OF CHRISTIAN PHILANTHROPY,

ABOVE ALL OF THAT OF THE MISSION OF THE "EVERLASTING GOSPEL,"

TO EVERY PEOPLE, AND TONGUE, AND NATION UNDER HEAVEN,

BEEN ENABLED TO EXEMPLIFY

THE PRESENT BLESSED INFLUENCE FOR GOOD

OF THOSE EVANGELIC PRINCIPLES,

WHICH IN THIS COMMENTARY ARE SHOWN

TO BE INTERWOVEN IN THE VERY TISSUE OF THE APOCALYPSE:

TOGETHER WITH THE SURE AND HEART-CHEERING PROMISE,

TO EACH ONE WHO IN THIS FALLEN WORLD

HAS, FOR CHRIST'S SAKE, THUS LABOURED, AND NOT FAINTED,

OF A PART IN THE COMING GLORIES OF THE HEAVENLY JERUSALEM,

IN THAT NEW HEAVEN AND NEW EARTH,

PREFIGURED IN ITS DIVINE BEAUTY TO ST JOHN IN PATMOS,

WHEREIN DWELLETH RIGHTEOUSNESS.

PREFACE TO THE FIFTH EDITION.

I HAVE to thank God for permitting me once again to revise this work on the Apocalypse. The impression of its importance has deepened in my mind the more I have reflected on it: most especially in reference to the tendencies of religious inquiry, and belief, which characterize the present time.

When first I began to give attention to the subject, some twenty years ago,¹ it was the increasing prevalence among Christian men in our country of the *futurist system of Apocalyptic interpretation*,—a system which involved the abandonment of the opinion held by all the chief fathers and doctors of our Church respecting the Roman Popes and Popedom as the great intended anti-Christian power of Scripture prophecy,—that suggested to me the desirableness, and indeed necessity, of a more thoroughly careful investigation of the whole

¹ In the Prefaces to former Editions a full and detailed account was given of the circumstances connected with the origin and progress of the Work; circumstances at that time interesting to others besides myself, but of which it now appears to me needless to speak. Suffice it to observe that the Work was primarily undertaken in the autumn of 1837; and that its four first editions,—each one an improvement and enlargement of its predecessor,—were published respectively in the years 1844, 1846, 1847, and 1851.

subject than had been made previously. For thereby I trusted that we might see God's mind on the question; all engaged in that controversy being alike agreed as to the fact of its being exprest in this prophecy, rightly understood: and whether indeed in His view Popery was that monstrous evil, and the Reformation a deliverance to our Church and nation as mighty and blessed, as we had been taught from early youth to regard them. Even yet more does the importance of the work strike me at the present time, when *infidelity* has become notoriously prevalent among our educated men; and even from ordained ministers in our own Church a voice has been raised somewhat pretentiously, with questionings of the truth of Christianity as a religion supernaturally revealed from Heaven, and denial of all supernatural inspiration of the Christian Scriptures.¹ For, supposing the evidence in proof of the fulfilment of the Apocalyptic prophecy in the history of Christendom since St. John's time to be satisfactory and irrefragable, we have herein a proof similarly irrefragable not only of the possibility, but of the fact, of the divine supernatural inspiration of one book at least of Holy Scripture;—a fact annihilative of the sceptic's doctrine as to the impossibility in the nature of things of such inspiration; and rendering more than probable, *à priori*, the idea of divine supernatural inspiration in other of its prophetic books also.

I said, *supposing the evidence in proof of the historical fulfilment of the prophecy to be satisfactory and irrefragable.*

¹ Not, I think, without premonitory warning in this very prophecy that there would be a remarkable outgoing about the present time of the spirit of heathen-like infidelity, as well as of other spirits of deception. See Apoc. xvi. 13, 14; and my comments on the passage, Vol. iii. pp. 496—502, 618—632.

And here of course arises the grand question for solution between myself and the sceptics who deny the fact of any really predictive prophecy of the future in the Christian Scriptures. And what then the criteria by which we are to decide it? I am perfectly willing to accept the criteria laid down by one who has argued out the plea for infidelity with as much ability, and as elaborately and temperately also, as any other of our modern sceptics;—I mean Mr. Greg, in his “Creed of Christendom.” At the beginning of his 4th chapter, on “The Prophecies,” he thus expresses himself. “In order to establish the claim of any anticipatory statement, promise, or denunciation, to the rank and title of a *Prophecy*, four points must be ascertained with precision:—viz. 1st, what the event was to which the alleged prediction was intended to refer; 2ly, that the prediction was uttered, in specific not vague language, before the event; 3ly, that the event took place specifically, not loosely, as predicted; 4ly, that it could not have been foreseen by human sagacity.” Now, as regards the two conditions first laid down, viz. as to the *subject predicted*, and the *time of the prediction*, as unquestionably preceding it,—their fulfilment in the case before us is obvious. † For the things figured in the Apocalyptic prophecy were declared to be the things that were to happen (the grand and most characteristic events evidently, whether in the world or in the Church) from after the time of St. John’s seeing the vision in Patmos; and this continuously, as appeared from subsequent express statements in the Apocalyptic Book, down even to the consummation. Moreover, as regards Mr. G.’s 4th condition, its fulfilment in the case before

us is equally obvious; for what merely *human* sagacity could have seen into the events of that prolonged, and in part far distant, futurity? The only question remaining is whether the predictions were *specific*, not *vague*; and the asserted fulfilments similarly *specific* and *definite* also. Nor have I a doubt as to the true answer being here, as before, distinctly in the affirmative. In fact my own investigations were from the first conducted, and my interpretation concluded on, with the self-same views that Mr. Greg has expressed as to the *definite* and *specific* character which, in regard of this Scripture prophetic book at least, we might reasonably expect to attach to both prediction and fulfilment.

Let me be permitted on this point (I mean in regard of my *à priori* Apocalyptic anticipations, and subsequent researches) to re-state substantially what I stated respecting them, without any thought in my mind of Mr. Greg, towards the close of my "History of Apocalyptic Interpretation."¹ Struck with the manner in which respectable previous expositors had most unsatisfactorily referred not a few of the more important figurations of the Apocalypse to quite different historic eras and events, I saw (it is there observed) that this had arisen from their, alike one and all, assigning a *vague indefinite* meaning to the prophetic symbols; whether on principle (mistaken principle), so as in the case of some, or from ignorance and want of discernment, so as in the case of many others:²—whereas, on the hypothesis of the Apocalypse being indeed a Divinely inspired prophecy

¹ Vol. iv. p. 558.

² E. g. Cuninghame, Frere, Fairbairn, &c. &c.; from whom I exemplify in the passage referred to, and at p. 693 of the same 4th Volume. But the names might be largely multiplied. Dean Alford's Apocalyptic Exposition furnishes a recent and notable exemplification.

of "the things that were to come to pass" in the histories of the Church and world, from after the time of St. John, two characteristics, as it seemed to me, might undoubtedly be expected to attach to its sacred prefigurations: the *one* that the *æras* and *events* selected for prefiguration would be *those of greatest importance* in the subsequent history of Christendom; the *other* that the prophetic *picturings* of such events and *æras* would in each case (more especially if expressed much in detail)¹ be so *specific* and *definite* as to be applicable perfectly and accurately to those *æras* and events alone. Would it not be so in the descriptions or picturings, retrospectively, of such a subject by any superior artist or historian? How much more so then in the anticipative figurings by the eternal omniscient Spirit of God! Hence, I add, a deep persuasion in my mind, as I proceeded, of the duty of noting most carefully every single point and peculiarity in each of the prophetic symbolizations; and of sparing no pains in the investigation of whatever might possibly elucidate them. And then, as the result of researches so conducted, it is observed

¹ Of course, in the very nature of things, as observable in the best human historic writings, as well as in prophetic writings of a higher origin, some descriptions must needs be shorter and less precise than others; alike from the greater peculiarity or importance of the subject described in the one case than in the other, and also with a view to the more effective throwing out into high relief of that which is most peculiar and most important. And, in the testing of the descriptive power and accuracy of the writer, it is evidently the fuller and more detailed descriptions that will be chiefly referred to.

In the Preface to my earlier Editions I remarked thankfully on the fact of the *commencing visions* of the Apocalyptic prophecy being of this character, with figurations singularly characteristic and of many details; and of the immense advantage of this towards a right interpretation of the Apoccalypse. "Ce n'est que le premier pas qui coûte," is a proverbial truth in no little measure applicable here. In consequence of the order and marked connexion of the various parts of the prophecy, the meaning of its fuller and more characteristic figurations having been fixed, there hence arise data, very generally, for fixing the meaning of other less definite figurations connected with the former.

further that the evidence hence arising of fulfilment (*specific* historic fulfilment) of prediction after prediction was altogether beyond what I had even hoped; indeed such as often to astonish me. The figurations of the Seals, when thus elucidated in each and every detail of their symbols,—elucidated very much on the indisputable evidence of illustrative *medals* of the time, never before referred to,—were found to unfold, brief as they are, a prophetic sketch of the successive fortunes and phases of the Roman Empire and Christian Church within it, during the three next centuries after St. John, most singularly accordant with the philosophic history of the same subjects drawn out at large in the two first volumes of Gibbon. Further, (passing over the briefer and less distinctive symbolizations of the first four Trumpets, the determinate sense of which had to be argued in considerable measure from the contexts preceding and following,) a similarly singular distinctiveness of the symbols, when each and every one thus particularly and in detail noted and elucidated, was found to *fix* the meaning of the 5th and 6th Trumpetvisions, with proportionally increased strength of evidence, agreeably with the usual previous Protestant interpretation, to the Saracenic and Turkish invasions of Christendom: and both that of the symbols in the vision next following of the rainbow-crowned Angel in Apoc. x., (especially through the new and extraordinary evidence illustrating it of *allusive contrast*,¹) and that of those of the sackcloth-robed witnesses' death and re-

¹ A kind of evidence this first applied by myself, I believe, in elucidation of the Apocalypse; but which has often been applied by historians, and with great advantage, in elucidation of past history. Its nature and value is sufficiently illustrated by me in the body of my work, before using it.

surrection in Apoc. xi., to fix *their* correspondence as specifically with the æra and grand introductory events of the great Reformation. Yet again, as I proceed to observe, by the *diadem* on the Dragon's heads, as if then the ensign of Roman sovereignty, (a point altogether unnoticed before,) confirmation was added to the usual interpretation explaining the figuration of the antagonistic Woman and Dragon in Apoc. xii. of the last conflicts of Roman Heathendom with the Christian Church at the opening of the 4th century; for just at that time the Asiatic diadem was first worn as the imperial distinctive by Roman Emperors:—and, as I am now at length able to add in my fifth Edition, through the similarly singular and irrefragable evidence of their own diademed coins in the 6th and 7th centuries, as exhibited in Plate XXVII. of my third Volume, confirmation of the truth of the application of the ten-diademed horns of the Beast from the sea, in Apoc. xiii., to the ten Romano-Gothic kings and kingdoms just then established in Western Christendom, in spiritual subjection to the Roman Popes, or Apocalyptic Antichrist, as their common head. Scarce less specific appeared to be other prophetic characteristics of the Beast itself, or its last ruling head, when thus with more particularity than ever sought out in the Prophecy; scarce less specific their fulfilment historically in the rise, history, and character of the Roman Popedom.

Such is my summary, as given in the passage referred to, of the views *à priori* entertained by me when about to enter on the investigation of the Apocalyptic predictions considered as Divinely inspired prophecies; such too, in my own judgment at least, as also there stated,

the satisfactory, indeed almost more than satisfactory, results. Theoretically it cannot but be acknowledged that there is an answer in all this to Mr. Greg's criterion of a true prophecy of the future. The testing of course remains as to the accuracy of the summary so given, and reality of the asserted specific coincidences between prophecy and history. But I have no fear of the most searching investigation on this point; provided only that it be conducted in a spirit of *fairness, candour, and supreme regard to truth.*

I feel forced to make this proviso in the recollection of the many criticisms written on my Book in a spirit very different. Most sincerely may I say with Pascal, that, in my own researches on the subject, the one paramount desire in my mind, ever followed out, has been "the discovery of the truth;" not without earnest and continual prayer to the Father of lights, in the words of our great poet:—

"what in me is dark
Illumine: what is low raise and support:
That, to the height of this great argument,
I may assert eternal Providence;
And justify thy word, and ways, to man."

And I confess to having expected originally that this spirit would have been generally recognized; and, in a measure, responded to by my critics and reviewers. But the event proved in not a few cases to be too much the contrary. Instead of a candid and careful inquiry, 1st, whether I was justified in my *à priori* views as to the intent of the prophetic symbols,—2ndly, whether the facts of history, adduced as in accord therewith, were correctly as I stated them, and the asserted coincidences consequently established between the prophecy

and the history,—instead of this, I say, and of an admission being fairly made of what could not fairly be disputed in my solution of any particular prediction, conjointly with the counter-statement of what might appear incorrect, or more open to objection,—I found that other feelings too often dictated the criticism. Not to speak of authors who had previously written on the same subject, with views different from my own, and who could scarce be expected to regard a new interpretation without prejudice, I had to learn that prejudice was paramount in other quarters also. In certain Reviews, advocating Church principles varying from mine, I saw burlesque sometimes substituted for fair criticism; or else a few incorrectnesses, real or imagined, held up as a sufficient sample of the whole Commentary, without notice of the mass of more important matter which the Reviewer might feel it difficult to deal with; and even actual falsifications made here and there of my Exposition, in order the better to justify his adverse judgment. In other cases, while dogmatically condemning it, the writers seemed to be altogether unacquainted with the evidence on which that exposition was based, or at least thought proper to ignore it. It was deemed enough to denounce Protestant prophetic views like my own, though held by Hooker, Butler, and all the chief fathers of our own Church,¹ as wild, and what had now become antiquated and effete.² And others, again, contented themselves (a very favourite mode this of proceeding) with an enu-

¹ See the extracts given by me in the Paper No. IV. of the Appendix to my 4th Volume.

² “The *wild* notion that the chief Bishop of Western Christendom was Antichrist.” So one Reviewer, a clergyman of the Church of England.

meration of the many varying and contradictory opinions propounded by various Expositors, as a sufficient reason of itself for rejecting alike one and all.¹ (Would our critics in similar manner, on the ground of the many different physical theories of the Universe, advanced in different ages, reject all alike;—the Newtonian, as well as those of Epicurus, Ptolemy, or Des Cartes?)—It is *the evidence of coincidences* between prophecy and history, (as Mr. Greg justly states the case,) of *real, peculiar, irrefragable coincidences*, especially if proved to exist in a continuous chain, (even though here and there a link of the chain may seem wanting or doubtful),² which, on the solid ground of common sense, must ever constitute the true test and proof, 1st, of the supernatural inspiration, 2ndly, of the right interpretation, of the Apocalypse.

But I do not wish here further to particularize, or to recall past controversies. Rather I would wish to express my sense of the advantage derived from some of the earlier criticisms of my Book, alike in the correction of sometimes not unimportant incorrectnesses, and in the indication where my argument needed clearer or fuller elucidation: for certainly, on all main

¹ So not long since Professor Jowett, in his Commentary on 2 Thessalonians; following here in the wake of multitudinous other anti-Protestant critics.

² Said Mr. K. Arnold: "A proof of failure on one point is a proof of absolute failure." What, let me ask, would my readers think if any one, with a dissected map before him, were, on account of failure in one of the joinings, from breakage or other accident, to argue that the failure was decisive, as negating the idea of design in the fittings generally?

How much more wisely Bp. Butler:—"Objectors may say that the conformity between the prophecies and the event is by accident; but there are many instances in which such conformity cannot be denied." His whole statement on the subject, and especially those, says an Edinburgh Reviewer, Mr. Rogers, "on the impression to be derived from the multitude of apparent coincidences in a long series of prophecies, some vast, some minute, and the improbability of their all being accidental, are worthy of his comprehensive genius. It is on the effect of the whole, and not on single coincidences, that the argument depends."

points, not only was my theory left unbroken by these criticisms, but, by the controversies to which they gave rise, and the corrections and improvements which they suggested, made stronger than before. Such, for example, was the result of my long controversies with the late Rev. Kirchever Arnold, of which a fuller notice will be found in the Preface to my 4th Edition:¹ such the result of that with Dr. Keith, on his laboured and virulent assault upon my *Historic Exposition of the Seals*, and of the death and resurrection of the Witnesses. An assault this, let me observe, answered by me yet more fully and elaborately in my "*Vindiciæ Horariæ*:"² of which a Refutation was forthwith advertised by Dr. K.; which however, in the course of the 12 or 13 years subsequently elapsed, has never yet appeared.—The failure of these former attacks on my Book may perhaps be deemed by admirers of the present Anglo-German literary school indecisive of the grand question on which I have been hitherto speaking; and that the result may be very different when the assault is made with the keener weapons of "modern criticism." Most heartily do I rejoice, were it only for the satisfaction of such persons, that Dean Alford, by his pronounced judgment against sundry

¹ Hence a more full and exact inquiry than ever previously made, I believe, into the tenets and history of the Paulikians; and vindication of them as true witnesses for Christ, not only against their Romish impugnors, and others who have followed these Romanists in England; but also against Dr. Gieseler, and his hostile Marcionitic anti-Paulikian theory. All which is now incorporated in the body of my work.

And let me here add, though not so immediately connected with my Arnoldian controversies, that there will be found in my Book, if I mistake not, a more accurate inquiry than by previous writers into the Waldensian history; especially on certain important and much controverted points, on which both Romish and Protestant writers in the controversy seem alike to have been in error.

² Including a very careful and accurate investigation of the history of the broken remnants of anti-Papal protesting Churches at the crisis just before the Reformation.

of my more important solutions in the last Volume of his Commentary on the New Testament, has furnished occasion for my calling him into the arena to test, with whatever advantage this modern criticism may afford, the accuracy of the coincidences asserted by me, and so of the truth or untruth of my Exposition. For hereby not only will the issue be more decisively settled; but the necessary, the *absolutely necessary*, steps towards such a decision, will be set forth before my readers more clearly than may have occurred to them before. And, after Dean Alford, have I not a right on somewhat similar grounds to call on Dr. Arthur Stanley for a justification of his almost contemptuous allusion to my Book, and rejection of its claims on men's belief from any peculiar evidence of truth? ¹

While such have been the adverse criticisms on the Horæ during the 18 or 20 years that it has been before the public, it is due to the cause I advocate to add that, on the other side, many, very many, have been the strong opinions expressed in its favour, more especially with reference to the point which I am now urging, I

¹ In thus mentioning *Dr. Stanley* I have in mind the allusion made by him to my Horæ Apocalypticæ, as well as to Dean Alford's Apocalyptic Exposition, as if each alike fanciful and untrustworthy,—the proofless, and the one almost super-abounding in proof,—in his article in the Edinburgh Review in defence of the Essays and Reviews.

Let me be here too permitted to ask *Professor Jowett's* candid consideration of the evidence drawn out by me from this prophecy in support of the usual Protestant view respecting the predicted Antichrist.

"It is criticism," says he, "that is leading Protestants to doubt whether the doctrine that the Pope is Antichrist is really discoverable in Scripture." So in the "Essays and Reviews," p. 411. It is evidently *modern* criticism of which the Professor is here speaking; for Scripture criticism at the æra of the Reformation, and for above a century and half after it, led the most inquiring minds to the belief that the Roman Pope *was* Antichrist. And I suspect that Mr. J., in regard of this as well as of many other questions, will find on leaning upon what he thus glorifies as modern criticism, that, like the Egyptian reed in the hand of the old Egyptian hierophants, it will pierce the hand that rests upon it.

Of course in any future controversy that may arise it is *this 5th Edition*, as that in which my views and evidence are set forth most fully and exactly, that must be referred to by the controversialist.

mean the sufficiency of its evidence of truth, by men whose judgment could not but be regarded as of weight. From the Preface to my 4th Edition let me be permitted to repeat the names of Dr. Chalmers,¹ and the late Vice-Chancellor of England Sir Lancelot Shadwell.² To which I have peculiar satisfaction in adding the opinion subsequently expressed by the late eminent and able Sir James Stephen; who, after most kindly reading through the greater part of that 4th Edition of the *Horæ*, with the express object, agreeably with a request I had made to him, of judging as to the sufficiency of its evidence, wrote me that in his judgment, if the proof of design arising out of the coincidences there traced out between the prophecy and history were deemed insufficient, all idea of proof from circumstantial evidence must be set aside.—Nor let me here omit to notice the corroboration of the truth of my Exposition from the more or less partial admissions in its

¹ So in a long letter written to me in 1847, very shortly before his death, on occasion of my friendly controversy with Dr. Candlish.

² In a letter to me dated Jan. 1, 1849, after some strong expressions of the interest he had felt in the perusal of the *Horæ*, he thus proceeded. "Every word of it, down to p. 524 of the 4th Volume (3rd Ed.), I have read with deliberate attention; many parts twice, some thrice. And I beg leave to express my entire approbation of the principle of construction upon which you have proceeded: viz. that of giving one uniform continuous meaning to the whole of the Apocalypse, while making each word bear its own appropriate sense; and thereby producing one consistent symbolic picture, consisting it is true of many parts, but all held in agreement together. You have in effect adopted the only rule that can safely be applied either in courts of law, or elsewhere, to the interpretation of written instruments: a rule which I am myself in the constant habit of adopting, and have learnt by experience to be most satisfactory." He then notices his satisfaction at the manner in which out of "so prodigious a mass of materials, collected, sifted, and arranged for the purpose," there had been shown the fulfilment of this symbolic prophecy, "alike in vast general circumstances and in minute particulars:" states that "my view of the *Seals* and of the *Trumpets* carried conviction to his mind;" and especially expresses his delight in my exposition of "*the 3½ days' death of the Witnesses and their revival*," that of "*the seven chiliads*," included.

I feel it the rather a duty to cite thus much from the Vice-Chancellor's letter, because it was his own expressed wish that I should make any use of it that might seem to me desirable.

favour by one or another advocate of each of the three chief counter-Apocalyptic theories within the last few years. 1st, Dr. S. Davidson,¹ sometime Theological Professor on Anglo-Germanic principles in the Independent College at Manchester, and who, both in Kitto's Cyclopaedia, in the Eclectic Review, and elsewhere, had dogmatically pronounced against my view of the prophecy as fundamentally wrong, because of its being on the historic system, and non-accordant with the hypothesis generally received in Germany of a Neronic date, and wholly *præterist* interpretation, has himself since then formally abandoned the Neronic date and *præterist* explication; confessing his final adhesion, both in respect of date and interpretation, to Hengstenberg's curious Commentary, described in the Appendix to the 4th Volume of my Book.² 2ndly, Mr. W. Kelly, the most recent Expositor, I believe, on the *futurist* side, himself an intelligent man, and the representative, it would seem, of the present Apocalyptic views of a considerable section of the Brethren (formerly called Plymouth Brethren), has in his Commentary distinctly renounced many of the chief dogmas of the original Futurist school; and declared his admission both of the year-day principle, and of the truth of a large part of my own historical Exposition of the Apocalypse, as a partial though (he considers) imperfect view of the prophecy.³ 3rdly, Mr. Birks, the ablest and most eminent advocate of an *historic* exposition founded on a different view of the structure of the Apocalyptic Prophecy from my own, and which involves a quite different interpretation of the Seals,

¹ See pp. 566, 567 of my 4th Volume; also my notice of Dr. D. in the Appendix to my Warburton Lectures.

² See my Vol. iv. p. 684, et seq.

³ See the Review of Mr. W. K.'s Commentary in my 4th Volume, pp. 639 et seq.

has renounced that counter-view ; and, both as regards structure, and other points too of minor but not unimportant difference between us, has acknowledged, in fine, his substantial agreement with me.¹

The fundamental point of sufficiency of evidence having been once established, the Prophecy proved in the strictest sense of the word to be a real prophecy, dictated supernaturally by none other than the omniscient Spirit of God, and the truth of my own Apocalyptic Interpretation on main points also established, need I suggest its surpassing importance in other points of view, besides that of proving the possibility, and indeed fact, of Divine supernatural inspiration ?

1st, and as regards the past and present, we must in such case have herein nothing less than *God's own philosophy of the history of Christendom*. For, as there is always a *moral* element in the *Old Testament Prophecies*, (a characteristic of them that has been well urged as never to be overlooked,) so too, quite as markedly, in *this*. In part by the direct expression of the Divine judgment respecting what might be prefigured at the time as passing in the Church or in the world,—whether by a voice from the Holy Place, or out of Heaven, recorded as audibly heard by the Evangelist, or perhaps by the Evangelist's own statements inaudibly dictated to him by the Divine Spirit,—whether, I say, in this way, or through intimations implied in what might

¹ See p. 549 in the Appendix to my Vol. i. ; also the Note p. 192 of Vol. iii.

I may here mention further the encouraging fact of the many Abridgments made of my book, as additional testimonies to the soundness and sufficiency of its evidence of truth. Of these there are three or four in English that I am acquainted with, besides Dr. Cumming's, and that of the American Dr. A. Barnes ; (for such Dr. A. B.'s Apocalyptic Commentary mainly is, notwithstanding the total want of due acknowledgment on the part of the plagiarist;) also one Abridgment in French, and a partial one in Italian.

visibly pass at the time on that standing symbol throughout these visions of the professing Church, the Apocalyptic Tabernacle, God's judgment was here ever clearly shown, indeed inseparably intermixed with the whole of the sacred prefigurations. Many are our Church histories, some of ancient, more of modern authorship; the histories, e. g., by Eusebius and Theodoret of old, and those more modern of Fleury and Dupin, of Mosheim, Gieseler, and Neander, Milner and Waddington; not to add particular Church histories, such as those of the Anglican Church by Hook, and of the Greek and Latin Churches by Stanley and Milman: and, in each, the judgment of the Historian on what he describes is necessarily more or less delineated in his historic page. But all this is at best but the judgment of fallible men. How superior, how inestimably precious, whether in the way of correction or of confirmation, the Divine judgment, as here indicated, on most of the important questions so discussed!—For example how different, and, let me add, how much grander as well as truer, the view here given of God's "education of the world," from what erring man has of late essayed to palm upon us:—in the one its lessons, and the world's consequent advance towards "perfection," (though still, alas, too evidently for the most part lying in wickedness,) being set forth as evidenced in the progress of human art, literature, and science of government, derived from the teachings of Egyptian, Greek, and Roman Heathendom, quite as much as in the higher standard of morals, and knowledge of the divine unity, derived from Jewish and Christian teaching:—in the other (the Apocalyptic prophecy) the two chief lessons of the world's history, as there prefigured, being,

1st, that of the essential and constant working of *sin* for evil; under every variety of age, nation, civilization, circumstance; 2ndly, that of the effectual working for man's recovery from evil, under every variety of age, nation, civilization, circumstance, of God's own *gospel-grace*:—lessons these of the divine education of our world intended not for time only, but for eternity; and not for men only, but for angels: that so "in the ages to come might be made known to them too, through the Church, the riches of God's grace in Christ Jesus."

Further, 2ndly, there is to be considered the light shed by the demonstrated *past* in the Prophecy on its most deeply interesting, but mysteriously shadowed forth, predictions of the yet coming *future*.

For, first, how can we hope satisfactorily to ascertain our present place in the world's calendar, except by marking the several onward stages of its progress, as defined and established by a demonstrated parallelism in their evolution of the successive pages of prophecy and history? Not certainly by the *signs of the times*, considered simply and alone, on which one prophetic school (that of the Futurists) is wont altogether to base its conclusions as to the nearness of the coming consummation; nor again on the ground, considered simply and alone, of the *measure of the evolution of the great prophetic period of the 1260 years*, on which certain other prophetic students appear to me to have too exclusively insisted in their calculations: but on the strength of all the three kinds of evidence considered conjointly, and when shown all to converge to the same result.¹

¹ The point is one the importance of which has much impressed itself on my mind; and I have thought it well accordingly to press and to illustrate it in my present Edition, even yet more fully than in those before. So especially in the concluding Paper of the Appendix to Vol. iv., now first included in the *Horæ Apoc.*

How, again, with reference to the as yet undeveloped future, can we hope to explain the prophetic figurative language concerning it in any way so satisfactory as by comparing those figures with the previous Apocalyptic figurations, the meaning of which has already been unfolded to us in the history of the past? Thus the great Lord Bacon advises the use of the part fulfilled of sacred prophecy in explication of the part unfulfilled; for he was not one, like so many of his modern professed disciples, to despise the prophesyings of Holy Scripture. "The method of this study," says he, "ought to be such that the truth of the events predicted, concerning every age of the world, may be conjoined with each respective prophecy of the Scripture; to the end that it may tend as well to the confirmation of the faith, as to the establishment of *a certain rule and skillfulness in the interpretation of the prophecies which remain yet to be fulfilled.*"¹

Let me here take the opportunity of mentioning that there is in the present Edition the correction of an inadvertence in my former Editions of no inconsiderable importance, concerning the relation of the 75 years, set forth in Dan. xii. as "the time of the end," to the great prophetic period of the 1260 years. Of that period I have from the first, on the strength of the precedent of the 70 years of the Babylonish Captivity, insisted on two epochs of commencement, in association with two correspondent epochs of termination: the incipient and imperfect beginning, as about the year A. D. 530, with

¹ "Secunda pars (historiæ ecclesiasticæ) quæ est historia ad *Prophetias*, ex duobus relativis constat, *Prophetiâ ipsâ, et ejus adimptione*. Quapropter tale esse debet hujus operis institutum, ut cum singulis ex scripturis prophetiis eventuum veritas conjungatur; idque per omnes mundi ætates: tum ad confirmationem Fidei; tum ad instituendam disciplinam quandam, et peritiam, in interpretatione Prophetiarum, quæ adhuc restant complendæ." De Augm. Scientiarum, Lib. ii. cap. xi.

an ending in the epoch of the great French Revolution in A. D. 1790; the other, or complete and more perfect epoch of commencement, dated about A. D. 606, being connected with a complete and more perfect ending about the year A. D. 1866. To which view of the 1260 years I still fully adhere. But, in regard of Daniel's supplemental 75 years of "the time of the end," quite inconsistently with this double theory of the great 1260 year epochs, I inadvertently connected it only with my primary and imperfect ending epoch in A. D. 1790; without suggesting the other possible, and indeed equally probable alternative, of its being a supplemental period to be connected with, and measured from, the second and complete ending of the 1260 years, about A. D. 1866. It is now some years since this inadvertence in former Editions of the *Horæ* was publicly, as it has been often privately, noticed by me. It will be found rectified now in my Commentary;¹ and also, as the Reader will see, in my Apocalyptic Chart.²

Yet one word in conclusion, on the great *millennial question*. As was my duty, I have very carefully considered the arguments in the Bampton Lectures of the present highly esteemed Bishop of Carlisle, Dr. Walde-

¹ See pp. 237—239, and 706—708 in my Vol. iv.

Besides this (which is indeed an addition rather than change) there is no change of interpretation that I remember in my present Edition: save only in regard of the *fallen star* of Apoc. ix. 1; to which, on reconsideration, I have concluded on giving what in my former Editions I spoke of as in my opinion the only admissible alternative explanation of the symbol, instead of the one previously preferred.

² Let me here take the opportunity of observing on the peculiar importance and value of a Tabular Chart, or Schedule, of the interpretation in every Apocalyptic Commentary. For there is such a connexion of one part of this Prophecy with other parts, and order so singularly marked in its structure, that the simple tabular arrangement will of itself be to a certain extent a testing of the interpretation offered, and detector (if such there be) of its structural inconsistencies and flaws. Indeed without this no man, in my judgment, is in a position to publish his scheme of interpretation. There seems to me a want of proper respect in an Author to his readers, when, on a subject so immensely important, he shrinks from the trouble of thus previously testing the truth of what he offers them.

grave, as also those of Professor Fairbairn, and other recent writers on the subject, against the hypothesis of Christ's pre-millennial Advent advocated by me in my former Editions. And I am bound to say that the result of the examination has been to confirm me in the truth of that hypothesis. I trust that the brief review of those publications, given in the Appendix to the 4th Volume of the present Edition, will show that my conclusion in regard to the arguments of these authors has not been formed without due consideration and reason. And let me add that, while feeling strengthened in my belief in the pre-millennial view by the very arguments most recently urged against it, it approves itself more and more to my mind by what seems to me to be its intrinsic grandeur. From the very nature of JEHOVAH the manifestation of the glory of His own attributes must necessarily be the great end, and object, of all his dispensations. "My glory will I not give to another."¹ Nor can I conceive any issue of the destinies of this our world whereby the glory of his attributes as the REDEEMER will be so exalted, as by that of our earth's final regeneration and jubilee following on the gathering round Him, and visible manifestation before the world, of all that have faithfully served and followed the Lamb during the past and still present æra of spiritual trial and temptation;—a multitude that no man can number, out of every people and nation and tongue and age;—arrayed in the likeness and glory, as well as admitted to the presence and the joy, of Himself, their SAVIOUR GOD.

¹ Is. xlii. 8. I have enlarged very fully on this most interesting passage, and especially the governing principle which it announces in the Divine proceedings, in the first Triad of my Warburton Lectures.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO VOL. I.

PRELIMINARY ESSAYS.

ESSAY	PAGE
I. GENUINENESS OF THE APOCALYPSE	1
II. DATE OF THE APOCALYPSE	32

INTRODUCTION.

CHAP.	PAGE
I. ST. JOHN IN PATMOS	51
II. THE PRIMARY APOCALYPTIC VISION, OR "THE THINGS THAT ARE"	71
III. THE OPENING VISION OF THE HEAVENLY THRONE AND COMPANY, PREPARATORY TO THE REVELATION OF THE FUTURE	82
IV. THE MODE AND MANNER, PLAN AND ORDER, OF THE REVELATION	97
V. ON THE ENSUING HISTORICAL EXPOSITION OF THE REVELATION	110

PART I.

FOUR FIRST SEALS, GENERAL VIEW OF	119
I. FIRST SEAL	129
II. SECOND SEAL	147
III. THIRD SEAL	160
IV. FOURTH SEAL	190
V. FIFTH SEAL	203
VI. SIXTH SEAL'S PRIMARY FIGURATION	235

CHAP.		PAGE
VII.	SIXTH SEAL'S SECONDARY FIGURATION, OR SEALING AND PALM-BEARING VISIONS	252
§ 1.	THE FOUR TEMPEST-ANGELS	253
§ 2.	INTIMATIONS OF GENERAL UNFAITHFULNESS IN THE NEWLY PROSELYTIZED ROMAN ISRAEL	259
§ 3.	INTIMATIONS OF INCIPIENT ANTI-CHRISTIANISM IN THE UNSEALED AND UNFAITHFUL ROMAN ISRAEL	270
§ 4.	CONTRA-DISTINCTIVE REVELATION OF GOD'S ISRAEL, OR TRUE CHURCH, OF THE SEALED ONES	296

PART II.

I.	THE HALF-HOUR'S SILENCE IN HEAVEN, INCENSE- OFFERING, AND TRUMPET-SOUNDINGS	321
II.	INTENT OF THE TRUMPET-SOUNDINGS, AND EXPOSI- TORY PRINCIPLES OF THE FOUR FIRST TRUMPETS ..	346
III.	THE FOUR FIRST TRUMPET-VISIONS	365
IV.	FOREWARNINGS OF COMING WOE	386
V.	THE FIFTH OR FIRST WOE TRUMPET	416
§ 1.	LOCAL APPROPRIATENESS OF SCRIPTURE SYM- BOLS	420
§ 2.	SYMBOLS OF THE FIFTH TRUMPET ANALYZED, TO SHOW THE ARABIAN LOCAL ORIGIN OF THE FIRST WOE	431
§ 3.	OUTBURST, PROGRESS, AND LIMITS OF THE FIRST WOE, AS PREDICTED AND FULFILLED	446
VI.	PAUSE BETWEEN THE FIFTH AND SIXTH TRUMPETS ..	469
VII.	THE SIXTH, OR SECOND WOE TRUMPET	480
§ 1.	OCCASION, AND LOCAL ORIGIN, OF THE NATION COMMISSIONED IN THE SECOND WOE, AS PRE- DICTED AND FULFILLED	480
§ 2.	FURTHER CHARACTERISTICS OF THE NATION COMMISSIONED IN THE SECOND WOE, AS PRE- DICTED AND FULFILLED	505

APPENDIX TO VOL. I.

NO.		PAGE
I.	NOTICE OF THE ARGUMENTS OF PROFESSORS LÜCKE AND MOSES STUART FOR THE GALBAIC, OR NERONIC, DATE OF THE APOCALYPSE	533
II.	ON THE COUNTER-STRUCTURAL SCHEME WHICH SUPPOSES A CHRONOLOGICAL PARALLELISM OF SEALS AND TRUMPETS; THE SEALS AS PREFIGURING THE CHURCH HISTORY, THE TRUMPETS THE SECULAR HISTORY OF ROMAN CHRISTENDOM ..	549
III.	§ 1. ON THE ROMAN COINAGE GENERALLY, AS MADE USE OF IN THIS COMMENTARY ..	569
	§ 2. ON THE HORSE WITH THE MARS' HEAD ..	582
	§ 3. MEDALLIC ILLUSTRATION OF NERVA'S CRETENSIC ORIGIN	588
	§ 4. ON THE <i>Διλειτρον</i> , OR BILIBRA, OF ALEXANDER SEVERUS	594
IV.	SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS TO CERTAIN OF MY EXPLANATIONS ON VARIOUS POINTS IN THIS VOLUME STATED, AND ANSWERED;—VIZ.	
	§ 1. ON THE CONTINUED PRESSURE OF THE PREVIOUSLY AGGRAVATED TAXATION UPON THE PROVINCIALS OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE UNDER ALEXANDER SEVERUS, AND AFTER HIM ..	599
	§ 2. ON THE CONSTANTINO-THEODOSIAN REVOLUTION IN SIXTH SEAL	605
	§ 3. ON "THE THIRD PART" IN THE APOCALYPTIC TRUMPETS	610
	§ 4. ON MY EXPLANATION AND APPLICATION OF CERTAIN OF THE APOCALYPTIC SYMBOLS ..	623

PLATES TO VOL. I.

PLATE		PAGE
	THE APOCALYPTIC CHART	119
I.	"JUDÆA CAPTA" MEDAL, AND THE JEWISH CANDLESTICK FROM THE ARCH OF TITUS ..	57
II.	SKETCH (IN PART FROM IMAGINATION) OF THE APOCALYPTIC TEMPLE, OR TABERNACLE; WITH	

PLATE	PAGE
THE ASSOCIATED MOUNT ZION, AND THE ROMAN WORLD SUBJACENT	98
III. THE ROMAN HORSE	126
IV. THE IMPERIAL CROWN AND ROYAL DIADEM ..	137
V. THE GOING FORTH OF A ROMAN IMPERATOR TO VICTORY	138
VI. THE CRETAN BOW	140
VII. THE ROMAN PROPÆTORS' AND QUÆSTORS' EM- BLEMS OF A BALANCE, EAR OF WHEAT, AND CORN-MEASURE	185
VIII. THE EMPEROR VALERIAN KNEELING BEFORE SA- POR, AS SCULPTURED ON THE ROCK OF NAKSHI- ROOSTAM	195
IX. THE DIOCLETIANIC MARTYR'S EPITAPH, AND VASE OF BLOOD FROM THE CATACOMBS AT ROME ..	225
X. THE CONSTANTINIAN LABARUM	240
XI. THE CONSTANTINIAN PHENIX	256
XII. MAP OF THE TRI-PARTITION OF THE ROMAN WORLD	366
XIII. THE APOCALYPTIC SCORPION-LOCUST	432
XIV. KEY OF MAHOMET, ON AN ARCH IN THE ALHAMBRA	446
XV. MARIOLATROUS COINS OF THE GREEK BYZANTINE EMPIRE OF THE MIDDLE AGE	487
XVI. TURKMAN STANDARD OF THE HORSE-TAIL ..	514
XVII. NERVA'S CRETENSIC COIN OF THE HUNTRESS DIANA	588

ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA FOR VOL. I.

- Page 127, line 1 ; for moinously read ominously*
 — *137, Note 2 ; for Valentinian read Valens*
 — *181, Notes, line 12 ; for Theocritus read Theophrastus*
 — *188, line 22 ; for then read than*
 — *256, Add, as Note ; The coins in the Plate opposite are in the
 B. Museum, and have been there authenticated. The
 top coin in the Plate at p. 31 of Vol. iii., which refers to
 the same Constantinian æra, is authenticated by Eckhel.*
 — *378, Note 2, line 9 ; for Note k read Note K.*
 — *442, Note 1 ; for conquest read conquests*

PRELIMINARY ESSAYS

ON THE GENUINENESS AND THE DATE

OF THE APOCALYPSE OF ST. JOHN.

WHEN a Book of any interest or importance is set before us, there are two questions on which we may reasonably wish and expect information, preliminarily to its perusal;—the 1st, *Who is the writer?* the 2nd, *When written?* More especially this is the feeling, if the Work be one that claims to be of *divine inspiration*; so as in the case of the APOCALYPSE. I purpose therefore, in the present preliminary Essays, to answer these two questions concerning it. The *first* is one that has obviously a most important bearing on the Book's *inspiration*, and consequently on its claim to any true *prophetic character*; the *second*, as will hereafter appear, on its right *interpretation*.

ESSAY I.—THE WRITER OF THE APOCALYPSE.

Now on this point a ready answer seems at once to meet the eye in the very text of the prophetic Book itself. For the writer more than once enunciates his own name in it, "John."¹ And the authority which the several contexts imply to have attached to this John,—in one place from

¹ So i. 4; "*John* to the seven churches which are in Asia, &c.:" i. 9; "*I John*, who also am your brother and companion in tribulation," &c.: xxi. 2;

"And *I John* saw the holy city, the new Jerusalem," &c.: xxii. 8; "And *I John* saw these things, and heard them."

the asserted fact of his being Christ's chosen medium for receiving the revelation, and communicating it to the angels, or presiding bishops of the seven Asiatic Churches,—in another from that of his pronouncing a blessing on those several presiding bishops,¹—in another from the prophets being spoken pointedly of as his brethren,²—is such as could scarcely belong to any one named John of less than *apostolic* dignity: insomuch that the very *genuineness* of the Book seems almost involved in the fact of its writer being *John the apostle*. Nor will the corroborative evidence that the Apocalypse itself offers fail to strike the inquirer, (an evidence acknowledged even by the superficial and the prejudiced,) in the holiness and super-human sublimity of the composition.³—Should direct testimony further be sought for, as desirable, the well-known corroborative testimony of *Irenæus* will be found ready at hand to the inquirer,—a testimony express and various times repeated, as will presently appear,—to the effect that the author of the Apocalypse was indeed *that beloved disciple, the Apostle and Evangelist St. John*.⁴ And considering *Irenæus'* own very early era, relation to St. John, and character,—that he was an Asiatic Greek, born nearly about the time of St. John's death,⁵—that he was a disciple of Polycarp, which latter was a disciple of St. John,⁶—and that he was

¹ Apoc. i. 4; "Grace be unto you and peace," &c. Now "without all contradiction the less is blessed of the better."

² Apoc. xxii. 9.

³ In the word *prejudiced* I allude to *Michaelis* more especially. His judgment is given, as will be presently seen, against the genuineness of the Apocalypse. Yet in the 10th Section of ch. xxxiii. of his "Introduction to the New Testament," the subject of which Section is the *style of the Apocalypse*, he thus expresses himself: "The language of the Apocalypse is both beautiful and sublime, affecting and animating; and this not only in the original, but in every even the worst translation of it. . . The Apocalypse has something in it which enchants, and insensibly inspires the reader with the sublime spirit of the author. . . A great part of the imagery is borrowed from the ancient prophets: but the imitation is for the most part more beautiful

and more magnificent than the original." I quote from Marsh's Translation of *Michaelis* (Cambridge, 1801), Vol. iv. pp. 533, 534.—The instant and exceeding inferiority of the Christian Fathers that followed on the apostolic age, considered in a literary point of view, will be presently noted and illustrated, as greatly enhancing the force of this argument.

⁴ The testimony of *Irenæus* will be given afterwards. See p. 22.

⁵ In *Grabe's Prolegom.* ad *Irenæum*, the birth of this Father is placed about the year A. D. 108. *Dodwell* has placed it eleven years earlier, or at almost the precise date of the Apocalypse. See *Lardner*, Vol. ii. p. 166. (Ed. 1838.)

⁶ Let me illustrate this by the following well-known beautiful extract from a letter of *Irenæus* himself, preserved by *Eusebius*, and given in his *E. II. v. 20*.

"I saw you [*Florus*], when I was very young, in the lower Asia with *Polycarp*.—For I better remember the affairs

moreover one of the most learned, as well as most devoted of the Christian bishops of that age,—his testimony will justly have been considered not only as of high authority, but as almost in itself conclusive on the point in question : indeed as altogether sufficient and conclusive, except in case of the existence of some strong countervailing evidence.

The fact is, however, that countervailing evidence of this nature has been asserted to exist. The genuineness of the Apocalypse has been questioned by ancient writers of eminence in the Christian Church, as early at least as the third century : more especially I may name *Dionysius of Alexandria*. And it has been questioned too by modern biblical critics of high reputation for learning and candour ; among whom *Michaelis* stands pre-eminent. This renders it necessary that the point in question should be more carefully looked into ; and the evidence, as well *against* as *for*, examined in detail. At least it must be done by him who would wish *thoroughly* to satisfy himself on the grounds of our belief in the *genuineness* and *divine inspiration* of the Apocalypse of St. John.—I purpose therefore drawing out the evidence somewhat fully ; and shall first, and with a view to the fairer conducting of the inquiry, set before the reader the strength and substance of the objections of these two writers, the most eminent perhaps respectively of ancient and modern objectors.

With regard then to *Dionysius*, who was Bishop of Alexandria about the middle of the third century,¹ and the earliest impugner (at least earliest of any note)² of the apostolic authorship of the Apocalypse, this is most observable,

of that time than those which have lately happened ; the things which we learn in our childhood growing up with the soul, and uniting themselves to it. Inasmuch that I can tell the place in which the blessed Polycarp sat and taught ; and his going out and coming in ; and the manner of his life, and the form of his person ; and the discourses he made to the people ; and how he related his conversation with John, and others who had seen the Lord ; and how he related their sayings, and what he had heard from them concerning the Lord, both concerning his miracles and his doctrine, as he had received them from the eye-witnesses of the Word of Life. All which

Polycarp related, agreeably to the Scriptures. These things I then, through the mercy of God toward me, diligently heard and attended to ; recording them, not on paper, but upon my heart. And through the grace of God I continually renew the remembrance of them."—I copy Lardner's translation ; Vol. ii. p. 96.

¹ He died A.D. 264 or 265, according to Lardner. See his Vol. ii. p. 643.

² Dionysius speaks of *certain* before him that had impugned it, but without naming them. *Τινες μὲν οὖν τῶν προφητῶν ἠθετησαν . . . το βιβλίον, &c.* Ib. p. 693. I shall presently speak of these persons.

that he did not impugn its ascription to the Apostle John on *historical* grounds. He did not allege the testimony of any more ancient writer against it. He did not thus argue (I borrow the language of Michaelis¹): “It is not preserved in the archives of the seven Asiatic Churches: the oldest persons in those cities have no knowledge of its having been sent thither: no one ever saw it during the life of St. John: it was introduced in such and such a year, and contradicted as soon as it appeared.” It was simply on *critical* grounds, and *internal* evidence, that he rested his objection; reasoning from certain marked *differences of style and diction* between the Apostle John’s Gospel and Epistles on the one hand, and the Apocalypse of John on the other.—Now the circumstance of an objector so learned as Dionysius having thus failed to appeal to historical evidence, and of certain previous but evidently rash and intemperate objectors, to whom he alludes, having equally failed to do so,² (nor, let me add, is the case different with any other patristic questioners of the apostolic authorship of the Apocalypse in the two next centuries,³) constitutes, as Michaelis allows, a considerable,⁴—I should say an *exceedingly strong* argument, in favour of the high origin in question. For had such counter-evidence existed at the time, I cannot but believe that he would have alleged it.

¹ Chap. xxxiii. § 2. I cite, as before, from Marsh’s Translation, Vol. iv. p. 484.

² His statement (Euseb. H. E. vii. 25) is, that they set aside the Apocalypse as the work of the heretic Cerinthus. *Τινες μὲν οὖν τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν ἠθετήσαν καὶ ἀνεσκεύασαν παντὴ τὸ βιβλίον καθ’ ἕκαστον κεφαλαιὸν διευθύνοντες, ἀγνώσων τε καὶ ἀσυλλογίσων ἀποφαινοντές· ψευδέσθαι τε τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν, Ἰωάννου γὰρ οὐκ εἶναι λεγοσίν· ἀλλ’ οὐδ’ ἀποκαλύψιν εἶναι, τὴν σφόδρῃ καὶ παχέϊ κεκαλυμμένην τῷ τῆς ἀγνοίας παραπετασμάτῳ· καὶ οὐχ ὅπως τῶν ἀποστόλων τίνα, ἀλλ’ οὐδ’ ὅλως τῶν ἁγίων, ἢ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, τοῦτον γέγονεν αἰ ποιητὴν τοῦ γραμματός, Κηρίνθον δέ, . . . ἀξιοπίστον ἐπιφημισαὶ θέλησαν τῷ ἑαυτοῦ πλάσματι ὀνομαῖ· τοῦτο γὰρ εἶναι τῆς διδασκαλίας αὐτοῦ τὸ δόγμα, ἐπιγεῖον εἶσεσθαι τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ βασιλείαν.* Thus the sum of their objections was, 1st, that the Book was, generally speaking, unintelligible and ir-

rational: 2ndly, that the *title* of the Book involved a falsehood; it being called *The Apocalypse* or *Revelation*, though most obscure. And they ascribed it to Cerinthus, simply because that sectary advocated the doctrine of Christ’s millenary reign on earth.—Yet, as Lardner justly observes, (Vol. ii. p. 700,) the Apocalypse directly contradicts Cerinthus’ opinions on the most essential points. E. g. Cerinthus (as Irenæus tells us) denied that *God made the world*: the Apocalypse teaches the direct contrary, chap. iv. 11, x. 6, &c. Again, Cerinthus taught that *Christ* did not *suffer*, but only the *man Jesus*: whereas the Apocalypse calls Jesus by the name *Christ*, speaks of him as the first begotten of the dead, and adds that he washed us from our sins in his own blood.—Dionysius’ case was certainly not helped by such reasoners.

³ Especially *Eusebius*. See p. 28 *infra*.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 484.

—As to Dionysius' grand *critical* argument,¹ just before stated, he who has marked the difference of style in the case of other sacred writers, when simply writing history, and when rapt by the Spirit into the enunciation of prophecy, (I might exemplify this in the cases of Moses, Isaiah, and St. Peter,²) will easily perceive the danger of deciding a question of identity of authorship simply on such grounds, and without the corroboration of external evidence:—not to add that there are observable certain remarkable points of similarity³ (as well as of dissimilarity)

¹ His objections are thus summed up by Lardner, Vol. ii. p. 719:—

1. The *Evangelist John* has not named himself, either in his Gospel, or in his Catholic Epistles: but *the writer of the Apocalypse* names himself more than once.

2. The writer of the *Apocalypse*, though calling himself *John*, has not shown us that he was the *apostle* of that name.

3. The *Apocalypse* does not mention the Catholic Epistle, nor that Epistle the *Apocalypse*.

4. There is a great agreement in sentiment, expression, and manner between *St. John's Gospel* and his Epistle; but the *Apocalypse* is quite different in all these respects, and without any similitude.

5. The Greek of the Gospel and Epistle is pure and correct; that of the *Apocalypse* has barbarisms and solecisms.

It is evident that the whole strength of Dionysius' case consists in the *two last* objections. As to the others it will suffice to test and refute them by parallel cases. Because *St. Paul* names himself in other Epistles, not in that to the *Hebrews*, is he therefore not the author of the last-named Epistle? Because *St. James* in his Epistle styles himself simply

“a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ” (James i. 1), not an *apostle*, is he therefore not the *apostle James*? Because *St. John* does not in his second and third Epistles name the first, is he therefore not the writer of the first? And the same of *St. Paul's* silence in each one of his Epistles about all the rest of the Epistles written by him.

² Compare the diction of *Moses' song* (Deut. xxxii.) with the simply written history which constitutes almost the whole of *Moses' compositions*; *Isaiah's* historical chapters, xxxvi and xxxvii, with the more poetical and impassioned of his poetic prophecies; and the second chapter of *St. Peter's* 2nd Epistle, with all his first Epistle. In fact the difference of style and diction in this last case appeared such to Grotius, Salmasius, and others, that they have argued from it (though vainly) a different authorship to the one Epistle and the other. See Maeknight's Preface to *St. Peter's* 2nd Epistle.

Similarly, to borrow an example from classical writers, let the reader compare the difference of diction and style between *Horace's Odes*, and his Epistles and Satires.

³ These have been drawn out by Mr. Twells and others. I subjoin a few, cited from Mr. Twells by Lardner, ii. 710—714.

1. In the *Apocalypse* (xix. 13) Christ is called, “*The Word of God.*”

2. In the *Apocalypse* Christ is called “*The Lamb,*” (v. 6, 12, vii. 17, xiv. 1, &c. &c.) *αρνιον.*

1. In *St. John's Gospel* (i. 1, 14) Christ is styled “*The Word,*” and in his first Epistle (i. 1) “*The Word of Life,*” * and *there only* in the Bible.

2. In *John's Gospel* Christ is called “*The Lamb of God,*” (i. 29, 36,) *ὁ ἀμνος του θεου.* (To which I may add the application of the type of the *pascal lamb* to him, *John* xix. 36; “A bone of it

* 1 *John* v. 7, “The Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost,” might be added, but that the genuineness of the passage is suspected, and indeed more than doubtful.

between the writings thus brought into comparison ; indeed such as to make Michaelis suggest in explanation the idea of the Apocalyptic phraseology being in these points a *forged imitation* of that of St. John's Gospel.¹—In similar manner the Evangelist's Apocalyptic *Hebraisms* may be accounted for by reference to his very natural adoption of much of the language and style, as well as figures, of the old Hebrew prophets, when under the prophetic afflatus : besides that the hypothesis is at least possible, in the ab-

3. In the Apocalypse Christ is called "*He that is true,*" "*He that is faithful and true.*" (iii. 7, xix. 11.)

4. In Apoc. ii. 17, Christ says, "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the *hidden manna.*"

5. In Apoc. i. 7, Zechariah's prophecy (xii. 10) is referred to ; "Every eye shall see Him, and they also who pierced Him."

* Sept. *Επιβλεψονται προς με ανθ' ων κατορηχσαντο.* With which compare,—

John xix. 37; *Οψονται εις ον εξεκεντησαν* and,

Apoc. i. 7; *Οψεται αντον' πας οφθαλμος, και οιτινες αυτον εξεκεντησαν.*

As an example of similar construction and phrase, also urged by Mr. Twells, I may select the expression "*to keep the words,*" or "*word,*" *τηρειν λογους,* or *λογον,* occurring in Apoc. iii. 8, 10, xxii. 7, 9 ; but which occurs no where else in the New Testament, except in St. John's Gospel, viii. 51, 52, 55, xiv. 23, 24, xv. 20, xvii. 6, and his Epistle, 1 John ii. 5.—Michaelis (*ibid.* §. 10, p. 535) adds that the similar but antithetical phrases *ποιειν αληθειαν* and *ποιειν ψευδος* are used, the one 1 Ep. John i. 6, the other Apoc. xxii. 15.—Let me suggest further the correspondence of *εχοντων την μαρτυριαν,* Apoc. xii. 17, with *εχει την μαρτυριαν,* 1 John v. 10 : and of the *σκηνωσει επ' αυτους* and *σκηνωσει μετ' αυτων* of Apoc. vii. 15, xxi. 3 with the *εσκηνωσεν εν ημιν* of John i. 14 ; a figurative verb not found in any other books

shall not be broken.") The only other passages in the New Testament where Christ is called the *Lamb,* are Acts viii. 32, 1 Peter i. 19.

3. In St. John's Gospel and Epistle, Christ is called "*He that is true,*" "*Full of truth,*" "*The truth ;*" i. 14, xiv. 6, 1 John v. 20.

4. In John vi. 31, 49, 50, 58, the spiritual food that Christ gives his disciples to eat is spoken of with reference to the type of *manna.*

5. In John's Gospel (xix. 37) the same prophecy of Zechariah is referred to (and in it alone of all the Gospels) ; "Again another scripture saith, They shall look on him *whom they pierced.*"

Michaelis (p. 535), in quoting the above, observes justly that Mr. Twells has not given to this example of parallelism all the force he might : because in the Apocalypse the quotation from Zechariah is made not according to the *text of the Septuagint ;* * but with a certain different Greek rendering, the same that occurs in St. John's Gospel citation.

of the New Testament : also that in Apoc. xviii. 24 the true reading, according to Griesbach, Scholz, &c., is *αιματα* in the plural (*εν αυτη αιματα προφητων ευρεθη*) ; which somewhat remarkable use of the word, though not very infrequent in the *Septuagint,* is found, I believe, no where else in the *New Testament* except in St. John's Gospel, i. 13, *Οι ουκ εξ αιματων, &c.*

¹ "These instances will not prove that the Apocalypse was written by St. John the apostle : for the author of it may in some cases have imitated St. John's manner, in order to make his work pass the more easily for the composition of St. John." *Ibid.*—Strange that Michaelis could imagine the possibility of *such* a forgery ; and this too at such a time as he supposes, viz. A. D. 120.

sence of direct contradicting testimony, of his domiciliation in Greek Asia having occurred late in life; and his publication of the Apocalypse been made first, of the Epistles and Gospel afterwards.¹—Nor let me here omit to observe that Dionysius himself, though incredulous as to the *Apostle John* being the author of the Apocalypse, had yet the conviction,—in part derived from the holy character of the book itself, in part from its general reception in the Christian Church,—that it was the writing of a *holy man* of that name, indeed of one *inspired by God*.²

It is *Michaelis'* judgment, however, that there exists, over and above the *internal* evidence alleged by Dionysius, direct *historic* evidence also against the fact of the beloved disciple having been the writer of the Apocalypse; and indeed against its divine inspiration. Referring to the two earliest of the Fathers, *Ignatius* and *Papias*,—authors contemporary with St. John in his old age, and whose writings must be dated very soon after his death,—he alleges, that the *former* in his Epistles still extant, though addressing in them three out of the seven Apocalyptic Churches, viz. those of Smyrna, Ephesus, and Philadelphia, does yet take no notice of anything written to those Churches in the Apocalypse; and that the *latter*, notwithstanding his well-known and strong advocacy of the doctrine of a *Millennium*, does yet, according to Eusebius, ground it only on *unwritten tradition* from the Apostles, and (as if he were either ignorant of it, or disbelieved the book's divine

¹ Of the *Apocalypse*, as most allow, (see my next chapter) A.D. 96; of the *Gospel*, as Mill and others, A.D. 97; * of the *Epistles*, as Basnage, A.D. 98: though others (not without reason, I think.) date the last earlier.—St. John is probably supposed to have remained in Judea, till near the formation of the siege of Jerusalem. After this may he not have long sojourned among the Syrian or Parthian converted Jews, before settling in Proconsular Asia; though that is generally dated earlier? See Macknight's Pref. to the Epistles of St. John, § i, iv.

² Ἄγιον μὲν γὰρ εἶναι τινός και θεο-

πνεύσου συναινώ' it being added, Οὐ μὴν ῥάδιως ἀν συνθοίμην τουτον εἶναι τον αποστολον, τον ἱον Ζεβεδαιου, τον αδελφον Ιακωβου· οὐ το εναγγελιον το κατα Ιωαννην επιγεγραμμενον, και ἡ επισολη ἡ καθολικη. Apud Euseb. H. E. vii. 25. Eusebius further quotes Dionysius, a little after, as admitting the writer's prophetic character, εἰληφεναι προφητειων οὐκ αντερω' and he also tells us, *ibid.* 10, that Dionysius, in a then extant letter of his, referred to the prophecy of the Beast in Apoc. xiii. as fulfilled in *Valerian's* persecution of the Church.

* Granville Penn judges that the appellation predicated of Christ in Apoc. xix. 13, "His name is called the *Word of God*," is the original whence the title was adopted into both John's Gospel and Epistle.

authority) not on the *Apocalypse of St. John*.¹—Thus, on the whole, Michaelis inclines to conclude that this book is a *spurious production*; introduced into the world after St. John's death, *about the year 120*, and between the times of Papias' and Justin Martyr's writings.²

Such is the substance of the chief objections of these two critics, who may fairly be supposed to represent the strength of the anti-Johannic arguments of the ancient objectors and the modern. And I cannot but at once remark, with reference to them, that it is plain that both Dionysius (with his followers) in *his* time, and also Michaelis in *his*, conducted their inquiries not without a very considerable though perhaps unconscious bias à priori against the point at issue,—I mean the genuineness and apostolical origin of the *Apocalypse*.³ Its *millenary doctrine* could not but prejudice the *Alexandrian Bishop* against it; considering that he was not only himself a strong anti-millennarian in sentiment, but that it was in the act of writing against Millennarians that he pronounced judgment against the genuineness of the *Apocalypse*.⁴ Again, the *failure of expositors*, in Michaelis' judgment, *to show anything like a clear fulfilment of the Apocalyptic prophecies*,—which yet, if the book were genuine and therefore inspired, ought, he was persuaded, to have been long ere this in great part fulfilled,⁵—operated, it seems evident, quite as powerfully to prejudice the *German critic*.⁶—Now the ungroundedness of these presumptions will, I hope, be made soon apparent. I trust in the ensuing historical Exposition of the *Apocalypse* to prove, on such evidence as may satisfy

¹ Chap. xxxiii. § 2, pp. 462—466, and again § 3, p. 486.

² *Ibid.* pp. 466, 484, 487, 528.

³ For its apostolicity, as all will allow, involves its divine inspiration.

⁴ See the account in Eusebius, H. E. vii. 25 ad init.

In illustration of what a bias such a man must be expected to have felt, let me cite a passage from Michaelis (p. 466) about the Millennarian Papias. "If Papias really knew and received the *Apocalypse*," argues the German critic, "he is by no means an important witness in its favour; because it is a book

to which his millennarian principles must have made him partial." Must not then the *anti-millennarian* views of *Dionysius*, by parity of reason, have made *him* prejudiced against it?

⁵ "If these prophecies are not yet fulfilled, it is wholly impossible that the *Apocalypse* should be a divine work; since the author expressly declares that it contains 'things which must shortly come to pass.'" p. 503.

⁶ See Michaelis' recurrence to the fact of this universal failure of Expositors, according to his judgment, in Sections 1, 5, 7, of the same Chapter xxxiii.

even the cautious and severe examiner, that its predictions have indeed been *fulfilled*, and *that* with exactitude very remarkable. Moreover I may perhaps, ere its conclusion, be enabled to show that much of the objection felt by Dionysius and others, alike in ancient and modern times, against the *millenary doctrine*, has been founded in misconception. For the present it may suffice to repeat that what has been stated shows the importance, as was before said, of our looking more accurately and particularly into the actual historical evidence,—whether *against* or *for*,—on the point in question: especially into such evidence as those *three half-centuries* may furnish *that elapsed next after the publication of the Apocalypse*: that is, in the interval from near the end of the first century, (such will be proved to be the Apocalyptic commencing date in the second of these Preliminary Essays,) to the time of Dionysius, about the middle of the third.

The which division of the interval into *three half-centuries* offers, I think, a very convenient chronological classification of the Christian Fathers and authors, whose testimonies to the Apocalypse of John we have to investigate. Nor will any but the *first* cause the least difficulty, or detain us long.

I. As to the *primary half-century*, ranging from A.D. 96 to about A.D. 150, it comprehends the last of those *apostolic men* who conversed, or might probably have conversed, with the apostles, viz. *Ignatius, Polycarp, Papias*; as well as one of very different and inferior authority, whom it may be well at once to examine and despatch, I mean *Hermas*.

1. I speak of the work of *Hermas* in this manner, under a full conviction of the correctness of Dr. Burton's judgment¹ both to its *age* and *character*:—its *age*, as not long before the middle of the second century; its *character*, as most probably a spurious publication, palmed on the Christian Church, agreeably with a custom already at that

¹ History of the Christian Church, chap. x. p. 203. (Ed. 1840.)

time too prevalent, under the name of Hermas, a companion of St. Paul.¹ Hence, even though the evidence of the writer's acquaintance with the Apocalypse of St. John be, as I think it is, conclusive; and indeed of his borrowing from it just in the same manner that he does from the older and undoubted canonical scriptures of the New Testament,²

¹ Dr. Burton says that it cannot indeed now be *ascertained* that such was the case in the Book of Hermas. But, he adds, "It is certain that many spurious publications were circulated at this period, which professed to have been written by apostles, or companions of the apostles. So too Mosheim ii. 3. 15

The passage in which a certain *Hermas* is mentioned, as one of St. Paul's friends and companions, occurs in his Epistle to the Romans, xvi. 14; "Salute Asyncritus, Phlegon, *Hermas*," &c. —The earliest extant quotation of the Book of the Pseudo-Hermas is by *Irenæus*, Adv. Hæreses, Lib. iv.

² So Lardner, Vol. ii. Chap. iv. p. 70, &c. Indeed the evidence seems to me even stronger than Lardner has represented it. And as Dean Woodhouse, under the singular impression that Hermas' work was published before the Apocalypse of St. John, perhaps as early as A.D. 75, (albeit, as Lardner observes, p. 59, there is a sentence in the book itself which speaks of the apostles as being all then dead,*) has in his Preliminary Essay expressed an opinion that no such evidence is apparent, it may be useful if I subjoin a notice of two notable points of parallelism to that effect.

1st, there are repeated references to a *certain well-known great tribulation*, as at hand, indeed the great tribulation. So Vis. ii. 2; "Happy ye, as many as shall endure *the great trial that is at hand*;" Lat. *pressuram supervenientem magnam*: and again *ibid.* 3; "Thou wilt say, Behold there is a great trial coming;" Lat. *Ecce magna tribulatio venit*. Now this cannot be the *great tribulation* noted in Christ's prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem, Matt. xxiv. 21; because *that* was to happen to the *Jews*; *this*, which

Hermas speaks of, to *Christians*. Moreover that it was to be one great *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, appears from Hermas referring to former persecutions in which Christians had suffered even unto death, Vis. iii. 2, &c. And what then *this expected great tribulation*, and where predicted? It can hardly, I think, be any other than the one predicted in Rev. vii. 14, "These are they that are to come out of *the great tribulation*;" *ἐκ της θλιψεως της μεγαλης*. This view of it seems confirmed by what is said in the vision next following, Vis. iv. 1; "I saw an emblem of the tribulation now at hand;" *figuram tribulationis superventuræ*: the emblem being one of "*a great Beast*," huge as a whale, with "fiery locusts coming out of his mouth." "This Beast," it is repeated, "is the figure of the *trial* that is about to come:" and again, "Here ye have the figure of the *great tribulation* that is about to come." Vis. iv. 1, 2, 3. Now, in the Apocalypse, in similar manner, after mention of the great coming tribulation, there appears a great red dragon seeking to swallow up the woman, the true Church; and again a vast ten-horned wild beast, the enemy of the saints. And the fiery locusts coming out of the mouth of Hermas' beast may not improbably have been borrowed from the imagery of the fifth and sixth Trumpets;—the *locusts from the abyss* in the one, and the *fire from the mouths of the horses* in the other. (This parallelism is noted in Cotelierius, though not by Lardner.)

2ndly, as Lardner observes, there is the parallelism between Hermas' *tower* and the Apocalyptic *city*, the *New Jerusalem*. —In either case the seer was carried into a high mountain to see it (Sim. ix. 1, Apoc. xxi. 10); — either is *square*

* Simil. ix. 16: "These apostles and teachers, who preached the name of the Son of God, dying after they had received his faith and power, preached to them who were dead before." I give here, and above, Archbishop Wake's translation. The Latin in the old translation which alone remains to us, the original Greek being lost, is as follows: "Illi apostoli, &c. *cum defuncti essent*, prædicaverunt illis qui ante obierunt," &c. Ed. Cotelier. Antwerp, 1698.

yet this will little help us in our present inquiry; Michaelis' theory, which we have to refute, being that the Apocalypse was a forgery published after St. John's death, somewhere between the time of Papias and that of Justin Martyr, (perhaps about A.D. 120,¹) and consequently early enough for the soi-disant Hermas to have become acquainted with it: while the mere *judgment* of this writer as to what was truly inspired scripture, and what was not, is of very little weight.—But in another point of view I deem the work eminently to our purpose, and on that account indeed have made this mention of it: viz. as showing us what kind of *forgery* of a sacred Book of Visions and Revelations the Christian writers of that age were capable of, almost *at their best*; this being one very highly esteemed by the early Church. To a candid and sensible man, wanting time or opportunity for examining into the direct historic evidence of the genuineness and divine inspiration of John's Apocalypse, I scarce could advise anything, I think, more calculated to produce presumptive belief in its favour, than simply that he should read one after the other, even if it were but for the space of one brief half-hour, the *Revelations of Hermas* and the *Revelation of St. John*.

2. I proceed to *Ignatius*, the venerable Bishop of Antioch, ordained, it has been thought, to that See by the hands of apostles, somewhere about A.D. 70, or a little before the destruction of Jerusalem;² and who, after some thirty or

(Vis. iii. 2, Apoc. xxi. 16):—the stones alike of the one and the other are *resplendent*, and the tower and the city each shining as the sun (Sim. ix. 6, Apoc. xxi. 11, 23):—the *foundations* in either case (at least Hermas' in part) are the *apostles* (Vis. iii. 5, Apoc. xxi. 14):—the tower of Hermas is the woman the Church, (Vis. iii. 3,) as the New Jerusalem is the Church the Bride, Apoc. xxi. 9, 10:—they who were to enter the *tower* had crowns of *palms*, and *white garments*, and the *seal* or *name* of the *Son of God* (Sim. viii. 2, ix. 12); just as they that were the saved in the Apocalypse, and who were to walk in the light of the New Jerusalem, had the seal or name of God on their foreheads, were clothed in white robes, and had crowns of gold, and palms in

their hands.—Apoc. vii. 3, 9, 10, xxi. 24.

It is to be observed that Hermas (as Lardner has remarked) makes no express *citations* from any of the Books of the New Testament, or indeed of the Old Testament. "It was not," says Lardner, p. 59, "suitable to the nature of his writing to *quote* books." His *use* of the Apocalyptic visions is just similar to his use of, and reference to, some of the parables in St. Matthew, and other scriptures.

¹ See *suprà*, p. 8.

² Lardner, Vol. ii. pp. 73, 74. For example, Chrysostom (as cited in Lardner) says that Ignatius "conversed familiarly with the apostles, was perfectly acquainted with their doctrine, and had the hands of the apostles laid upon him."

forty years' faithful labour in the Church, suffered martyrdom, A.D. 107, or, as some prefer to fix the date, A.D. 115 or 116, under Trajan.¹—It was in the course of a forced and hurried journey from Antioch to Rome, the scene of his martyrdom by wild beasts, that he wrote Epistles; and, as it has been generally supposed, the same substantially that are still extant, to the *Ephesian* Christians, the *Magnesians*, *Trallians*, *Romans*, *Philadelphians*, *Smyrneans*, and *Poly-carp*.² And Michaelis makes this, as we have seen, one of the two strong grounds of his disbelief of the genuineness of the Apocalypse, that Ignatius, in these Epistles of the probable date (say) of A.D. 107, makes no mention of the book; and consequently seems either not to have known it, or at least not to have recognised it as holy Scripture: his non-reference to it being the more remarkable, forasmuch as it had been published, according to ecclesiastical tradition, in the very locality of those churches which he was addressing; and this only some ten years, or a little more, according to the same tradition, before the time when he wrote.³

Now it is not without reason that Dean Woodhouse⁴ calls attention to the circumstances under which Ignatius wrote these Epistles, “a prisoner, guarded by soldiers, whom from their ferocity he compares to leopards, and by them hurried forward in his passage to Rome.” In such circumstances it is to be expected, the Dean adds, that he would write with perpetual interruptions, and his quotations depend for the most part on memory. Besides which we

¹ Eusebius places the death of Ignatius in the tenth year of Trajan, i. e. A.D. 107; in which Dupin, Tillemont, Cave, and Lardner follow him. Others, as Bishop Pearson, Pagi, and Le Clerc, date it a little later, about A.D. 116. See the argument on this point in Lardner, pp. 74, 77.—If we are to believe the Acts or Martyrdom of Ignatius, relating that Ignatius was condemned by Trajan himself at Antioch, then we have numismatic evidence, as Eckhel shows in his Vol. vi. p. 452, that this must have been in the year 114 A.D. But the genuineness of those “Acts,” as Lardner observes, is disputed; and the Consuls under whose

Consulship they themselves place the martyrdom held office A.D. 107.

² See the evidence drawn out in Bishop Pearson's Dissertation, given in the 2nd Volume of the Antwerp Cotelierian Edition of the Apostolic Fathers; also in the Preliminary Dissertations prefixed to the Epistles of Ignatius, in Smith's Edition of them in the original, in Wake's Apostolic Fathers, or Chevalier's Translation of the Epistles of Clement, Polycarp, and Ignatius, p. xlvi.: which last writer has abridged from Bishop Pearson.

³ See my next Chapter on the date of the Apocalypse.

⁴ Woodhouse, p. 13, 2nd Edition.

have to bear in mind Lardner's remark¹ on Ignatius' usual mode of reference to the Books of the New Testament; as made almost always by allusion only, or unacknowledged adoption of their language: St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians being the one and only Book *expressly named* by him.—This premised, the Dean suggests the following two passages² from Ignatius, as passages in which he judges the language to have been borrowed from the Apocalyptic extracts that I have placed in the parallel column; and so borrowed as from one of the sacred Books.

Ignat. ad Rom. ad fin.
Εν ὑπομονῇ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Ignat. ad Ephes. § 9.
Λιθοὶ πατρὸς ἡτοιμασμένοι εἰς οἰκοδομὴν Θεοῦ, . . . κατὰ πάντα κεκοσμημένοι ἐντολαῖς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Αποκ. i. 9.
Εν ὑπομονῇ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Αποκ. xxi. 2, 19.
Τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἁγίαν . . . καταβαίνουν ἀπο τοῦ Θεοῦ, . . . ἡτοιμασμένην ὡς νυμφὴν κεκοσμημένην τριαντάρι αὐτῆς. Καὶ οἱ θεμέλιοι τοῦ τειχοῦς τῆς πόλεως παντὶ λίθῳ τιμῆ κεκοσμημένοι.

Besides these, Mr. J. C. Knight, in a late little Publication,³ has suggested a *third* case of parallelism.

Ignat. ad Philadelph. § 6.
"If they do not speak concerning Jesus Christ, οὗτοι ἐμοὶ στήλαι εἰσιν (καὶ ταφοὶ)⁴ νεκρῶν, ἐφ' οἷς γεγραπταὶ μόνον ὀνόματα ἀνθρώπων.

Αποκ. iii. 12; Ep. to the Philadelphian Church.

Ὁ νεκρὸς ποιῶ αὐτὸν στύλον ἐν τῇ ναφ τοῦ Θεοῦ μου· καὶ γράψω ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ μου.

Of which examples it seems to me that the *first* may be regarded as a case of language borrowed very probably from the Apocalypse. For the parallelism is exact; and this in respect of a phrase not usual, and which does not occur in that precise form any where else in the New Testament.⁵—The other two seem to me more doubtful.

¹ Lardner, p. 78. The same as the pseudo-Hermas, noticed p. 11 *suprà*.

² He gives a *third* also; which, however, as grounded on a needless and entirely unauthorized correction of *ναοὶ* into *λαοὶ*, it is not worth the while to quote.

³ Entitled, "Two New Arguments in Vindication of the Genuineness and Authenticity of the Revelation of St. John."

⁴ Omitted in Mr. K.'s citation as parenthetical.

⁵ The peculiar use of the genitive must be observed. It does not designate the *persons* exercising this patience, so as in Luke xxi. 19, *Εν τῇ ὑπομονῇ ὑμῶν*, "In your patience possess your souls;" and

as also in 2 Thess. i. 4, *Αποκ. ii. 2, xiv. 12, &c.*—nor is it a genitive expressive of the *sufferings* which their patience had to *endure*; as in 2 Cor. i. 6, *ἐν ὑπομονῇ τῶν αὐτῶν παθημάτων ὧν καὶ ἡμεῖς πάσχομεν*. But it is the genitive of an *object patiently waited for*. Of which use of the genitive with *ὑπομονῇ* there is only one other example, viz. in 2 Thess. iii. 5; "The Lord direct your hearts into the love of God, and *εἰς ὑπομονὴν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, into the *patient waiting for Christ*:" where, however, the *case* is different, being the *accusative*, as required by the verb, not *ablative*. If not *Αποκ. i. 9*, this probably was Ignatius' original.

In the *second* the reference suggests itself more readily to 1 Peter ii. 5, "Ye also, as living stones, (λίθοι ζωντες) are built up a spiritual house;" or to a similar passage in Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians.¹—As to the *third*, Mr. Knight urges it as a case of *antithetical* parallelism; and one the more observable, because occurring in Ignatius' Epistle to the same *Philadelphian Church* to which the Apocalyptic passage had been addressed. It had been a promise in the Apocalyptic Epistle, "Him that overcometh I will make a pillar in the temple of God; and upon him (or it, στυλον) shall be written the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God:"—a promise partially indicative of even the *present* state and character of those that might rightfully appropriate it among the Philadelphian Christians; their reward being its glorious and everlasting completeness and perfection. But what of *false professors and teachers* in the Church, such as Ignatius was referring to? They were not, nor would be, *living pillars in the living temple of God*: and on them there was not, and would not be, written *the name of God*. Rather they were the very antithesis and contrast of the Apocalyptic figure; which consequently Mr. K. supposes to have been in Ignatius' mind when writing. They were but "*sepulchral pillars*, and on them were written only *the names of men*."—Such is Mr. Knight's argument; and, notwithstanding the existence in the Epistle of the words και ταφοι, which he omits, it is perhaps sustainable: the word "*only*," prefixed to "*the names of men*," being in such case an antithetic allusion by the writer to the Apocalyptic figure of *pillars written with the name of God*.—The word ταφοι, however, suggests a reference to Matthew xxiii. 27 as also possible: the antithesis, if so, intended by him in the word *only* being that the heretical teachers spoken of, though professedly Christians, were regarded by Ignatius as having only the *name* to live, not the *reality* of life.²

¹ Ephes. ii. 20, 21; "Being built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom all the building (οικοδομη), fitly framed together,

groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord."

² Vossius compares the Roman knight Laberius' saying about himself; "Sepulchri similis nihil nisi nomen retineo."

Let me add two other passages that have struck me in my own perusal of the generally received Epistles of Ignatius, as containing in them certain probable references to the Apocalypse; especially the latter.—The *first* is from his *Epistle to the Trallians*, § 3; where he charges them to reverence the *Bishops* like Jesus Christ the Son of the Father, (so I read the clause with Bishop Pearson,)¹ and the *presbyters* as the *sanhedrim of God*, *πρεσβυτεροῦς ὡς συνεδριον Θεου*: an expression certainly remarkable, and which we may not unnaturally conceive to have had allusion to the Apocalyptic imagery of the *twenty-four presbyters*, that appeared in vision *seated*, *εν συνεδριω*, *round the throne of God and of the Lamb*.²—*Secondly*, in the same *Epistle to the Trallians*, he speaks of a true member of the Church of Christ under the figure of being one “*within the altar*,” *εντος του θυσιαστηριου*; and of him that did not really belong to it as “*without the altar*,” *εκτος*.³ Now this is the characteristic figure of true Christian worshippers (as we shall see strikingly illustrated in the course of the ensuing Commentary) in the Book of the Apocalypse. So especially Apoc. xi. 2; “*Rise and measure the temple of God, and the altar, and them that worship in it: but the court that is without the temple, cast out; for it is given to the Gentiles*.” In either passage,—both that of Ignatius and that of the Apocalypse,—the word *altar* seems used to include the *altar-*

¹ Ὁμοίως πάντες εντρεπεςθωσαν . . . τον επισκοπον ὡς Ἰησουν Χριστον, οντα υιον του Πατρος, τους δε πρεσβυτερους ὡς συνεδριον Θεου. Vossius reads, τον επισκοπον ὡς τον πατερα. In the last clause, about the *presbyters*, there is no difference of reading.

Somewhat similar expressions occur elsewhere in Ignatius' Epistles. So e. g. in his *Ad Magnes*. 6; *Προκαθημενον του επισκοπου εις τοπον Θεου, και των πρεσβυτερων εις τοπον τῆς συνεδριου των αποστολων*. Also *ib.* 13, *Του αξιοπρεπιστατου επισκοπου ὕμων, και πνευματικου στεφανου του πρεσβυτεριου* where *στεφανου* is, I suppose, in the sense of *κυκλου*.

² Apoc. iv. 4.—On Cyprian's expression, *Epist.* i. “*Presbyteri qui nobis assidebant*,” the commentator (Oxford Ed. 1682) quotes the passage from Ignatius'

Ep. ad Magnes. § 13, given in the note preceding, and then thus remarks: “*Theodor. v. 3, docet quòd ὡ μεσος θωκος ad Episcopum pertineat; imo viri eruditi ad hunc episcopi in cleri medio sedendi morem trahunt que habentur Apoc. iv. 4.*” This will confirm my argument.

³ Ὁ εντος του θυσιαστηριουων καθαρος εστι . . . ὁ δε εκτος ων ου καθαρὸς εστιν, &c., § 7.—Such, as Vossius says, is the reading of the ancient Latin translator, and apparently the true reading. With which compare the similar figurative expression in Ignatius' *Epist. ad Ephes.* § 5; *Εαν μη τις η εντος του θυσιαστηριου υστερειται του αρτου του Θεου*. Where the *artos* seems to be the *shew-bread* of the Jewish temple, figuratively applied to signify the Christian's bread of life.

court; ¹ in either the figure of worshipping *within the altar-court* to signify *true church-membership*. The figure here too is certainly remarkable; nor do I think of any other passage in the New Testament that could so well have suggested it to Ignatius.²

Such are the parallelisms that suggest themselves, (and others might perhaps be added,³) as fit to be taken into consideration, on the supposition long and generally entertained of the genuineness of the seven above-mentioned Epistles of Ignatius. And I think them at least sufficient to weaken the force, and throw doubt on the validity, of the Ignatian argument urged by Michaelis against the apostolicity of the Apocalypse; as if a book unknown to, or unacknowledged by, the venerable writer of the Epistles.— Since the publication however of my first Edition of the *Horæ*, Mr. Cureton has given to the world a translation of an ancient and trustworthy Syriac version of Ignatius' Epistles: which Edition, out of all the seven, only recognizes the three epistles to the Romans, the Ephesians, and

¹ *Ignatius'* meaning to this effect is illustrated by the following from his *Epist. ad Magnes.* § 7; Παντες ουν ως εις ένα ναον συντρεχετε Θεου, ως επι εν θυσιαστηριον, ως επι ένα Ιησουν Χριστον' and a passage in *Clem. Alex. Strom. vii.*; Εστι το παρ' ημιν θυσιαστηριον ενταυθα, το επιγειον, το αθροισμα των ταις ευχαρις ανακειμενων, μιαν ωσπερ εχον φωνην την κοινην, και μιαν γνωμην.

It is to be observed that in Ignatius' time and for some time afterwards, the word *θυσιαστηριον*, or *altar*, was only used as a *figure* from the Jewish ritual. It was not till some time after, and as the *apostasy* was developed, that the term was adopted and applied to the *communion tables* of the Christian Churches. (See this illustrated at the close of my ch. vii. § 3, in the Commentary ensuing.) That there were not altars properly so called in the *primitive Church*, says Suicer on *θυσιαστηριον*, is "*meridianâ luce clarior.*" And so Lardner, iv. 212, from Basnage.

² St. Paul's statement, 1 Cor. ix. 13, "They that wait at the altar are partakers with the altar," said of Christian ministers' right to a sustenance, and that in Heb. xiii. 10, "We have an altar whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle," affirmed of the

Hebrew Christians distinctively, if I mistake not, (the "*we*" being used just as the "*our*," in 1 Cor. x. 1,) with reference to certain of the Jewish temple sacrifices not at that time abolished,—are little comparatively to the purpose.

³ E. g. the following passage from Ignatius' Epistle to the Magnesians, § 5, 'Ὅσπερ ἐστὶ νομίσματα δύο, τὸ μὲν Θεοῦ, τὸ δὲ κόσμου, καὶ ἑκάστου αὐτῶν ἰδίῳ χαρακτήρῃ ἐπικείμενον ἐχει, [οὗτως] οἱ ἀπίστοι τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, οἱ δὲ πιστοὶ ἐν ἀγάπῃ χαρακτήρῃ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς [ἐχουσι], may be compared with what is said of persons having *the mark of the Beast*, and others having *God the Father's mark*, in Apoc. xiii. 16, xiv. 1.

I have in the above only referred to the seven Epistles that have been hitherto almost universally acknowledged to be genuine Epistles of Ignatius. In another more than doubtful, that to the Christians of *Tarsus*, (which, however, Bellarmine and other Roman Doctors receive as genuine,) there occurs, § 3, a direct recognition of the John that wrote the Apocalypse as the *Apostle John*, in the passage following: "Τὶ δηποτε; Πέτρος μὲν ἐσαρροῦτο, Παῦλος δὲ καὶ Ἰακώβος μαχαίρᾳ ἐτεμνοντο, Ἰωάννης δὲ ἐφυγάδεν ἐν τῷ Παθμῷ."

Polycarp as genuine; and from out even of them rejects considerable portions.—Now, if this Syriac version really give us all the genuine Epistles of Ignatius, then our Apocalyptic argument is thus affected. 1st, the fewer and shorter his epistles, by so much is the argument weaker that is derivable from their silence (if silent they be) about it, for Ignatius' non-recognition of the Apocalypse: 2ndly, the Apocalyptic parallelism cited from Ignatius' Epistle to the Romans is found in the Syriac, as well as in the Greek: 3rdly, the other suggested Apocalyptic parallelisms, if really such, though not Ignatian, must yet be referred to some pseudo-Ignatius of perhaps no very much later date; and are therefore so far valid.

* 3. I now pass on to *Polycarp*. And though in his own very brief Epistle to the Philippians,—the only writing of his now extant,—we cannot trace allusion to St. John's Apocalypse, any more than to St. John's Gospel, or sundry other acknowledged books of the New Testament, yet in the *Narrative of his Martyrdom*, written by the Smyranean Church over which he presided *immediately after that event*, we can trace it; and, as Lardner justly observes,¹ the testimony of his Church, there given, may be considered as Polycarp's own testimony. And first Woodhouse cites the following case of borrowing from the Apocalypse.

In *Polycarp's Martyrdom*, the body of the suffering martyr is represented,
 ουκ ὡς σαρξ καιομενη, ἀλλ' ὡς χρυσος και αργυρος εν καμινῳ πυρωμενος.

In *Rev. i. 15*, the feet of the Son of Man are described as ὁμοιοι χαλκολιβανῳ ὡς εν καμινῳ πεπυρωμενοι. And in *Rev. iii. 18* we read, χρυσιον πεπυρωμενον εκ πυρος.

Now the writer may very possibly have had in view in the first instance, observes Woodhouse, that passage in 1 Peter i. 7, where the Apostle compares the suffering Christians to "gold tried by the fire." But why, instead of Peter's *δια πυρος δοκιμαζομενου*, in the sequel of that passage, the phrase *εν καμινῳ πυρωμενος*? There seems to be no passage in Holy Scripture that could at all probably have suggested the change of phrase, except these of the Apocalypse.²

¹ Lardner, ii. 110.

² The only two passages in the other books of the New Testament in which *καμινος* occurs are Matt. xiii. 42 and 50; where however it is used of the *furnace of fire* into which the *wicked* are to be cast

at the end of the world, not of a *purifying furnace*:—the only other passages where *πυροσμαι* is used are 1 Cor. vii. 9, 2 Cor. xi. 29, Eph. vi. 16, 2 Peter iii. 12; in not one of which is it used in Polycarp's sense of *refining*.

Moreover Woodhouse cites from the same beautiful Narrative those commencing words of Polycarp's sublime prayer, at the moment when the fire was about to be lighted under him, *Κυριε ο Θεος ο παντοκρατωρ*, as being the identical words used in Apoc. xi. 17, *Κυριε ο Θεος ο παντοκρατωρ*.

4. There remains *Papias*, Bishop of Hierapolis near Colosse: a man that belongs also to the apostolic age, and one said by Irenæus to have been a hearer of John, and companion of Polycarp.¹ Now of his writings, which were in five books, entitled *Λογων Κυριακων Εξηγησις*, "An Exposition of the sayings of our Lord," there remain to us only a few short fragments, preserved by Eusebius: which treating, however, not of the Apocalypse, but of other subjects, (chiefly two of the Gospels,) furnish no data from which an inquirer may form his own independent judgment on the point, whether Papias knew and received the Apocalypse, as the genuine writing of the Evangelist John, and as inspired scripture, or not. And we are thus thrown back on ancient testimonies about him, to resolve the question.—But so it is that, on looking into them, we find, as Michaelis observes, contrary testimonies in two writers, each of eminence in their day; viz. *Eusebius* the celebrated Bishop and Historian of the 4th century, and *Andreas* Bishop of Cæsarea, about the middle, probably, of the 6th.²

¹ Irenæus adv. Hæc. v. 33. The passage is as follows: "Hæc autem," (viz. the millenary doctrine of which he had been speaking,) "*Papias, Johannis auditor, Polycarpi autem confubernalis (ἑταίρος), vetus homo, per scripturam testimonium perhibet, (Greek, εγγραφως επιμαρτυρει, Euseb. H. E. iii. 39,) in quarto librorum snorum: sunt enim illi quinque libri conscripti.*"

Eusebius, who had these books before him, says, that it does not appear from the Preface that Papias himself heard or saw any of the apostles, but only that he had received the things concerning the faith from others who were well acquainted with them: adding that he mentioned the names of "the disciples" Aristion and *John the presbyter*, as well as of the apostles Andrew and Peter, John and Matthew, Thomas and James, as those into whose sayings he had made

inquiry: Aristion and *John the presbyter* being mentioned in the present tense, "What they say," as if contemporaries; the apostles in the past, "What they were wont to say." Eusebius inferred that the *John*, whose hearer Irenæus says Papias was, was probably this *John the presbyter*, not *John the evangelist*.—Jerome however (Ep. 29, ad Theodor.) viewed the matter otherwise; for he speaks of him as "*Papiae, auditoris Johannis Evangeliste.*" Perhaps in his youth he might have heard the Evangelist John himself; in the researches of his manhood only heard of him from others, St. John having died in the interval. As the "companion of Polycarp," we can hardly suppose him not to have been in earlier days, at least, well acquainted with Polycarp's instructor St. John.

² He is placed by Cave and Lardner

The *former*, says Michaelis, implies that Papias had no acquaintance with the Apocalypse, by thus writing: "This writer has mentioned several things, which he says he learnt by *oral tradition*; such as parables and doctrines of our Saviour, not contained in the Gospels, and also some things which are fabulous: among which may be reckoned the assertion that, after the resurrection of the dead, Christ will reign in person a thousand years on earth. I suppose that he acquired this notion *from his inquiring into the sayings of the apostles*, and his not understanding what they had delivered figuratively."¹ Such, says Michaelis, is *Eusebius'* testimony. And, *if correct*, since it implies that Papias made no mention of John's Apocalypse in support of his millenary views, the inference seems warranted that Papias did not know the book; for surely, argues Michaelis, he would have referred to had he known it.—On the other hand *Andreas*, who himself wrote a Comment on the Apocalypse still extant, of some repute for its learning,² and who professes to have both consulted and largely used the earlier patristic works noticed by him, declares expressly that Papias, for one, testified to its inspiration: saying, "Of the divine inspiration of this Book I need not treat at large; since so many holy men, Gregory the Divine, Cyril of Alexandria, and before them *Papias*, Irenæus, Methodius, and Hippolytus, have given their testimony to it."³

Thus the representation of Eusebius is met by that of Andreas; and the correctness of the former appears doubtful, *even as Michaelis puts the case*. Nor, I think, will reasons fail to appear for believing Andreas right in his statement, not Eusebius. If Eusebius was two centuries older than Andreas, and moreover the more learned man

about the year 500 A.D.; but I think 550 may be probably more nearly the date of his Apocalyptic Treatise, for reasons that will be given in my notice of Andreas in the Appendix to my 4th vol.

¹ Ibid. p. 465.

² See the Jesuit Peltan's testimony to him, prefixed to Andreas' Commentary.

³ Περι μεντοι τη θεοπνευστη της βιβλιας περιττον μη κενειν τον λογον ηγαμεθα των μακαριων Γρηγοριω τω Θεολογω, και

κυριλλω, προσετι δε και των αρχαιοτερων Πιππιου, Ειρηναιω, Μεθοδιω, και Ιππολυτω ταυτη προσμαρτυρηστων το αξιοπιστον. Παρ' ων και ημεις πολλας λαβοντες αφορμας εις τωτο εληλυθαμεν, καθως εν τισι τοποις χρησης τωτων παρεθιμεθα.

On what Andreas here says of *Gregory Nazianzen*, and the very equivocal soundness of Michaelis' argument from it against Andreas' accuracy, see Note², p. 29, *infra*.

of the two, on the other hand Andreas assures us that he had studied Papias', as well as the other writers' works, to which he refers :¹ while we have no assurance that Eusebius did so ; and, considering the contempt he expresses for Papias' understanding,² it seems hardly likely that he would. Again, Eusebius was a man strongly prejudiced against Papias' millenary doctrine ; and therefore biassed against connecting either him or his doctrine with the Apostle John :³ whereas Andreas could have had no prejudice on this account in Papias' favour, he not being himself a pre-millennarian.⁴—Moreover, in point of fact, both Michaelis will be found, if I mistake not, to have given a rather unfair version of Eusebius' testimony ; and Eusebius to have shown, by a decidedly unfair and incorrect statement respecting another millennarian in the very passage cited, how incorrect he may probably have been in the testimony really given by him about the millennarian Papias. *First*, I say, it will be seen from the original⁵ that Eusebius does not make Papias *say*, so as *Michaelis' translation* does, that he *learnt* these doctrines by oral tradition ; but only that Papias so set them forth *as if* they had come to him through it :—a statement explicable perhaps on the supposition of his having in his *Εξήγησις* mixed up *traditionary collectanea* on the subject, with the Apostle John's simpler doctrine of the millennium. Again, it will be seen that Eusebius does not attribute Papias' adop-

¹ See the Extract in the Note preceding.

² σφοδρα γαρ τοι σμικρος ων τον νουν, &c. See the quotation from Eusebius in Note 5, below. A eulogistic reference to Papias found in another passage of Eusebius seems to be spurious. So Lardner ii. 119.

³ See Note,⁴ p. 8, *suprà*, giving Michaelis' sentiments on the effect of prejudice on this head.

⁴ See his Comment on Apoc. xx. The following sentence will suffice to show Andreas' anti-millennarian views. Χιλια ετη τοι νυν ο απο της τω Κυριω ενανθρωπησεως χρονος μεχρι της τω Αντιχριστω ελευσεως.

⁵ Και αλλα δε ο αυτος συγγραφευς (Παπιας), ως εκ παραδοσεως αγραφου εις αυτον ηκουτα,

παρτεθειται, ξενας τε τινας παραβολας του Σωτηρος, και διδασκαλιας αυτου, και τινα αλλα μυθικωτερα εν οϊς και χιλιαδα τινα φησιν ετων εισεσθαι μετα την εκ νεκρων αναστασιν, σωματικως της του Χριστου βασιλειας επι ταυτησι της γης υποστησομενης· α και ηγουμαι τας αποστολικας παρεκδεξαμενον διηγησεις υπολαβειν, τα εν υποδειγμασι προς αυτων μυστικως ειρημενα μη συννεωρακοτα· σφοδρα γαρ τοι σμικρος ων τον νουν, ως αν εκ των αυτου λογων τεκμηραμενον ειπειν φαινεται. Πλην και τοις μετ' αυτον πλειστοις οσοις εκκλησιαστικων της ομοιας αυτω δοξης παραιτιος γεγονε, την αρχαιοτητα τ' ανδρος προβεβλημενοις· ωσπερ ουν Ειρηναιφ, και ει τις αλλος τα ομοια φρονων αναπειρηεν. Η. Ε. iii. 39.

tion of millenary views to his *inquiring* into the *sayings* of the apostles, but to his *misapprehension*¹ of their *διηγησεις*, or *narratives*: a word used by St. Luke² of *written* histories; and which we may here also not improbably explain of the canonical written Gospels and Acts of the Apostles.³—*Further*, Eusebius' own untrustworthiness, and tendencies to inaccuracy on any *millenary* subject, appear sufficiently from the very sentence just cited. For in its ending clause he attributes the millenary opinions of both Irenæus, and each other ancient father that adopted that view, to the weight which *Papias'* opinion (that silly old man, as he calls him) had with them. Whereas, possessing (as we do) the works of both Irenæus and of other early millennarists, we *know* from them, (as will be seen almost immediately,) that these later fathers did *not* rest their opinions on Papias' authority, but on written scripture, alike of the Old and New Testaments; including specially the Apocalypse of St. John.⁴

My conclusion is, that *Papias* did precisely the same; that Eusebius' insinuation about him was groundless; that Andreas is correct in mentioning Papias among the witnesses to the genuineness and inspiration of the Apocalypse, just as we know him to have been correct in respect of the other four ancients whom he quotes as authorities;⁵ and that Papias' millenary doctrine was founded in part on the Apocalyptic Book, as well as on the many other scriptures well agreeing therewith, both of the Old and New Testament.

II. So we come to the writers of the *second half-century*

¹ παρεκδέξαμενον.

² Επειδὴ περ πολλοὶ ἐπεχειροῦσαν ἀνατάξασθαι διηγήσιν, &c.; "to set in order a history." Luke i. 1.

³ Lardner's translation is, I see, substantially the same as that which I have given: viz. "which opinion, I suppose, he was led into by *misunderstanding the apostolic narratives*."—How these might lead Papias to premillennarian views will well appear from comparing *Mr. Greswell's* case; who confesses his inability to explain the *Parables in the written Gospels*, except on the *millenary principle*.

⁴ See especially, in the last chapters of Irenæus' 5th Book on Heresies, his reference to, and argument from, various Books of Scripture. I believe the little sentence quoted in Note ¹, p. 18, above, is *all* that he says of Papias.

⁵ Viz. Irenæus, Hippolytus, Gregory Theologus, and Cyril of Alexandria. Gregory is the only one about whose testimony on the point in dispute there can be any doubt. And see on it p. 29, Note ², *infra*.

subsequent to the publication of the Apocalypse ; a period extending from A.D. 150 to 200, and which includes the honoured names of *Justin Martyr*, the *Narrator of the Lyonnese martyrdoms*, *Irenæus*, *Melito*, *Theophilus*, *Apollonius*, *Clement of Alexandria*, *Tertullian*. And in regard of all these our task is indeed brief and easy. Their testimony to the apostolic authorship, and divine authority of the Apocalypse, is uncontroverted and notorious.

1. First, *Justin Martyr*,—a Christian philosopher, born at Siche^m ¹ about A.D. 103, it is supposed, converted to Christianity about 133, and who suffered martyrdom about 165,—this man, to whose learning and piety testimony has been borne by nearly all the succeeding fathers, in his *Dialogue with Trypho*,² written probably about the year 150, thus expresses himself: “A man from among us, by name *John, one of the Apostles of Christ*, in the *Revelation* made to him, has prophesied that the believers in our Christ shall live a thousand years in Jerusalem ; &c.”

2. Some twelve or fifteen years after this, the *Narrative of the Lyonnese martyrs* was written by one of the surviving Christians of that city ; that is about A.D. 177. It was addressed by the Gallic Churches, as a letter to the Churches of Asia, (Proconsular Asia,) and Phrygia, including of course the seven Apocalyptic Churches among them ; and by Eusebius has been preserved to us entire.³ And in this letter there appears (as Lardner has remarked)⁴ the remarkable expression, in description of a true disciple, “Following the Lamb whithersoever he goeth,” *ακολουθων τῷ Ἀρνίῳ ὅπου αν ὑπαγη*—the very words (thus adopted as from Scripture) of the Apocalypse.⁵

3. It was very soon after these martyrdoms that *Irenæus*, previously a presbyter of the Lyonnese Church, became its bishop.⁶ He wrote his Book on Heresies probably between A.D. 180 and 190. And in it he testifies many times

¹ Lardner ii. 125.

² Cited *ibid.* Vol. ii. p. 137.

³ Euseb. H. E. v. 1.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 164.

⁵ Viz. Apoc. xiv. 4 : Οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ ακολουθουντες τῷ Ἀρνίῳ ὅπου αν ὑπαγη. It also, I see, (H. E. v. 2,) refers to Christ as τῷ πιστῷ και αληθινῷ μαρτυρι,

και πρωτοκῶ τῶν νεκρῶν, so as in Apoc. i. 5, iii. 14.

⁶ So Eusebius, H. E. v. 5 ; “When Pothinus had been put to death with the martyrs in Gaul, Irenæus succeeded him in the bishopric of the Church of Lyons.”

most clearly on the point in question: speaking of the Apocalypse as the work of *John the disciple of the Lord, that same John that leaned on his breast at the last supper*; ¹ declaring (as will be seen in the second of these Preliminary Essays) the time when it was written; and speaking of *various approved and ancient copies* of that Book of Scripture as then existing, confirmed by the agreeing testimony of those who had seen John himself.²—In short a more clear and decisive testimony, on almost every point on which information might be desired, could scarcely have been given.

4. Next may be mentioned his contemporary *Melito*, Bishop of *Sardis*, about A.D. 170; and who consequently may have presided over that See at the very time when the letter from the Gallic Churches was sent to it.³ He wrote a *Treatise on the Revelation of John*, doubtless as on a book of apostolic authorship and authority; and thus is allowed by *Michaelis*⁴ to be one of the witnesses in its favour.

5. Of *Theophilus*, Bishop of Antioch about 181, *Eusebius* says that in a work of his against the Heresy of *Hermogenes* he made use of testimonies, or quotations, from *John's Apocalypse*.⁵ It was undoubtedly, as *Michaelis* allows, received by him.

6. *Apollonius*, a writer at the close of the second century, and called by *Jerome* a most eloquent man,⁶ (though probably not the same that, when accused before *Perennis*, the *Prætorian Prefect* under *Commodus*, about A.D. 186, read an eloquent apology before the Senate, and then suffered martyrdom,) is also noted by *Eusebius* as one that acknowledged the Apocalypse, and borrowed testimonies from it.⁷

¹ De Hær. iv. 37, 50; v. 26, 30.

² This occurs in his disquisition on the name and number of Antichrist: "in omnibus antiquis et probatissimis et veteribus Scripturis numero hoc posito, et testimonium perhibentibus his qui faciem Joannis viderunt." Bk. v. 30.—On which passage the thought suggests itself, Were not both *Papias* and *Polyearp* among the persons referred to by him in the plural, as having seen St. John?

³ So *Lardner* ii. 159.

⁴ *Ibid.* § 2, p. 466.

⁵ H. E. iv. 24.

⁶ De V. I. c. 40.

⁷ *Euseb.* H. E. v. 18.—*Lardner* thinks him a different person from the Roman martyr of that name, and a few years later; chiefly on the authority of *Jerome*, who speaks of him as flourishing under both *Commodus* and *Severus*. Compare his remarks *ibid.* pp. 323 and 392.

7. Its reception by *Clement of Alexandria*, an inquisitive and learned writer who flourished, as Lardner gives the date, about 194, is as undoubted. He has frequently quoted from it, and referred to it, as the work of an *apostle*:¹ and adds, as we shall presently see, his testimony to fix its *date*.

8. Finally in this half-century comes *Tertullian*, the contemporary of Clement; the most ancient, and one of the most learned, of the Latin fathers. His testimony to the Apocalypse is very full and ample. He quotes or refers to it in more than seventy passages in his writings; appealing to it expressly as the work of the *apostle* John, and the same that wrote the 1st Epistle of St. John.² He defends too the authenticity of the book against the heretic Marcion and his followers, by asserting its *external evidence*; thus appealing to the Asiatic Churches on the point: "We have churches that are disciples of John; for, though Marcion rejects *the Revelation*, the succession of bishops, traced to its original, will rest on *John* as its author."³

Thus far not a single writer of *the Church* had impugned the genuineness, or the divine inspiration, of the Apocalypse of St. John. Only the *Alogi*, an *heretical sect* that rose up ere the end of this half-century, (so Epiphanius tells us,) and derived their name from an absurd antipathy to the term *Logos*, (*The Word*), did on this account reject both the *Gospel of John* and the *Apocalypse of John*, which alike gave the obnoxious title to Jesus Christ.⁴ The only other objection they pretended against the latter, was that there was no Church of Christians existing at the Apocalyptic station *Thyatira*:⁵ of which statement, if referred to *St. John's time*, they offered no proof; and, if referred to *their own time*, the circumstance did not militate against

¹ He refers to Apoc. xxi. 21, ("The twelve gates are twelve pearls," &c.) as the work of an *apostle*. Pæd. Bk. ii.—Again, referring to Apoc. iv. 4, he says, "Such an one, though here on earth he be not honoured with the first seat, shall sit upon the four-and-twenty thrones, judging the people; as John says in the Revelation." Strom. Bk. vi. Lardner, ii. 245.

² See Lardner, ii. 295; and the Index of Scripture citations at the end of the best editions of Tertullian.

³ "Habemus et Johannis alumnas ecclesias: nam, etsi Apocalypsim ejus Marcion respuit, ordo tamen episcoporum, ad originem recensus, in Johannem stabit auctorem." Adv. Marcion. B. iv. c. 5.

⁴ See Michaelis, ubi suprà, p. 468.

⁵ Καὶ οὐκ ἐνὶ ἐκείᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ Χριστιανῶν. So Epiphanius (De Hæres. c. 51) reports their language. Gibbon could not find in his heart to pass by the objection. See his History, ii. 359.

there having been one some seventy or eighty years before.¹ Their ascription of the Book to Cerinthus,—whose, obviously, it could not be, as I have already shown in my brief anticipatory notice of these earliest objectors against the Apocalypse,²—did not help their case. And altogether, Michaelis confesses, “the estimation in which they were held by their contemporaries was not sufficient to inspire much respect for them in a critic of the present age.”

III. Early, however, in the *next half-century*, it is said,³ a man of some repute in *the Church* rose up to impugn the genuineness of the Apocalypse; I mean the Roman presbyter *Caius*. If so, it was evidently under the influence of strong anti-millennarian prejudices, and with almost as little just pretension to authority as his Alogistic predecessors: since he appears to have urged no argument against it, except its (by him misunderstood) millennial doctrine; and, with the absurdity of the Alogi, to have ascribed it to Cerinthus.⁴ But, in fact, this view of Caius’ meaning seems questionable.⁵—However certain writers in Egypt, contemporary with him, or nearly so, under evident prejudices against, and misconceptions of, this millennial doctrine of the Apocalypse,—attacked it as obscure, unconnected, and indeed false in statement: inasmuch as it called that a *revelation* which was covered with *darkness*, and represented *John* to be its author, when in fact it was the work of *Cerinthus*.⁶ These continued the line of *objections* and *ob-*

¹ So Michaelis *ibid.*

² See Note ², p. 4.

³ About A.D. 212.

⁴ The following are the words of Caius, as reported by Eusebius, H. E. iii. 28: “Cerinthus also,—who, by his revelations, as if written by some great apostle, imposes upon us monstrous relations (*τερατολογιας*) of things of his own invention, as if shown him by angels,—says, that after the resurrection there is to be a terrestrial kingdom of Christ; and that men shall live again in Jerusalem, subject to sensual desires and pleasures. And being an enemy to the divine Scriptures, and desirous to seduce mankind, he says there will be a term of 1000 years, spent in nuptial feasting.” I give Lardner’s translation, ii. 400.

⁵ Lardner, in his later judgment on

the point, (compare his pp. 401 and 705 *ibid.*) and Michaelis, p. 474, have concluded that the Revelation above referred to by Caius was probably *the Apocalypse of St. John*; and not the spurious *Revelation of St. Peter*, written in the 2nd century, or any other.—But Prof. Ilug, citing Paulus, concurs with him in the opinion that Caius did not mean St. John’s Apocalypse. *Introd.* to the N. T. ii. 649. (Wait’s *Transl.* 1827.) And so, previously, Mr. Twells, and others.

⁶ See Michaelis, pp. 474—477. These seem to have been the *Allegorists* whom Nepos opposed in his *Ελεγχος Αλληγοριστων*. And it was either *these*, or *Caius*, or *the Alogi*, that Dionysius must have meant, when he spoke of previous questioners of the inspiration of the Apocalypse. See Note ², p. 4.

jectors, from its first origin with the Alogi, down to *Dionysius*:—that same *Dionysius*, Bishop of Alexandria about the middle of the third century, of whose arguments I have already given a succinct account;¹ and who, we have seen, though he entered with better judgment and temper on the inquiry, was yet as unable as his predecessors to adduce any *historical* testimony whatsoever, of the least weight, to aid his argument.

Meanwhile the chain of testimony was continued still onward to the genuineness and divine inspiration of the Apocalypse. 1. First *Hippolytus*,—a Christian Bishop who flourished, according to Cave and Lardner, about A.D. 220, in early years a disciple of *Irenæus*,² and in more mature life a martyr to the cause of Christ,—not only elsewhere and otherwise bore testimony to it,³ but moreover wrote an express commentary on the Apocalypse:⁴ and this with so much weight of influence from his character, authority, and talents, that *Michaelis* attributes to it very principally the general reception of the Apocalypse thenceforward in the Christian Church.⁵—2. After him (not to speak of the Egyptian Bishop *Nepos*, and of his *Ελεγχος Αλληγοριστων*,

¹ p. 4, &c. *suprà*.

² So *Photius*, cited by *Lardner*, ii. 424; *Μαθητης δε Ειρηναίου ο Ιππολυτος*. *Photius* eulogizes him as in his style clear, grave, concise: *την φρασιν σαφης εστι, και υποσεμνος, και απεριττος*. He was bishop of a place called *Portus Romanus*. Whether this was the modern *Ostia* at the mouth of the Tiber, or the modern *Aden* at the mouth of the Arabian Gulf, each of which bore that name in ancient times, has been long controverted. By the late discovery however of his Book on Heresies it has been shown to be the former. See *Lardner*, ii. 427; also my own notice of *Hippolytus* in the Appendix to Vol. iv.; and *Bunsen* on his lately recovered work.

³ So in his work on *Antichrist*, § 36: “*St. John* saw in the isle of *Patmos* a revelation of awful mysteries, which he taught to others without envy:” and, presently after; “*Tell me, holy John, thou apostle and disciple of Christ*, what thou hast seen and heard about *Babylon*.” Cited by *Lardner*, p. 437.

⁴ *Jerome* mentions among the writings

of *Hippolytus* one entitled, “*On the Apocalypse*.”—Again, on the curious marble statue of *Hippolytus*, now in the Vatican, a monument dug up near Rome in 1551, and of which an account is given in *Lardner* (p. 428), a list is engraved of his writings, and one of them is recorded as “*On St. John’s Gospel and Apocalypse*.”—Similarly *Ebedjesu*, who was Bishop of *Nisibis* in the Nestorian Syrian Church, near the close of the 13th century, (see *Lardner*, iv. 320,) in the 7th chapter of his metrical catalogue of ecclesiastical writings, mentions among other works of *Hippolytus*,

Chapters against *Caius*;
And a defence of the *Apocalypse*,
And the *Gospel of St. John*,
The *Apostle and Evangelist*.

His *Commentary on the Apocalypse* is referred to several times by *Andreas of Cesarea*; also by *Jacob the Syrian*, Bishop of *Edessa* from A.D. 651 to 710. *Michaelis*, pp. 478, 479; *Lardner* ii. 437.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 478.

to which Dionysius' work was an answer,¹) Origen, the most critical and learned of all the ecclesiastical writers of his time, though a decided anti-millennarian,² did yet receive the Apocalypse into the canon of inspired Scripture; and this without the slightest doubt, so far as appears, of its genuineness. "What shall we say of John," is his observation in one place, "who leaned on the breast of Jesus? He has left us a *Gospel*: . . . he wrote likewise the *Revelation*, though ordered to seal up those things which the seven thunders uttered: he left too one Epistle of very moderate length; and *perhaps*" (I beg the reader to mark the discrimination exercised by him) "*perhaps* a second and third; for of these last the genuineness is not by all admitted."³—3. And with Origen, in *Eastern Africa*, there agreed, we know, on the important point of our inquiry his equally eminent contemporary, the bishop and martyr of *Western Africa*, *Cyprian*.⁴

So ends our catena of testimonies to the genuineness and divine inspiration of the Apocalypse, traced as proposed through the three half centuries that followed after its publication. Alike from East and West, North and South,—from the Churches of the Asiatic province and the Syrian, of Italy and of Gaul, of Egypt and of Africa,—we have heard an unbroken and all but uniform voice of testimony in its favour.⁵ Nay, even what there is of *contrary* testimony has been shown only to confirm and add new weight to that which it opposes: for it proves how unable they who most wished it were to find evidence or argument of this kind, of any real value, and such as could bear examination, on their side of the question.

Let me just add, by way of supplement to my sketch of

¹ See Lardner, ii. 655, 691, &c.

² Michaelis with his usual candour notes this; "Origen, notwithstanding his warm opposition to the doctrine of the Millennium, received the Apocalypse as a work of St. John the apostle," &c., p. 480.

³ Quoted by Eusebius, II. E. vi. 25.

⁴ See Lardner, iii. 47. Cyprian in several places cites it, and speaks of it as divinely inspired Scripture. In the only passage where he mentions the name of

the writer, he simply calls him *John*; evidently meaning thereby the most eminent person of that name, viz. the apostle John: for how else could he have viewed the book as inspired?

The same might be said of an author contemporary, as it would seem, with Cyprian, and whose Treatise is one of those that has been often joined with Cyprian's works.—See Lardner, iii. p. 64.

⁵ So Woodhouse.

the earlier historic evidence, that in what remained of the 3rd century, while no other *opponent* to it appeared of any note, the Apocalypse was received as the work of the inspired apostle John, alike by the schismatic *Novatians* and *Donatists*,¹ and by the most eminent writers of the *Catholic Church*; e. g. *Victorinus*,² *Methodius*,³ *Arnobius*,⁴ *Lactantius*:⁵—further, that in the earlier half of the 4th century, while *Eusebius* doubted,⁶ *Athanasius* received it;⁷ and in

¹ Lardner, iii. 121, 565. The *Novatian* schism began about A.D. 251, the *Donatist* about 311.

² Bishop of *Pettaw* on the *Drave*, about A.D. 290, according to Lardner (iii. 162); and who suffered martyrdom in the persecution by Diocletian. He wrote a *Commentary on the Apocalypse*, as Jerome informs us, evidently as a book of divine inspiration: his other Commentaries, mentioned by Jerome in association with this, being on Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Habakkuk, Ecclesiastes, and the Canticles; all books of the canon of Scripture.—See Lardner, iii. 163.

I doubt not that the book still extant under the title of Victorinus' Commentary on the Apocalypse is really his, and the one meant by Jerome, though interpolated. See the notice on this question, and sketch of his Comment, in the second Chapter of my History of Apocalyptic Interpretation, in the Appendix to my 4th Volume.

³ A contemporary of Victorinus; bishop first of *Olympus* in Lycia, afterwards of *Tyre*; and who, like Victorinus, suffered martyrdom under Diocletian. So Jerome. He often quotes the Apocalypse as a book of Scripture; speaks of it as written by "the blessed John," (*ὁ μακαριος Ἰωαννης*;) in all probability meaning the apostle John; and is mentioned by Andrew of Cæsarea, in conjunction with Irenæus and others, as among those who had borne testimony to the divine inspiration of the book. Lardner, iii. 181, 198.—A brief sketch of his Apocalyptic notices will also be found in my History of Apocalyptic Interpretation.

⁴ On Psalm cii. he says, "Si vis videre divitem et mendicum, *Sancti Apostoli Johannis lege Apocalypsim*;" besides elsewhere referring to it as to a book of canonical Scripture. Lardner, *ibid.* 480.

⁵ He borrows from, and moreover

cites the Apocalypse as both a book of sacred Scripture, and as written by John. Inst. vii. 17, Epit. c. 42, 73, 74, &c.—See Lardner, iii. 541.

⁶ A person might put it, he said, if he so thought fit, among the *ὀμολογουμενα*, the *acknowledged* Scriptures of inspiration; or if he preferred, among the *νοθα*, or *apocryphal*. H. E. iii. 25. He seized, we find, on the facts of Papias having mentioned *John the Presbyter* as one whom he had learnt from, as well as *John the Apostle*, and of the tombs of either being (according to traditional report) at Ephesus, as a ground-work for the theory of its having been not improbably the simple *presbyter* John that saw the Apocalypse: *Εἰκος γαρ τον δευτερον, ει μη τις εθελοι τον πρωτον, την επ' ονοματος φερομενην Ιωαννου Αποκαλυψιν εωρακεναι*. H. E. iii. 39. On which doubt as to the *apostolicity* of its origin was mainly founded his doubt as to its *inspiration*.—Lardner, iv. 126, observes that he never refers to the Apocalypse for authority: adding that he was probably influenced in his judgment on this point by regard to the arguments of Dionysius; as well as by aversion to the *millennarian doctrine*, which the Apocalypse of St. John was brought forward to support.

⁷ The Apocalypse is often and largely quoted by *Athanasius*. Moreover in the *Festal Epistle*, generally allowed to be his, the list of sacred books given by him coincides with that of our own received Canon, and ends like it with the Revelation of St. John. Lardner, iv. 155, 158.—I may add, that in the *Synopsis* of sacred Scripture, usually joined with the works of Athanasius, but respecting the real author of which there exists some doubt, "the Apocalypse, seen by John the Evangelist and Divine in Patmos," is reckoned among the canonical Books. Lardner, iv. 163.

its later half, while *Cyril of Jerusalem* apparently hesitated respecting it,¹ and *Gregory Nazianzen*,² and *Chryso-*

¹ He not only excludes it from his Canon of Scripture, but in his Chapter on Antichrist omits all clear direct reference to it as an authority; grounding his doctrine wholly on *Daniel's* prophecy, and apparently reflecting on the Apocalypse (for it seems the book referred to) as *apocryphal*. Βασιλευσει δε ὁ Αντιχριστος τρια και ἡμισυ ετη μονα. Ουκ εξ αποκρυφων λεγομεν, ἀλλ' εκ του Δανιηλ. Φησι γαρ, Και δοθησεται εν χειρι αυτου εως καιρου και καιρων και ἡμισυ καιρου.—Cat. xv. Hence, and not without reason, as it seemed to me on first reading them, the Benedictine Editors' inference, and Lardner's, iv. 175, as to Cyril's rejection of the Apocalypse from the books of divine Scripture.

But, since then, my attention has been directed by the works of Professors Lücke and Moses Stuart on the Apocalypse (the former at p. 335 of his *Einleitung*, the latter vol. i. p. 361) to Cyril's scarcely questionable reference in his Catechism, xv. 12, 13, 27, to the figurations of the Dragon and the Beast in Apoc. xii, xiii, xvii; speaking, as he does, of Antichrist as "another head of the Dragon;" (του ἔρακοντος εστιν αλλη κεφαλη) and, with regard to Daniel's fourth Beast in its last form, prefigurative of Antichrist, that *he was to be the eighth king*. (αυτος ογδοος βασιλευσει.) Thus Cyril cannot be regarded as a decided rejector of the Apocalypse.

² The opinion of *Gregory Nazianzen* on the genuineness and inspiration of the Apocalypse has been a subject of controversy. His metrical catalogue of the genuine books of the New Testament begins thus:

Μαθηταις μεν εγραψεν Ἐβραϊοις θαυματα
Χριστου·

Μαρκος δ' Ἰταλια, Λουκας Αχαϊαδι.
Πασι δ' Ἰωαννης, κηρυξ μεγας ουρανο-
φοιτης.

Then he gives the Acts, then the fourteen Epistles of Paul, and the seven Catholic Epistles; viz. one of James, two of Peter, three of John, one of Jude. From which Baronius and others infer that

Gregory did not receive the Apocalypse; and Lardner (iv. 287) allows that, arguing only from it, this would be the natural conclusion. But he adds that in other of Gregory's remaining works the Apocalypse is twice cited; (in one, Προς δε τους εφεστωτας αγγελουσι· πειθομαι γαρ αλλουσι αλλης προστατειν εκκλησιας, ὡς Ἰωαννης διδασκει με δια της Αποκαλυψεως; in the other, Ὁ ων, και ὁ ην, και ὁ ερχομενος, ὁ παντοκρατωρ)—also that *Andreas* of Cæsarea, in his Apocalyptic Commentary, (as likewise his imitator *Arethas*,) names Gregory as one by whom the Apocalypse was received.—And, let me add, not only does *Andreas* so speak of him at the beginning of his work, but he actually quotes him several times in it. Besides which, in the very verse itself of Gregory about John the Evangelist, there seems to me a not improbable argument for his reception of the Apocalypse. For if, instead of Lardner's figurative rendering of the ουρανοφοιτης, enlightened with the heavenly mysteries, we render it literally, "ranging, or conversant, in heaven," it can only allude to John's rapture to heaven in the Spirit, so as described in the Apocalypse.* And if so, it is a direct testimony to the fact of John the Evangelist being the Apocalyptic John; and may have been meant to couple together in brief his two chief works, the Gospel and the Apocalypse.—The circumstance of its being alluded to out of its order in the canon is not any strong argument against my inference. Order is by no means always observed in the patristic lists. For example, Chrysostom begins his List of the Books of the N. T. with St. Paul's Epistles. Lardner iv. 537.

This controverted point about Gregory Nazianzen I have the longer dwelt upon, because Michaelis, on the assumption of *Andreas* being grossly incorrect in his statement that *Gregory* recognised the Apocalypse, has unduly used it to shake his testimony in favour of *Papias'* recognition of the Apocalypse. See his pp. 466, 490: also my p. 21 supra.

* Just as Prudentius in his Cathem. Hymn vi. 73, 112, &c. (see Lardner v. 5) in reference to St. John's Apocalyptic rapture to heaven;

Quàm clara, quàm tacenda,
Evangelista summi
Fidissimus magistri, . . .
Nebulis vides remotis; &c.

Tali sopore justus,
Mentem relaxat heros,
Ut spiritu sagaci
Cælum peragret omne.

tom,¹ though not rejecting, did yet but sparingly refer to it as inspired Scripture, it was on the other hand fully and unhesitatingly acknowledged, alike among the Greeks by *Epiphanius*,² *Basil*,³ and *Cyril of Alexandria*,⁴ by the Syrian *Ephrem*,⁵ and, among the Latins, by *Hilary*,⁶ *Ambrose*,⁷ *Jerome*, and *Augustine*.⁸—Subsequently in the *Greek Church*, though the Book was never formally rejected by any Ecclesiastical Council,⁹ yet the same variety of opinion was expressed by its chief authors as by those of the 4th century.¹⁰ On the other hand, the 'Syrian Church seems to have received it, after the time of its eminent Doctor Ephrem Syrus, the same as before:¹¹ a Church which had its ramifications, not only in Assyria and Mesopotamia, coun-

¹ Lardner, iv. 549, says that Chrysostom omits all notice of the Apocalypse as entirely as if he were ignorant of it.—But the statement requires several modifications. For at the commencement of his comment on the Epistle to the Ephesians, he refers to the *Apostle John's banishment* into the parts of Ephesus: an allusion scarce to be mistaken (indeed the learned Benedictines so explain it unhesitatingly) to the *Apocalyptic John's banishment* to the island of Patmos, opposite the Ephesian coast; thereby almost identifying the author of the Apocalypse and the Gospel: *Και ὁ μακαριος δὲ Ἰωάννης εὐαγγελιστὴς τα πολλὰ ἐνδιετριψεν ἐκεῖ· καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἐξ ὧρι σθη ἐκεῖ, καὶ ἐτελεύτησε.*—Moreover, as Professor Lücke observes at p. 337 of his Introduction, both Wetstein and Schmid have noted many passages in his Homilies on St. Matthew, in which he evidently borrows figures from the Apocalypse, respecting the future consummation, and happiness of the kingdom of God. "So that the statement of Suidas," says Lücke, "seems to be borne out, that Chrysostom, besides the Gospel, received also the three Epistles and the Apocalypse of John." (*Δεχεται δὲ ὁ Χρυσόστομος καὶ τὰς ἐπιστολάς αὐτοῦ τὰς τρεῖς, καὶ τὴν Ἀποκαλύψιν.*)

² E. g. in the passage following: 'Ὁ ἅγιος Ἰωάννης, διὰ τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου, καὶ τῶν Ἐπιστολῶν, καὶ τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως, ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ χαρίσματος τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος μεταδεδωκε. Cited by Lardner, iv. 190.

³ This is my conclusion from his having thus cited the Apocalypse in his

second Book against Eunomius; "And the same Evangelist" (he had been referring to John i. 1.) "in another Book says, 'Which is, and which was, even the Almighty.'" And again, in his fourth Book; "In the Apocalypse, which is, and which was, and which is to come." Lardner, iv. 279. This seems to me decisive; notwithstanding the fact of his having very seldom referred to the book. *Arctas*, too, mentions *Basil* as one that received the Apocalypse as inspired.

⁴ Lardner, v. 13.

⁵ So Lardner, iv. 313, to whom I refer the reader. ⁶ *Ibid.* 179.

⁷ He often quotes the Apocalypse: for example, when writing on Psalm xl. thus; "Et ideo fortassis *Joanni Evangelistæ* cœlum apertum, et albus equus est demonstratus:" viz. in Apoc. xix. 12—16. Lardner, iv. 335.

⁸ The opinions of Jerome and Augustine are too well known to need the insertion of proofs or authorities. But see Michaelis p. 493, and Lardner.

⁹ Professor Spittler, says Michaelis, p. 489, has clearly shown that the 16th Canon of the *Council of Laodicea*, held A.D. 363, and which in its list of the canonical Books of Scripture omits the Apocalypse, is a forgery. And indeed in the chief editions of the Councils the Canon is noted as suspect. So e. g. Harduin, i. 792, notes in the margin, "Hunc canonem Dionysius prætermittit."

¹⁰ See the summary given by Michaelis, p. 491.

¹¹ See Michaelis, p. 495.

tries nearest to the mother Syrian Church, but also in Arabia, Persia, Tartary, China.¹ By the *Latin* Church too it was notoriously and universally received: and in the third Council of Carthage, held A.D. 397, and presided over by the great Augustine, it was solemnly declared to be included in the Canon of inspired Scripture.²

And on the whole, and in conclusion,—considering the early date, continuity, and strength of the *external* historical testimony to the Book's apostolic Johannic original, and on the contrary the comparative lateness, brokenness, and weakness of all counter-historical testimony,—considering too, in reference to the *internal* evidence connected with the question, that, although the Book's marked difference of style, and more strikingly Hebraistic phraseology, as compared with that of St. John's Gospel and Epistles, might very naturally suggest a different authorship, yet this seems accountable for (in great measure at least) by the total difference of subject in the Apocalypse, and influence of the same divine afflatus that dictated the effusions of the old Hebrew prophets, whereas, on the other hand, the counter internal evidence of the Book's inimitable sublimity and holiness seems absolutely unaccountable for on any other hypothesis than that of an apostolic and inspired original,—I say, considering and weighing the testimonies thus given in by this twofold kind of evidence, it does appear to me that Augustine and the Latin Council had good reason for their solemn verdict; and that we may safely and unhesitatingly direct our inquiries into the meaning of the Apocalypse, as into that of a prophecy of the

¹ With reference to the *Nestorian* branch of this Church a very curious illustrative memorial, found in the last-named distant country of China, has furnished decisive evidence of the fact of the Nestorian Churches there receiving it. I allude to an ancient monument (the interest of the locality, as well as of the subject, bids me here to particularize) dug up at Sanxuen, in the Chinese province of Xensi, in the year 1625; a monument, as Michaelis is convinced, (see his p. 497,) really ancient and genuine. It bore two inscriptions, one in Chinese, the other in Syriac, re-

ferring its erection to the year of the Greeks 1092, or A. D. 781; at which time, as well as some centuries later, there was a very numerous colony of Nestorian Syrians, who regularly received their bishops from the Nestorian patriarch. And on this monument mention was made of the New Testament as containing *twenty-seven* books:—a proof, adds Michaelis, that the Apocalypse must have been included in the number.

I have seen an account of this in Asseman's *Bibliothec. Orientalis*.

² See Michaelis, p. 493.

future, revealed to the beloved disciple, by none other than Christ's own divine, eternal, and omniscient Spirit.¹

ESSAY II.—THE DATE OF THE APOCALYPSE.

This is my *second* preliminary point of inquiry; and one on which also, I believe, the *historical* evidence will be found not only ready at hand, but conclusive. For the testimony of *Irenæus*,—Polycarp's disciple, let it be again remembered, who was himself the disciple of the apostle John,—is as express to the point in question as it is unexceptionable. Speaking of the name and number of the Beast in the Apocalypse, he says, that had this been a matter then to be made known, it would have been disclosed by him who saw the Apocalypse: "for it [the Apocalypse evidently] was seen *no very long time ago*; but *almost in our age, towards the end of the reign of Domitian*."² The attempts that have been made to get rid of this testimony, and force another meaning on *Irenæus'* words, by those whose Apocalyptic theories made them wish to do so,³

¹ I am glad to entertain the belief that even in the German theological schools there has been of late a receding in no inconsiderable measure from the old scepticism on this point; and a reverting to the view of an Apostolic origin to the Book here advocated. So *Professor Tholuek* has expressed himself to me in conversation. So *Dr. Zullig* declares his opinion in his *Offenbarung Johannis*, (i. 136, &c.,) published at Stuttgart in 1834—1840. So again *Professor Moses Stuart*, whose Germanizing affinities are well known, and apparent through all his Book, in an elaborate and excellent essay, reaching from p. 283 to p. 450 of the first Volume of his lately published *Apocalyptic Commentary*. And, once more, *Olshausen*, as appears in his *Comment* on *Matt. xxiv. 1*.

As regards *Professor Lücke*, if in his *Einleitung* published in 1832 (p. 388) he has pronounced a strong opinion against the apostolic authorship of the Apocalypse, yet in his earlier work on *St. John's First Epistle* he expresses himself to quite a different effect. So at pp. 6, 11, 27, &c., of the *Introduction*. (*Edinburgh Translation*, in vol. xv. of *Clark's Biblical*

Cabinet, 1837.) I trust with him first impressions will soon return.

² The following is the passage, which I quote in full from *Eusebius*, H. E. iii. 18. Γραφῶν γε τοι ὁ Εἰρηναῖος περὶ τῆς ψήφου τῆς κατὰ τὸν Ἀντιχριστὸν προσηγορίας φερομένης, ἐν τῇ Ἰωαννοῦ λεγομένῃ Ἀποκαλύψει, αὐταῖς συλλαβαῖς ἐν πεμπτῶ των πρὸς τὰς αἵρεσεις ταῦτα περὶ τοῦ Ἰωαννοῦ φησιν. Εἰ δὲ εἶδει ἀναφανδὸν ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ κηρυττεσθαι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, δὲ ἐκείνου ἀνερρέθη του και τὴν Ἀποκαλύψιν ἔωρακτος· οὐδὲ γὰρ πρὸ πολλοῦ χρόνου ἔωραθη, ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενεας, πρὸς τῷ τελεῖ τῆς Δομετιανου αρχης.

³ *Michaelis*, p. 525, thus candidly acknowledges the origin and object of these attempts. "Several modern commentators, who wish to refer the Apocalypse to the reign of Nero, that they may be better able to explain its prophecies, contend that the words of *Irenæus* have been misunderstood by ecclesiastical writers, and that *Irenæus* did not mean to say that the Revelation was seen in the reign of *Domitian*."

seem to me to have utterly failed.¹ It is as clear a testimony on the point it relates to, as there can be found to any other fact in any other historian.

Nor is it unsupported by other testimony.—First, *Tertullian* seems in no dubious manner to indicate this view of the Apocalyptic date. For in his *Apology*, after specifying Nero's as the first imperial persecution, and this one by the *sword*, (wherein, as he elsewhere says,² Paul and Peter suffered, no mention being made of John,) he proceeds to notice Domitian's as the next persecution, and this as one in which Christians suffered by *banishment*, the well-known punishment inflicted on St. John.³ It is evident that Eusebius thus understands *Tertullian*; I mean as alluding to St. John's banishment as the act of Domitian.⁴—Next *Clement of Alexandria* indirectly, but I think clearly, confirms the statement. In relating the well-known story of St. John and the robber, he speaks of it as acted

¹ It will only need, I think, to mention the three several counter-constructions that have been proposed of the words of Irenæus, in order to convince the intelligent and unprejudiced reader of their absurdity and extravagance.

1. *Wetstein* proposes to apply the verb *ἠώραθη*, not to *Ἀποκαλιψίς*, (notwithstanding the *ἠωρακός τὴν Ἀποκαλιψίω* of the clause immediately preceding,) but to *Ἰωάννης*: in the sense that *St. John* was seen at the end of Domitian's reign!!

2. *Knittel* would apply the same verb *ἠώραθη* to the *ὄνομα* of the clause next but one preceding; in the sense that the *name of Antichrist*, viz. *Τεταν*, (which, together with *Ἄρειος*, had been mentioned a little before as a likely solution of the enigma,) had been *discovered* only at the close of Domitian's reign: Domitian's own *prænomen* being *Titus*; and his character, as a *θεομαχος*, and persecutor, and fit type of Antichrist, then at length made known by his persecutions of the Christians!—This, let it be observed, though the verb in Irenæus' text is *ἠώραθη*, not *εἶρεθη*, or *εἰρεθη*, the noun *Τεταν*, not *Τετος*, and the real name declared to be still a mystery, and only the subject of conjecture!!

3. *Harenberg*, admitting that the *ἠώραθη* must be construed with the *Ἀποκαλιψίς*, as its nominative, proposes

to give *that nominative noun* quite a different sense here from what it had in the clause preceding: and, whereas it there meant the *Apocalyptic vision* seen by St. John, here to make it the *Apocalyptic Book*, or *Volume*; which *Book*, says he, was not seen,—that is, not seen *by the Christians in Gaul*,—fill the end of Domitian's reign: the words, “by the Christians of Gaul,” or something tantamount, being thus further supplied!!

Michaelis (p. 525) allows the great improbability of this solution. Yet it is an explanation somewhat like it that was the best Sir I. Newton could devise, in order to escape from the force of Irenæus' testimony. “Perhaps he *might* have heard from his master Polyarp that he had *received this book from John* about the time of Domitian's death: or indeed John *might* himself at that time have made a *new publication of it*; from whence Irenæus *might* imagine it was then but newly written.”

² Scorpiæ. c. 15.

³ “Tentaverat Domitianus, portio Neronis de crudelitate; sed, quia et homo, facile captum repressit, restitutus etiam quos relegaverat.” *Apol.* c. 5. The verb *relego* is used by him elsewhere of St. John's exile to Patmos. *De Præsc.* 36.

⁴ Euseb. H.E. iii. 20.

out by the apostle on his return from exile in Patmos, “after the death of the tyrant;”¹ and represents him as at that time an infirm old man.² Now “the tyrant,” whose death is referred to, must necessarily be either *Nero* or *Domitian*; as these were, up to the end of the first century, the only imperial persecutors of the Christian body. And *Nero* it can scarcely be: since, at the time of *Nero*’s persecution, St. John was by no means an infirm old man; being probably not much above, if indeed so much as, sixty years of age.³ Thus it must rather have been the tyrant *Domitian*.⁴ So, in fact, Eusebius expressly explains Clement to mean.⁵ Nor is there any thing whatsoever inconsistent with this view of the chronology of the story, so as some have supposed, in Chrysostom’s second-hand version of it; but the contrary.⁶—Thirdly, *Victorinus*, Bishop of

¹ *Quis Dives Salvetur*, chap. xlii. The story is copied by Eusebius into his H. E. iii. 23, and begins thus: *Επειδη γαρ, του τυραννου τελευτησαντος, απο της Πατμου της νησου μετληθεν εις την Εφεσον.*

² The statement, *επιλαθομενος της ηλικιας της εαυτου*, and the appellative *τον γεροντα*, both occur in reference to him: the latter twice over.

³ For he is supposed to have been considerably younger than our Lord. The traditionary reports of his age at the time of his death all tend to that conclusion. And Jerome, Adv. Jovin. Lib. i. c. 14, says expressly of his age when first called by Christ; “*Ut autem sciamus tunc fuisse puerum manifestissimè docent ecclesiasticæ historiæ.*” Now *Nero*’s persecution broke out in the year of our Lord 64, and ended with *Nero*’s death, A.D. 68.

⁴ Compare with Clement’s emphatic designation of *Domitian*, as I suppose, under the appellation of “the tyrant,” the undoubted application to *Domitian* of the same title, in the same emphatic manner, by the author of the *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, whether Lactantius,

or some contemporary; “*rescissis actis tyranni.*” M. P. c. 3. ad fin. So also in Apollonius Tyaneus’ celebrated second-sight view, and notification, of *Domitian*’s death; “*Strike the tyrant,*” &c.

⁵ H. E. ubi sup.

⁶ It is to Sir I. Newton that I here more particularly allude; who has endeavoured to draw a conclusion from Chrysostom’s version of the story, such as to make it support his theory of St. John’s having been banished to Patmos, and seen the Apocalypse, under *Nero*. His argument is this. “Chrysostom says that the young reprobate continued captain of the robbers *a long time*. Therefore this is *a story of many years*; and requires that John should have returned from Patmos rather at the death of *Nero* than of *Domitian*; because between *Domitian*’s death and that of St. John there were but two and a half years.” And so too argues Tilloch, p. 39—41.—But Chrysostom’s “*long time*” is in fact indefinite.* And that it was not meant to signify *many years* appears clearly on reference to the original; since the reprobate is there designated as still a *young man* when recovered by St. John.†—It should be

* See on this point of the *πολυν χρονον* some illustrations in my supplemental Paper on the Apocalyptic date, in the Appendix to this Volume.

† The passage in Chrysostom (Ad Theodor. Laps.) is as follow. Τα δε κατα τοις νεον εκεινον, τον προτερον μεν Ιωαννου του Ζεβεδαιου γενομενον μαθητην, υστερον δε επι πολυν λησταρχησαντα χρονον, και παλιν υπο των αγιων του μακαριου θηρευθεντα χειρων . . . ουδε αυτος αγνοεις . . . και σοον πολλακις ηκουσα θαναμαζουτος την συγκαταβασιν την πολλην, και οτι την αιμαχθεισαν πρωτον επιλησε δεξιαν τω νεφ περιχυθεις, και ουτως αυτον επι τα προτερα επανηγαγε. Where mark the *τω νεφ* in the conclusion.

Pettaw, and martyr in Diocletian's persecution, in a Commentary on the Apocalypse written towards the close of the third century, says twice over expressly, and in a part that bears no mark of interpolation, that the Apocalypse was seen by the Apostle John in the isle of Patmos, when banished thither by the Roman Emperor Domitian.¹—To the same effect, fourthly, is the very important testimony of *Eusebius*. For, though doubting about the *author* of the Apocalyptic book, (and in these doubts we see exemplified the free exercise of his independent judgment,) yet, on the *date* of St.

added that St. John is supposed to have lived more than two and a half years after his return: the time being three years according to *Cave*, four according to *Basnage*. See *Lardner*, v. 427.

Very much the same limitation of the interval between this man's first conversion and recovery appears in *Clement's* original narrative. He depicts the subject of the story as a youth nearly grown up, when first seen and presented to the bishop of the place by St. John; προσβλεψας νεανισκον ικανον τῷ σωματι, &c. He speaks of the interval simply thus. χρονος εν μεσῳ: "A certain interval of time past." And St. John's later visit, in which he reclaimed this young man (τον νεανισκον, as he is still called,) from the bishop, is spoken of as if his next and second visit; made on occasion of some affair arising in the district church, (one ου μακραν, "not far off," says *Clement*,) which caused them to send for him. Χρονος εν μεσῳ και, τινος επιπεσσυσης χρονιας, ανακαλουσι τον Ιωαννην.—just as if he had in the interval still lived at Ephesus, within call; and meanwhile no particular occasion had arisen for his presence, till then.*

¹ The two passages are as follows, taken from the edition of *Victorinus* given in the *Bibliotheca Patr. Max.* (B. P. M.) Vol. iii. pp. 419, 420.

1. On Apoc. x. 11, "Thou must prophesy again," he observes; "Hoc est quoniam, quando hoc vidit Joannes, erat in insulâ Pathmos, in metallum damnatus à Domitiano Cæsare. Ibi ergo vidit Apocalypsin: et cum senior jam putaret se per passionem accepturum receptionem, interfecto Domitiano omnia judicia ejus soluta sunt; et Joannes, de metallo dimissus, sic postea tradidit hanc eandem quam acceperat à Domino Apocalypsin."

2. On Apoc. xvii. 10, about the Beast's seventh and eighth heads, he writes; "Intelligi oportet tempus quo Scriptura Apocalypsis edita est. Quoniam tunc erat Cæsar Domitianus; ante illum autem fuerat Titus frater illius, et Vespasianus pater, Galba, Otho, et Vitellius. Hi sunt quinque qui ceciderunt: unus extat sub quo scribitur Apocalypsis;—Domitianus scilicet. Alius nondum venit: Nervam dixit."

I have alluded to the work now come down to us under the title of *Victorinus' Commentary*, (the same from which I have quoted the above,) as being really *Victorinus'*, though interpolated. Nor do I think we need have any doubt on that point. See my full notice of *Victorinus' Commentary* in the Appendix to my Vol. iv., on the History of Apocalyptic Interpretation.

* Let me add, with reference to *Chrysostom's* own view on this matter, that he, in common with the other ancient Fathers, (followed, I might add, by *Whitby*, *Macknight*, *Paley*, and most other learned moderns,) dates St. Paul's 2nd Epistle to Timothy (then Bishop of Ephesus) just before St. Paul's martyrdom, near the end of Nero's persecution: Δοκει μοι προς τῷ τελει ειναι αὐτῆ ἡ επιστολῆ· εγω γαρ ηδη, φασι, σπενδομαι. (Homily on 2 Tim. ad init.) And is he likely to have supposed that St. John address the Church of Ephesus, and the other six Asiatic churches, in the tone of apostolic connexion and authority described in the Apocalypse, at the very time when St. Paul (himself the apostolic superintendant of the Ephesian church) was yet living, or else almost immediately after his death; so as the notion of *Chrysostom's* referring St. John's exile in Patmos to Nero's persecution requires?

John's banishment to Patmos, he distinctly intimates more than once his agreement with the tradition of the ancients, that referred it to Domitian's persecution: and indeed implies, as is perfectly evident, that he knew of no other tradition whatsoever as to the time of St. John's banishment to Patmos.¹—The same is the recorded judgment of *Jerome*;² the same of Augustine's friend, *Orosius*;³ the same of *Sulpitius Severus*.⁴—Once more, we find an unhesitating statement of similar purport in *Primasius*; an eminent Augustinian commentator on the Apocalypse, of the sixth century. In his Preface to this Commentary, he speaks of the Apocalyptic visions having been seen by St. John when banished and condemned to the mines in Patmos by the Emperor Domitian.⁵—Other ancient testimonies of less importance might yet be added.⁶

¹ Immediately before the quotation made by him from Irenæus, which I have given at full p. 32, in the first Note of this Essay, Eusebius says; "In this persecution (*under Domitian*) it is reported (*κατεχει λογος*) that *John the Apostle and Evangelist*, being yet alive, was banished into the island Patmos, for the testimony of the word of God."—If it be objected that the whole of this report is given as from Irenæus, and that the *date*, as well as mention of the Apocalyptic John as John the *Apostle and Evangelist*, might perhaps be deemed a part of Irenæus' report, rather than Eusebius' own opinion, I may refer, secondly, to the unequivocal statement made by him at the end of chapter 20 of the same 3rd Book of his History; *Τοτε δη ουν* (*viz.* on Domitian's death, and Nerva's accession) *και τον αποστολον Ιωαννην υπο της κατα την νησον φυγης την επι της Εφεσου διατριβην απειληφεναι, ο των παρ' ημιν αρχαιων παραδιδωσι λογος*: where he reports the matter not as the tradition of *one* of the Christian fathers, Irenæus only, but of the Christian ancient writers (in the plural) *generally*.—Further, in another passage, II. E. iii. 29, soon afterwards, he adds the statement following; "*About this time* (*Domitian's reign*) *was the heresy of the Nicolaitans*, which continued for a short time; of which also the *Revelation of John* makes mention."—Moreover in his *Chronicon* he places St. John's banishment at the 14th year of Domitian.

In the Note at p. 40, it will be shown

that there is nothing contradictory to this in Eusebius' statement on the same subject in his *Demonstratio Evangelica*.

² "Vidit enim (sc. Joannes Apostolus) in Patmo insulâ, in quâ fuerat à Domitiano Principe ob Domini martyrium relegatus, Apocalypsin." Adv. Jovin. Lib. i. ch. 14. So again in his De V. I. chap. 9, where he speaks of John's banishment as an event that occurred in the 14th year of Domitian's reign. Lardner, iv. 446.

I may add that in the *Epist. Paulæ et Eustochii ad Marcellam*, inviting her to Bethlehem, given in Jerome's works, Tom. iv. ii. 549, (Bened. Ed.) the Apocalypse is spoken of as written *after the destruction of Jerusalem*.

³ "Domitianus . . . persecutionem in Christianos secundus à Nerone imperavit. Quo tempore etiam beatissimus Joannes Apostolus in Pathmum insulam relegatus fuit." Hist. B. vii. B. P. M. vi. 436.

⁴ "Interjecto deinde tempore Domitianus, Vespasiani filius, persecutus est Christianos; quo tempore Joannem Apostolum atque Evangelistam in Pathmon insulam relegavit: ubi ille . . . librum Apocalypsin . . . conscriptum edidit." Hist. Sacr. Lib. ii. B. P. M. vi. 344.

⁵ "Hæc autem eo tempore videre promeruit, quo in Patmos insulâ pro Christo à Domitiano Cesare exilio missus, et metallo damnatus, terminis arcebatur inclusus." B. P. M. x. 288.

⁶ E. g. 1st, that of *Jornandes*, the historian of the 6th century, in his *De Regn. Success.* "Domitianus . . . manus in

Such is the *later* and *subsidiary* Patristic testimony still extant, to the fact of St. John having seen the Apocalyptic visions in Patmos under the reign of *Domitian*:—a chain of testimony not to be viewed (so as Tilloch would quite unwarrantably represent it)¹ as but the repetition of that of Irenæus, whom indeed for the most part these writers do not even refer to:² but as their own deliberate independent judgment, formed on *all* the evidence which then existed. As to any contrary *early* tradition respecting the date, if such there was, (as Sir I. Newton and Tilloch, still without any warrant of historic record, have assumed,³) it can scarcely have been unknown to them. And their total silence respecting it is only explicable on one of two suppositions;—viz. either that it did not exist; or that they deemed it undeserving of credit, and not even worth the notice.

Nor can this be wondered at: seeing that as to any con-

Christianos injiciens, Ioannem apostolum et Evangelistam, postquam in ferventi oleo missum non potuissent extinguere, in Pathmos cum insulam relegavit, ubi Apocalypsin vidit." B. P. M. xi. 1086.—2ndly, and to the same effect, as quoted by Lardner v. 140, *Isidore of Seville*, about 600 A.D. in his *Chronicle*.

Besides these I may mention two *apocryphal*, but probably rather early, authorities.—The *first* is the *Pseudo-Prochorus* (compare Acts vi. 5), in his *Narratio de rebus gestis Sancti Joannis*: a writing which Bellarmine (B. P. M. ii. 46) thinks may perhaps be the same that Athanasius alludes to under the title *Circuitus Joannis*; and which, if so, may probably have been of the third century, when literary forgeries under apostolic names were rife. (See Mosheim, iii. 2. 3. 11.) This *Pseudo-Prochorus* is very full on the subject of *Domitian's* persecution of the Christians; and (chap. xiv.) gives the Emperor's pretended Rescript, addressed to the Ephesian heathens who had applied for it, condemning the apostle John to the mines in Patmos. B. P. M. ii. 53.—My *second* apocryphal authority is the old *Roman Martyrology*: which, as Whitty observes on Heb. iv. 3, asserts that *Antipas*, mentioned Apoc. ii. 13, suffered martyrdom under *Domitian*; so fixing the date of the Apocalypse to a time after

that event. This Martyrium of Antipas is, I presume, the same that Andreas of Cæsarea in his Apocalyptic Commentary on that verse tells us he had seen:—*Ἀντίπας ἕπερ ἀνεγνων το μαρτυριον.*

¹ "However numerous the authors are who ascribe it to the end of Domitian's reign, the testimony of all of them may be resolved into that of *one individual* whom they copied, (p. 8, "whom they refer to,") namely, Irenæus." Tilloch on the Apocalypse, p. 14. So again pp. 8, 9, 44. He says too, p. 6, after Sir Isaac Newton, that Irenæus *first introduced* this opinion. But how so? Why not rather *Polycarp*, Irenæus' instructor in "*the lower Asia*;" (see p. 2, Note⁶, *suprà*;) or other Christians there resident; to whom, and their Churches, the Apostle John, as commanded by Jesus Christ, (Apoc. i. 11,) had first communicated the Apocalypse?

² I pray the reader to refer back to the extracts, especially that from the Alexandrian Clement, as evidence on this point.

³ They dwell much on this hypothesis. Sir I. Newton calls it "a tradition in the *first churches*." Tilloch says, p. 9, "Epiphanius followed some other [and of course *earlier*] authority now lost:" p. 11, "*Early* commentators held the opinion," &c. Eusebins' ignorance of any such early counter tradition has been already noted, p. 36.

trary statement on the point in question, there appears to have been none whatsoever until the time of *Epiphanius*, Bishop of Salamis in Cyprus, in the latter half of the fourth century: a writer commendable indeed, as Dupin says,¹ “for zeal, learning, and piety, but credulous, indiscriminating, inaccurate;” and whose chief work, “On Heresies,” is decried by Mosheim as “full of blots and errors, through the levity and ignorance of the author:”² who moreover, in his statement in that work on this very point,—supposing it correctly given, and not an error of transcription in our copies,—so exemplifies this ignorance, as quite to justify the silent neglect of it by those writers of our catena, viz. *Jerome*, *Orosius*, *Sulpitius*, and *Primasius*, who wrote after him. For he speaks of St. John having prophesied when in the isle of Patmos, in the days of the *Emperor Claudius*:³—a time when, as Michaelis justly observes,⁴ it does not appear from history that there was any imperial persecution of the Christian body whatsoever; and when moreover the probability is that of the seven Apocalyptic churches scarce one was as yet in existence,⁵ and the Apostle John moreover in no way associated with the district.⁶ But indeed one is almost forced to suspect some strange error in the transcriber. For Epiphanius elsewhere implies John’s age to have been ninety at the time of his return from Patmos.⁷ And can

¹ Auteurs Ecclesiastiques, Tom. ii. p. 301. (Ed. Paris, 1693.) ² iv. 2. 2. 9.

³ Αυτου δε προφητευσαντος εν χρονοις Κλαυδιου Καισαρος ανωτατω, οτε εις την Πατμον νησον υπηροξεν. Hær. 51, n. 33, quoted by Lardner, iv. 190.

⁴ Michaelis *ibid.* § 9, p. 520.

⁵ See *ibid.* and my Note ² p. 43.

⁶ The reader should remember that in the Acts and the Apostolic Epistles we have an authentic history, and series of historical notices, descriptive of the state of the Christian Church throughout the whole of the reign of Claudius; which reign lasted only from A.D. 41 to 54. So that we are perfectly in a situation to compare the facts of the case with the Epiphanian theory, as to the time of the Apocalyptic publication; and so to convince ourselves of its falsehood.

⁷ The passage I refer to is one in which Epiphanius speaks of John writing his Gospel, given in Lardner, iv. 183.

Διο ύστερον αναγκαζει το άγιον Πνευμα τον Ιωαννην, παραιτουμενον ευαγγελισασθαι δι' ευλαβειαν και ταπεινοφροσυνην, επι τη γηραλεα αυτου ήλικια, μετα ετη εννενηκοντα της έαυτου ζωης, μετα την αυτου απο της Πατμου επανοδον, την επι Κλαυδιου γενομενην Καισαρος· και μετα ικανα ετη του διατριψαι αυτον απο [f. επι] της Ασιας αναγκαζεται εκθεσθαι το ευαγγελιον. Hær. 51, n. 12. Where we may most naturally understand the “*after ninety years of age*,” as in chronological apposition with the “*after the return from Patmos, which was under Claudius the Emperor*.”

Does not the whole passage, let me ask, suggest Apoc. x. 11 to one’s mind; “And he said to me, Thou must prophesy again before many peoples, &c.:

” a charge applied by Victorinus, and other early expositors, to St. John’s writing his Gospel and Apocalypse after his return from Patmos?

we suppose that he really thought John to have been *ninety* years old before A.D. 54, which was the latest year of the life of Claudius, or near *seventy* when called by Christ to be his disciple? ¹—Besides which strange theory we are reminded by Newton and Tilloch of yet another testimony to the early date of the Apocalypse. The *subscription to a Syriac version of the book*, written about the beginning of the sixth century,² is thus worded; “The Revelation which was made by God to John the Evangelist in the island of Patmos, whither he was banished by the Emperor *Nero*.” But of what value is this opinion, then first broached, as it would appear? ³—Or again, of what that of the commentator *Arethas*, promulgated still two or three centuries later,⁴ to the effect that the Apocalypse was writ-

¹ See Note³ p. 34, *suprà*.—At p. 190 Lardner expresses his suspicion of an error of transcription in the passages given in Notes⁷ and³ p. 37. Vitringa (In Apoc. p. 8) intimates that he should have thought the same, but from the circumstance of Epiphanius twice over making the statement. And a similar suspicion, I should think, must have crossed the mind of every reflective inquirer into the subject.

It will be seen in the next Note but one that Juvenal designates Domitian as the *Flavius ultimus*. And so too Martial says, “*Flavia templa*,” of temples built by Domitian. Epig. ix. 4. Might not Epiphanius have somewhat similarly designated him from this his Gentile name? If so, and the appellatives given by him were *Φλαβιον Καισαρος*, (I write the *Φλαβιον* as Eusebius in his *Chronicon*, quoted from Syncellus in Clinton’s *Fasti Romani*, p. 80.) the rareness of this appellation of the emperor might perhaps make a transcriber suspect error; and by a small alteration he might think to rectify it, the word being changed into *Κλαυδιου*.

² “The Syriac version of the Apocalypse is now known to be a part of the Philoxenian version, which was made by Polycarp at the beginning of the sixth century.” Michaelis *ibid.* p. 521.

³ May not a mistake have arisen from *Domitian* having sometimes the title of *Nero* given him; and in fact the *original* writer of the Syriac subscription have meant *Domitian*, not *Nero*?

Thus Juvenal iv. 37:

Quum jam semianimum laceraret *Flavius*
orbem
Ultimus, et calvo serviret Roma *Neroni*.

On which Ruperti observes: “*Neroni* alteri. . . Nota sunt Ausonii verba;

Et Titus imperii felix brevitate, sequutus
Frater, quem Calvum dixit sua Roma
Neronem.”

Similarly Tertullian, in his *Apolog.* ch. 5, speaks of “*Domitianus portio Neronis*.”

Or perhaps, contrariwise, the fact of *Nero*’s prænomen being *Domitius* (so Jerome on Dan. xi., “*Multi nostrorum putant. Domitium Neronem Antichristum fore*”) may have caused the mistake with an ill-informed translator, or transcriber; and, seeing that the time of the writing of the Apocalypse was stated to have been under *Domitian*, he may have judged it to mean *Domitius Nero*.

Mistakes like these can of course only be supposed of writers ignorant or careless, not of such as Irenæus or Eusebius.

⁴ On Apoc. xiii. 2, “The beast that I saw was like to a leopard, and his mouth like a lion’s,” he writes; “Per os leonis regnum designatur Babyloniorum, cui *Saracenorum* regnum manifestè successit, quòd in hoc usque tempus regia eorum *Babylone* sit.” B. P. M. ix. 771. Now the Saracen capital of Bagdad near Babylon was not built till A.D. 762. See my notice of *Arethas* in the Appendix to Vol. iv.

ten before the destruction of Jerusalem;¹ an opinion contradicted indeed elsewhere in the body of his work by himself?²—Alike the one and the other slept unnoticed for centuries. And, if waked up by critics of a more modern age, it has only been (as Michaelis, we have seen, confesses) from the supposed necessity of such dates, in order to any possible explanation of the Apocalyptic prophecies.³

It does not need that I discuss at all prominently certain points of *indirect* and *subsidiary* historical evidence, in favour of an early date, which these writers have also called in to their aid. A sufficient notice of them will be found below: and it will appear that they all, like the *direct* testimony just discussed, prove weak and worthless on examination.⁴

¹ "Nondum enim vastatio à Romanis illata Judæos involverat, ubi hæc Evangelista oracula suscipiebat." Comment. in Apoc. vii. 4; B. P. M. ix. 759.

Andreas (Arethas' predecessor and model) had previously mentioned that certain preceding expositors supposed an allusion to this event in Apoc. vii; *Ταυτα τινες εις την επι Ουισπασιανου βασιλευς πολιορκιαν εξελαβον απαντα, των ειρημειων εκαστον τροπολογησαντες;* (quoted by Lardner v. 78;) and Michaelis, p. 524, suggests that *Hippolytus'* lost Comment must be the one referred to. But I find what substantially answers to *Andreas'* statement in *Tichonius'* still extant Commentary, Homily xiii., an expositor of the fourth century. For on Apoc. xvi. 14, he refers the great day of the Lord to Jerusalem's destruction by Titus. This, however, is meant in a *retrospective* sense simply; I mean retrospective from the date of the Apocalyptic visions: just, for example, as *Mr. Faber* explains the Seals retrospectively.—See my notice of *Tichonius* in the Appendix to Vol. iv.

² On Apoc. i. 9, he cites with approbation *Eusebius'* date; "Relegatum ipsum in Patmum insulam sub *Domitiano* fuisse *Eusebius Pamphilus* in *Chronicâ* suâ citat." B. P. M. ix. 743.

³ See Note ³, p. 32 *suprà*.

⁴ There are two points of subsidiary *historic* evidence urged by Sir I. Newton, in proof of the Apocalypse having been written in *Nero's* persecution; besides the story from *Clement* and *Chrysostom* already noticed, Note ⁶, p. 34.

I. Of these two the *first* is thus stated by that eminent author. "Eusebius in

his *Chronicle* and *Ecclesiastical History* follows *Irenæus*: but afterwards in his *Evangelical Demonstrations* he conjoins the banishment of *John* into *Patmos* with the deaths of *Peter* and *Paul*: and so do *Tertullian*, and *Pseudo-Prochorus*; as well as the first author, whoever he was, of that very ancient fable, that *John* was put by *Nero* into a vessel of boiling oil, and, coming out unhurt, was banished by him into *Patmos*. Though this story be no more than a fiction, yet was it founded on a tradition in the first churches, that *John* was banished into *Patmos* in the days of *Nero*."

Let us however examine Sir I. N.'s three authorities on this point, and see whether they will bear him out.

1. *Eusebius*, after briefly sketching the earlier persecutions of the apostles and disciples, as related in the Book of the Acts of the Apostles, adds that subsequently, or in addition to these, (*επι τουτοις*.) *James*, the Lord's brother, was stoned to death: and he then passes to the following notice of *Peter*, *Paul*, and *John*, which is the passage referred to by Sir I. Newton; *Και Πιτρος δε επι Ρωμης κατα κεφαλης ταιρουται, Παιλος τε αποτεμνεται, Ιωαννης τε νησφ παραδιδεται*—a passage followed by the general statement that the surviving disciples, undeterred by these things, persisted in their Christian profession and designs. *Eusebius Dem. Evan. Lib. iii. p. 116.* (Paris 1628.) Thus we see that there is here no intimation whatever of *synchronism* between the two events of *Paul's* beheading and *John's* banishment.

2. In *Tertullian's* Treatise de Præs.

Nor will the only other evidence offered on their side,—evidence *internal* in its character, and which has been urged

Hæc. c. 36, (who was the *first author* of the story referred to,*) the conjoined mention of John's being thrown into boiling oil, and Paul's and Peter's death, is not at all a *chronological* but a *local* conjunction. Speaking of Rome he says: "Ista quàm felix ecclesia cui totam doctrinam apostoli cùm sanguine suo profuderunt: ubi Petrus passioni Dominicæ adæquatur; ubi Paulus Joannis [sc. Baptistæ] exitu coronatur; ubi apostolus Joannes, posteaquam in oleum igneum demersus nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur." Not a word is here said of this last transaction having taken place under Nero. On the contrary, tradition, we shall now see, referred it to the times of *Domitian*.—For first *Jerome* adv. *Jovianian* (Lib. i.) repeats the story immediately after the clause given in Note², p. 36 *suprà*, wherein he states *Domitian* to have been the Emperor that banished St. John to Patmos. And, further, Sir I. Newton's third witness,

3. *Pseudo-Prochorus*, is directly against him. For, after telling the story at full length, and similarly conjoining the mention of this event with that of Paul's and Peter's martyrdoms, as a mere association of *place*, (for he supposes it to have occurred at Rome, and that thus the *Porta Latina* in that city became a memorial of one apostle, St. John, as the *Porta Vaticana* was of the other, St. Peter,) after this, I say, he expressly states the Emperor by whom St. John was thus thrown into the oil to have been *Domitian*, (who soon after banished him to Patmos,) not *Nero*. "Audiens *Domitianus* de adventu ejus [Joannis] . . . jussit ut proconsul duceret ante Portam Latinam, et in ferventis olei dolium illum vivum dimitti." . . . "Deus enim per crudelem tyrannum consilium suum disponebat, ut, sicut virtutibus et signis Joannes et Petrus socii fuerunt, ita in urbe Româ memoriam haberent sui triumphî. Sicut enim Porta Vaticana," &c. *Domitian* is again and again mentioned by this writer as the Emperor concerned in the persecution of St. John. B. P. M. ii. 52. See Note⁶ p. 36 *suprà*.

One cannot but greatly regret that such a man as Sir I. Newton should have written in the above-made citation from

him what was not only so incorrect, but so calculated to mislead. Perhaps, however, he may have transcribed from others, and not looked into the originals.

II. The *second* point of subsidiary *historic* evidence urged by Sir Isaac, and repeated by Dr. Tilloch with an air of great confidence and triumph, p. 41, is the early existence of *pseudo-Apocalypses* in the professing Christian Church; especially one by *Cerinthus*, who, they say, lived so early as to withstand the apostles in the first council at Jerusalem, (Acts xv,) and died before St. John: which false Apocalypses implied the previous existence of the true.—But what the authority for assigning this early date to Cerinthus, and his Apocalypses? It is well known to be a controverted point (as Mosheim says, i. 2. 5. 16, and Lardner viii. 409) whether Cerinthus was of the first century or the second. Epiphanius,—the inaccurate and untrustworthy Epiphanius,—is the only author of the story of Cerinthus being at the Council at Jerusalem. And he himself puts the Cerinthians elsewhere after the Carpocratians; whom all place, I believe, (see Lardner viii. 393,) after the end of the first century. On the other hand *Irenæus* dates the Cerinthians after the Nicolaitans; which last he deemed (as his date of the Apocalypse proves) to have been of *Domitian's* time. *Theodoret* implies (as Lardner observes, p. 409) that Cerinthus did not arise till the old age of St. John. Κηριθον δε φασιν, Ιωαννης . . . επι περιοντος, τα της οικιας αιρσιως παρασπειραι ζιζανια. H. E. ii. A judgment on the question moderate, and which seems to me sufficiently to agree with the various most trustworthy testimonies. Thus St. John, in extreme old age, may have written his Gospel after Cerinthus' first rise; Cerinthus, after St. John's death, have written and published his false Apocalypse.

Let me add, had these perverters of *St. John's Apocalypse* written as early as Tilloch asserts, even before St. Paul's 1st Epistle to the Thessalonians, might we not presume that they would have been as specifically reprobated as those that wrested *St. Paul's epistles* in 2 Pet. iii. 16?

* See Lardner, ii. 286.

of late years with great earnestness and some effect¹ by Dr. Tilloch and others, after Sir Isaac and Bishop Newton,—be found at all better able to bear examination.

For what is the main argument of this kind? It is founded on certain marked similarities discoverable, as they suppose, in sundry Epistles of Peter and Paul, written before Nero's death, to passages in the Apocalypse;² whence they infer that the Apocalypse was written first, the Epistles afterwards.—Now in a question of this kind it is important, indeed essential, to distinguish between cases of *reference* to some antecedent writing, (whether *direct*, or by means of the *article* or *pronouns demonstrative*,) and those of mere *similarity* of thought or expression. Of the *former* class of examples, adduced by these critics from the apostolic epistles, there is not one, I believe, which is not explicable as a reference to the previous prophecies of the Old Testament.³—As to cases of mere *similarity* and *coincidence of thought*, if we may often see much of it even in *uninspired* writings, without implying imitation on the part of one or other of the writers, how much more may we expect undesigned resemblances in *inspired* writings, such as are both the Epistles and Book of the Apocalypse spoken of; seeing that, though written by different human penmen, they were inspired by one and the same *divine Spirit*:⁴ which

¹ See the notices of it by *Burgh* in the Appendix to his Comment on the Revelation, pp. 409—422 (4th Ed.), and by a *Reviewer* in the *Investigator*, Vol. i. p. 213. The former entirely adopts and approves the argument; the latter however much more cautiously, and only in part.

² See the enumeration of them in Sir I. Newton and Dr. Tilloch. The most striking, I think, are those of St. Peter about the church at *Babylon*, the *royal priesthood*, and *new heaven and new earth*; and those from the Epistle to the Hebrews about the *heavenly sabbatism*, the *general assembly*, the coming unto *Mount Zion*, the *city that hath foundations*, the *heavenly Jerusalem*: also, as Dr. Tilloch adds, p. 99, and his Reviewer in the *Investigator*, the expressions in 1 Cor. xv. 52, about the *last trumpet's sounding*, and in Gal. iv. 26, about “the *Jerusalem above*, which is the mother of us all.”

³ E. g. St. Peter's *promised new heavens and new earth* may be referred to Isa.

lxv. 17, lxvi. 22, as well as to Apoc. xxi. 1; the *city which hath foundations* to Isa. liv. 11, as well as to Apoc. xxi. 14; the *last trumpet* to Exod. xix. 16, (compared with Heb. xii. 19, 26 and 1 Thess. iv. 16,) as well as to Apoc. xi. 15.—Indeed that this last could not have been the original of 1 Cor. xv. 52 is hence evident;—because the last Apocalyptic trumpet included in it, like the trumpets preceding, a certain considerable space of time ere the events connected with it (of which the judgment of the dead is not the first) should be accomplished; whereas at the last trumpet sounding of 1 Cor. and 2 Thess. the dead are to rise “in the twinkling of an eye.” See, too, Note² on the next page.

⁴ 2 Pet. i. 20, 21: “No prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation: for the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.”

Spirit may just as well be supposed to have dictated an idea or brief sketch to St. Peter or St. Paul, which was afterwards to be developed in the finished pictures of the Apocalypse of St. John, as to have spoken by those first-mentioned Apostles in terms or figures borrowed from the previously promulgated pictures of the Apocalypse. All this is very evident; and with it the exceeding danger of arguing, so as Newton and Tilloch have done, for the chronological priority of the Apocalypse, from any supposed imitations of it which they may think to trace in one and another of the apostolic epistles.—But it is to Dr. Tilloch himself that we owe the setting forth of the utter unsoundness and error of this their argument in the clearest light. For he has plainly shown that *on this principle* there must be allowed proof of reference to the Apocalypse in St. Paul's *two Epistles to the Thessalonians*,—proof as conclusive as in any other case:¹—which two Epistles were, however, notoriously written before ever a Christian church was founded at Ephesus;² much more before it had any episcopal angel presiding over it, such as was addressed in the first of the Apocalyptic Epistles by the Lord Jesus. And the same very much in regard of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians; which also, as we have seen, Dr. T. strongly argues to have been post-Apocalyptic: seeing that it was almost certainly written before the foundation of any of the seven Asiatic churches but that of Ephesus.³

¹ Tilloch, Diss. ii. § 11, pp. 110—122. "In the First Epistle to the Thessalonians," he says, p. 110, "there are several expressions, which, if we believe that the writer often has allusions to the Apocalypse in his other Epistles, we can hardly have reason to doubt have reference to the contents of that prophecy:" instancing the *wrath to come*, the *coming of Christ with all his saints*, the *coming as a thief in the night*, the *trumpet of God*, and the *signs and periods*, which the Christians addressed *perfectly knew*; 1 Thess. i. 10, iii. 13, iv. 16, v. 1, compared with Apoc. vi. 16, xix. 11—14, xi. 15, xiii. 5, &c.—Again of the Second Epistle he writes, p. 117; "To the author of this work it appears certain that in these passages of the first chapter [viz. verses 7, 8, 'Rest with us, when the Lord

Jesus shall be revealed from heaven in flaming fire,'] the allusions to the Apocalypse are quite obvious."

² Both these Epistles were written, while Timothy and Silas were with Paul, from Corinth: (compare Acts xviii. 5, 1 Thess. i. 1, iii. 1, 2, 6, 2 Thess. i. 1:) and it was not till after leaving Corinth that he first touched at Ephesus, where there was then no Christian church, but only a Jewish synagogue; (Acts xviii. 19;) nor till his second visit, on returning from Jerusalem and Antioch, (Acts xix. 1, &c.) that he formed a church in that city. Indeed Tilloch allows this, pp. 21, 112.

³ St. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians was written from Ephesus, as all allow, and is indeed most manifest (see 1 Cor. xvi. 8, 19), during St. Paul's sojourn

So as to the *primary* argument of these writers, to prove an early date, from *internal* evidence. A *secondary* class of arguments from internal evidence, derived from the allusions that we find in the Apocalypse to the *Israelitish tribes* and the *Holy City, temple, and altar*,—as if, say they, the Jewish city, temple, and altar were still standing,¹—is even yet more obviously inconclusive. For it takes for granted that those expressions are meant *literally* of the old Jerusalem and Israel, not *figuratively*, of the Christian Church: a point which not only have they not proved, but which, I am well persuaded, (and we shall soon see that the persuasion exprest is not without reason,) they never can prove.²

Yet a few words, ere I conclude, on two or three corroborative points of evidence drawn both from *profane history* and *Scripture*.—*First*, it would seem from historic report very questionable whether *Nero's* persecution of Christians extended *far beyond the precincts of Rome itself*:³ a circumstance which, if true, (nor is it contradicted by any distinct Christian ecclesiastical record of

at Ephesus, mentioned Acts xix, in which he was occupied in *founding the Ephesian Church*.*—I might add the same too of the Epistle to the *Galatians*, which bears date probably yet earlier.—See Lardner and Macknight on the Chronology of St. Paul's Epistles.

There is a passage in Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians, which strikes me as corroborative on this point. He writes thus, § 11. "St. Paul noticing you in the beginning of his Epistle, glories of you in all the churches which alone then knew God; for *we* did not then know Him." Whence we may naturally infer, that at the date of St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, or *as late as about the year A.D. 61 or 62*, the Christian Church of *Smyrna* (which was one of the *Apocalyptic* churches, and Polycarp's see afterwards,) had not been formed.

¹ So Sir I. Newton:—"allusions to the

temple and altar and Holy City, as then standing; and to the *Gentiles*, who were soon after (?) to tread under foot the holy city and outward court."

² See my observations in Chap. ii of my Introduction to the Prophecy, on the primary exhibition of a scene like that of the Holy Place of the Jewish temple in Apoc. i; also those on the sealing of the 144,000, out of the twelve tribes of Israel, in Apoc. vii; and those on the measuring of the temple and altar in Apoc. xi. 1, 2. Here however Tilloch differs; as may be inferred from his explaining the sanctuary, altar, &c., of Dan. ix. 24, in a Christian sense.

³ See especially Tacitus Ann. xv. 44. Also Suetonius' Nero c. 16.—The learned modern ecclesiastical historians *Gieseler* (Text Book i. 2. 28), *Waddington* (Church History i. 113, 114, 2nd Ed.), and many others, take this restricted view of the *Neronian* persecution.

* Let me add, would St. Paul have said, 1 Cor. xv. 8, "Last of all he was seen by me also," if St. John had subsequently to Paul's seeing Christ near Damascus, yet before his writing to the Corinthians, been favoured with the vision of Christ in Patmos; and not rather pointedly have referred to that extraordinary vision, in further proof of Christ's resurrection?

the first four centuries,) ¹ negatives of itself the idea of St. John having been banished in *his* persecution to the mines of Patmos.—*Secondly*, they furnish no evidence that in Nero's persecution banishment to the islands, with its usual penal accompaniments, was one of the punishments then put in force against accused Christians: whereas, on the other hand, we have direct profane historic testimony in proof that that particular punishment *was* enforced against persons accused of Christianity in the persecution by *Domitian*. The illustrative case of the noble Senator *Clemens'* equally noble wife *Domitilla* will readily occur to the memory of the classic reader.²—To which let me add, *thirdly*, that it appears from Tacitus,³ that about the sixth year of Nero, or A.D. 60, the city of *Laodicea* was destroyed by an earthquake; in which earthquake, according to Eusebius,⁴ the adjacent cities of *Colossæ* and *Hierapolis* were also involved. Now, as regards *Laodicea* itself, we read in Tacitus that before he wrote it was rebuilt: ⁵ the exact time of its restoration not being specified by him; but which, according to such memorials as exist, seems to have been completed not till some 10 or 12 years

¹ So Waddington *ibid.* 114; Orosius and perhaps Sulp. Severus, both given by Lardner vi. 624, being the earliest Christian writers who distinctly extend the Neronian persecution into the Provinces. Eusebius especially, H. E. ii. 25, does not. As to the Lusitanian inscription given by Lardner, p. 623, from the archaeologist Gruter, which would make Nero's persecution to have extended into Portugal, Dean Waddington observes (*ibid.* 113), "The forgery of the Lusitanian inscription, according to which 'Nero purged that province from the new superstition,' is now universally admitted." So too Gieseler, *ibid.*

² The history is found in Dion Cassius, lxxvii. 14, and Eusebius H. E. iii. 18.—Flavius Clemens was cousin-german to Domitian, Domitilla his niece.

Let me observe that Dion Cassius expressly mentions also the liberation from exile of those whom Domitian had banished on the charge of atheism, (i. e. of Christianity,) by the Emperor Nerva on his accession: 'Ο Νερούνας τους τε κρινόμενους ἐπ' ἀσεβείᾳ ἀφῆκε, καὶ τους φευγόντας κατήγαγε.—a fact precisely

agreeing with the ecclesiastical tradition as to St. John's liberation occurring on that Emperor's death (whoever he was) that had banished him to Patmos.

³ Annal. xiv. 27. See Note ⁵.

⁴ In his Chronicon.—I agree with Tillemont, ad ann. 60, in supposing Eusebius to mean the same earthquake as Tacitus; though he places it in the tenth year of Nero.

If Colossæ was destroyed in the earthquake, and Tacitus' date is to be received, Paul must have written his Epistle to the Colossians before the ending of Nero's 6th year, Oct. 13, A.D. 60. Let me be permitted to refer on this point to my Essay and Chart of the Pauline Chronology, in the Appendix to my Warburton Lectures, p. 457.

Mr. Gresswell dates the Epistle A.D. 61 on account of the earthquake. But this is a year too late.

⁵ "Eodem anno ex inlustribus Asiæ urbibus Laodicea tremore terræ prolapsa, nullo à nobis remedio, propriis opibus revaluit."—In Fellowes' "Excursions in Asia Minor" there is a notice of the "extinct volcanoes of Laodicea."

after, perhaps in the reign of Vespasian.¹ Which time of the city's restoration is of course quite inconsistent with the idea of a Laodicean Church existing at the epoch of Nero's persecution; much more with the state of wealth and luxury ascribed to it in the Apocalyptic epistle. On the other hand, on the hypothesis of a *Domitianic* date to the Apocalypse, the testimony of these monumental memorials well consists with the idea of Laodicean prosperity sketched in the epistle: while at the same time the non-restoration, according to existing monuments, of both Hierapolis and Colossæ before Domitian's death, quite accounts for the silence at that time in the Apocalyptic letter about Colossæ and Hierapolis.—How rash then Dr. Tilloch's argument from this silence for a Neronic date;² even if considered only in the light of profane history! How much more rash when considered also in the light of the adverse evidence derivable from the Scriptures themselves! In which Scriptures, not to revert to what has been argued from other of St. Paul's Epistles, we have in fine his 2nd to Timothy, then Bishop of Ephesus, written, according to the most probable and generally received opinion,³ just before his death under the Neronic persecution: and which gives not a hint of the Apostle John's being even then established in that neighbourhood, or expected; or of

¹ Turning to *medallic* illustrations, I find in Mionnet's coins of *Colossæ* none between those of the elder Agrippina, struck, I suppose, under Caligula, (see Rasche on "Agrippina Senior,") and those of Commodus, a century and a half after: (Colossean coins, however, are very rare:) in his coins of *Hierapolis* a gap from Nero to Trajan. And neither Eckhel nor Rasche supply any others in the case either of *Colossæ* or *Hierapolis*. In those of *Laodicea* Mionnet's gap is from Nero to Titus only; there being various Laodicean medals both of Titus and Domitian.

The elder Pliny (H. N. v. 29, 30) implies the existence of a Roman tribunal under Vespasian at Laodicea. Vit. p. 54. And Kitto's Pictorial Bible, on Apoc. iii, speaks of an inscription found on the amphitheatre there, with a date showing that it was in course of erection at

the time of John's exile in Patmos, A.D. 96.

² "These passages (viz. 'John to the seven churches in Asia,' and 'The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches,') prove that the Apocalypse was written before there was a church at Colosse or at Hierapolis: for Dean Woodhouse has not ventured to state that these churches had *ceased to exist* at the date he assigns to the Apocalypse." Tilloch, p. 32; and so again at p. 38.—Dean Woodhouse, it seems, in accounting for the omission of these churches, had simply said that they were probably not mentioned from the circumstance of "*their having become of less importance*;" not bethinking him, at the time, of the earthquake that I have specified.

³ So Chrysostom, (see p. 35 *suprà*.) Whitby, Macknight, Michaelis, Paley, &c.

any such new Churches having been formed there, as are addressed in five out of the seven letters to the Asiatic Churches! Besides that the state of those Churches, as Apocalyptically described, seems to indicate a considerable interval of time from that of their first founding. So, for example, very specially in the case of the Ephesian Church, which is charged with having then "left its first love."¹

Thus (to conclude) the varied historical evidence that has been inquired into all concurs to confirm the date originally and expressly assigned by *Irenæus* to the Apocalypse, as seen and written *at the close of the reign of Domitian*; that is, near the end of the year 95, or beginning of 96.² Accordingly, the great majority hitherto of the most approved ecclesiastical historians and biblical critics, alike Roman Catholic and Protestant, French, German, and English,—writers who have had no bias on the point in question, one way or the other, from any particular cherished theory of Apocalyptic interpretation,—for example, Tillemont, Dupin, Bossuet, Le Clerc,—Turretin, Spanheim,³ Basnage, Lampe, Mosheim,—Mill, Whitby,⁴ Lardner, &c.,—have all alike adopted it.⁵ To whom I am happy to add the more modern names of the German ecclesiastical historian Gieseler,⁶ as well as of our own Church historians Burton and Waddington⁷ also, and the very learned classical chronologist Fynes Clinton.⁸ We may, I am persuaded, depend on its correctness, with as unhesitating and

¹ This argument is urged strongly 'by Vitringa in Apoc. i. 2; also by L'Enfant and Beausobre, after him, as cited in Lardner vi. 327.

² Domitian was assassinated *Septem-ber* A. D. 96. Suetonius' *Domit. c. 17.*

³ Spanheim in his *Eccles. Hist.* speaks of it as among the things *certain.*

⁴ On Heb. iv. 3.

⁵ Woodhouse, from whom I have freely borrowed in this Preliminary Essay, thus sums up about the date of the Apocalypse, p. 11: "Lampe has asserted, and Lardner fully confirms the assertion, 'that all antiquity is abundantly agreed that *Domitian* was the

author of St. John's banishment to Patmos.'"

⁶ Text Book i. 63.

⁷ Burton, p. 163, says: "The date of all his (St. John's) writings is attended with uncertainty, except perhaps that of his Apocalypse, which must have been written either in the island of Patmos, or soon after his return to Ephesus." Dr. B. had just spoken of John's banishment to Patmos as under *Domitian*.—What Dean Waddington says of the seven Apocalyptic churches, i. 7, implies it.

⁸ In his *Fasti Romani ad ann. 95.*—Let me add that *Mr. Tregelles*, in his late Critical Edition of the Apocalypse text,

implicit confidence, as on the truth of almost any of the lesser facts recorded in history.

The important bearing of the true Apocalyptic date on Apocalyptic interpretation will soon appear.* *See appendix*

(Preface p. x,) accounts for the very much fewer number of the Apocalyptic MSS, as compared with those of the other New Testament Books, from the fact of its having been written, agreeably with Irenæus' testimony, at a later period than the rest.

* Since the above was printed in my 1st Edition I have seen the American Theological Professor *Moses Stuart's* Apocalyptic Commentary, published in 1845, shortly after my own: a Commentary the result, he says, of 20 years' thought and labour; and in which, after Lücke and others of the more modern German school, he contends strongly for the *Neronic* date. As the commentary is thus elaborate, and he asserts that "it is now a matter agreed on by nearly all the recent critics who have studied the literature of this book that it was written *under the bloody reign of Nero*, or shortly after," (Biblioth. Sacra ii. 249,) I feel it right not to omit a consideration of his argument.

Accordingly in the Appendix to the present Volume there will be found a review of whatever new argument, or evidence, may have been adduced by any of the more recent writers of the German school in favour of a *Neronic* date; more especially by Professor M. Stuart himself. I am well persuaded that the review will only result in a confirmation of what I have written above.

EXPOSITION
OF THE
APOCALYPSE.

INTRODUCTION

TO THE

PROPHECY OF THE FUTURE:

APOC. I—IV.

CHAPTER I.

ST. JOHN IN PATMOS.

It was in the year of *Christ*, as we have seen, 95 or 96, and of *Rome* 848 or 849, that St. John had the visions of the Apocalypse revealed to him. The chronological eras in which I thus mark the date,—eras perhaps the most famous in history,—suggest to us the two kingdoms between which, from thenceforward, was to lie the visible contest for the supremacy of the world. Of the *former* kingdom the then living ruler and head was the Emperor *Domitian*, the last of the twelve Cæsars; who was engaged at the time spoken of in a bitter persecution of the Christians in his empire: of the *latter* the most eminent member and director (for Head it knew none but the LORD JESUS) was the last and only survivor of Christ's twelve apostles,¹ himself a sufferer in the persecution, the beloved disciple *St. John*.

“I John, your brother and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience (or rather patient expectation²) of Jesus Christ, was in the isle that is called

¹ Such is the received tradition of the Church, handed down in ecclesiastical history: though of the times, as well as manner, of the deaths of several others of the apostles, precise accounts are wanting.

² *Εν τῇ ὑπομονῇ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.* Αποκ. i. 9.

Patmos, for the word of God and for the testimony of Jesus,"—such is the account now given by St. John respecting himself. He had been banished from his brethren and friends in proconsular Asia,¹ to the barren isle of Patmos, simply for bearing witness to Jesus as the Christ and Saviour of the world: and probably,—if we may form a conjecture from what was common among the Romans in the case of such punishment,² and from the strength too of the phrase "*tribulation*," used by the Apostle to designate his own experience of it,—was condemned to penal labour in the mines or quarries;³ or perhaps to incarceration in some dungeon of the island. He was now far advanced in life, much beyond the threescore years and ten that have been noted as the measure of the age of man:

¹ Proconsular Asia, of which Ephesus was the capital, must be distinguished from Asia Minor, as well as from the vaster continent of Asia. It appears that the word *Asia* was used by the Romans in four senses: 1st, for the *whole Asiatic continent*, as opposed to Europe and Africa; 2ndly, for *Asia Minor* in its *largest* extent, including Cilicia and other districts *beyond the Taurus*; 3rd, for the *same* in its *smaller* extent, embracing only the provinces *within the Taurus*; 4th, for *Lydian Asia*, or, as it was also called towards the end of the first century, *Proconsular Asia*, extending along the coast from Pergamos down to Caria, and inland to the Phrygian frontier, or a little beyond it.—It is in this last sense that the word is used in Acts xvi. 6, &c.,—a passage which has been very appositely cited in illustration; "When they had gone throughout *Phrygia* and the region of *Galatia*, and were forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the word in *Asia*, after they were come to *Mysia* they essayed to go into *Bithynia*, but the Spirit suffered them not: and they, passing by *Mysia*, came down to *Troas*."—See the Diatribe of the learned Archbishop Usher on the subject; referred to by Vitringa on Apoc. i. 4.

Perhaps the little maritime district on the Cayster near Ephesus had *first* the name *Asia*, since Homer so uses the word, Il. B. 461, *Ἀσιω ἐν λειμῶνι, Καῦστριον ἀμφὶ ῥέεθρα*; it being called so, according to Strabo (l. xiv. p. 961), from one *Asius*, a king of Lydia. Thence the appellation may have extended to a larger and larger signification.

² His being there as one *penally banished*, and in *exile*, is almost implied in what St. John says of his being the fellow-partaker with the Asiatic Churches in *affliction*, &c.; and it is stated by many of the ancients. So Ignatius' Epistle (as it is called) to the Tarsenses, *Ἰωαννης ἐφυγαδενετο ἐν Πατμῶ* an epistle very ancient, doubtless, if not of Ignatius' own writing: and so too almost all the other early fathers cited in the Essay preceding.—Dr. Tilloch stands nearly alone, I believe, in his strange idea (pp. 12, 15, 16) of St. John having voluntarily gone to Patmos (itself an almost barren island!) merely to preach the Gospel.

Daubuz (ad loc.) observes from Grotius; "By the Roman laws this was the punishment of seditious persons; among which were reckoned those who broached and published new superstitions." And, as it appears from Dion Cassius, (l. lxvii. 14) that many who suffered under Domitian suffered under the conjoint charge of *atheism* and *Jewish manners*, (*εγκλημα αθεοσητος* and *Ἰουδαίων ἠθῆν*.)—a charge, as Neander judges, (Church Hist. vol. i. p. 131, Clark's Eng. Ed.) designative of *Christians*,—it is evident that this punishment among others would naturally be adjudged to them.

³ Victorinus, quoted p. 35, Note ¹; and, after him, Primasius, quoted p. 36, Note ⁵, affirm this about St. John.—"De vestris semper metalla suspirant," said by Tertulian in his Apolog. c. 44, suggests the hardness of the labour in the mines, enforced on criminals.

and at ninety, or nearly ninety years, privation and penal labour, like this, must needs have been peculiarly painful. But the spirit of the man had that within it which might well sustain his infirmity; the peace, hopes, and joys of the Gospel:—joy at suffering for Christ; joy in communion with him, through that Holy Spirit whose light no dungeon could exclude; joy in looking for a speedy reunion with Him, and the triumphant establishment, soon it might be or somewhat later, of his kingdom in glory.

How peculiar, how different from those of the few rude inhabitants, and perhaps ruder governor of the island around him,¹ were the thoughts and feelings, recollections and anticipations, joys and sorrows, that filled the mind of the aged saint! In part and measure it is not difficult for us to picture them to ourselves. For, besides certain historical notices of his life, we have preserved to us the expression of his mind in writings of his own still extant,—his Gospel, his Epistles, his Apocalypse. Nor, I think, can we better prepare ourselves for an intelligent and profitable consideration of the extraordinary prefigurative visions just at this time accorded to him, than by endeavouring, though but partially and briefly, to picture these his thoughts and feelings to ourselves: and this as they embraced within their scope alike *the past, the present, and the future.*

1. *The past.* It was now above sixty years since the ascension of his blessed Lord. Surely that was an event and scene that could never fade from St. John's recollection:—then when He led the disciples out as far as Bethany on the mount of Olives, and there for the last time blessed them, and, as He blessed them, was parted from them, till a cloud received him out of their sight.²—It was then that two Angels, robed in heavenly white, stood by them; and said, “Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye so gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus shall come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.”³ These

¹ Daubuz on Apoc. i. 10, says, “It is likely that St. John was exiled into the island of Patmos, because there were as yet no Christians therein.”

² Luke xxiv. 50.

³ Acts i. 10, 11.

were heart-cheering words, never to be forgotten ;—words indeed that were but the repetition of many to the same effect that Jesus Himself had before spoken to them.¹ At first the idea, the joyful idea, in their minds was that the promise of his coming would very speedily be fulfilled ; and, long before the generation then living had wholly passed away, this dearest wish of their hearts have its accomplishment.² But the years that had since passed, (above sixty years we have seen), had already shown some error in their expectations on that point :³ yet only so as, by unfolding the fulfilment of other of Christ's predictions, that needs must come first in order of time, to confirm, and render yet more certain, their assurance of the fulfilment of this best promise in its due course also.

Thus, in regard to *Jerusalem*, when they witnessed the Lord's ascension, that "holy city"⁴ was yet standing. As they returned from Mount Olivet, the hum of busy life rose from its thronging population : and with its towers and pinnacles, its forts and palaces, and its temple the mightiest and most splendid of all its mighty buildings, Mount Zion seemed still, as in the olden time, the queen amidst the hills that surrounded it.⁵ But Christ had fore-shown its then imminent destruction and desolation.⁶ Its people had rejected Him who came to save them ; and

¹ It will be found interesting to note these predictions in the order of time, and with regard to the occasions on which they were given : e. g. Matt. xvi. 27, xix. 28, 29, xxiv. 30, xxv. 31, Luke xvii. 24, John xiv. 3, &c. &c. It will thus appear, 1st, that it was not till after the lapse of a certain time from the calling of his disciples, that He opened to them the subject of his second coming in glory ; 2nd, that it was not until after he had mentioned to them the *sufferings* and *humiliation* that He would have to undergo. Indeed it would seem to have been generally in direct connexion with pre- intimations on the subject of his approaching sufferings, or on that of their own coming trials and sorrows, that He spoke of his second and glorious coming.

² His saying (Matt. xxiv. 34), "This generation (*ἡ γενεὰ αὐτῆς*) shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled," was not one that the disciples could overlook ; understanding *Christ's coming*, verse 30, so as they doubtless did, of his *second coming to glory*. On which passage (supposing the word *αὐτῆς* read, as we read it, with the aspirate) the question would arise with them, Is the word *generation* to be taken in a chronological sense of thirty or thirty-three years ? Or was the term intended by the expression to be measured by the longevity of all then alive, so as only to end with the death of the longest liver ; and thus to extend to some ninety or a hundred years, from the time when the prediction was spoken ?—Compare on this expectation of the disciples, Acts iii. 19, 1 Thess. iv. 17, Heb. x. 37, James v. 8, &c.

³ For what I conceive to be the true explanation of this prophecy in Matt. xxiv. 34, let me refer the reader to Part VI. Ch. 6, § 1, of this Commentary.

⁴ Matt. xxvii. 53.

⁵ Ps. cxxv. 2.

⁶ To the *disciples*, Matt. xxiv. 2, Luke xix. 41—44, xxi. 24, &c. ; to the *people themselves*, Matt. xxi. 40, 41, 43, xxiii. 35—38, Luke xxiii. 28, &c.

had even imprecated the curse on themselves, when they cried out for his crucifixion, "His blood be on us and on our children." And when yet again, —after that the Spirit had been poured out from on high, and that the apostles, with all its signs and mighty wonders to attest the truth of their mission, had preached and pressed upon them with all earnestness, both at Jerusalem and throughout the provinces, the Gospel of his salvation,¹ (it was their Lord's last charge to them to do so,²)—when that unhappy people for twenty, thirty, forty years had still rejected, pertinaciously rejected, this witness of the Spirit, and last offers of mercy,³—then at length the Almighty's protection was withdrawn; and wrath came on them to the uttermost.

Not without providential warnings loud and many did it fall upon them. The predicted preliminary signs appeared in due course,—of earthquakes, famines, and pestilences, of wars and rumours of wars, of false Christs and prophets,⁴ and fearful sights, sounds, and wonders, in heaven above and the earth beneath,⁵ yea, and even within the solemn recesses of the sanctuary: ⁶—signs appointed as

¹ The manner in which St. Paul, in the fulfilment of his mission among the Gentiles, always sought out the Jewish synagogue and the Jews, to whom first to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ, is very remarkable.

² Luke xxiv. 47; "beginning at Jerusalem."

³ So Euseb. H. E. iii. 7.—Might not what is said, Matt. xii. 31, of the sin against the Holy Ghost, have had some reference to this rejection by the Jews of the dispensation of the Spirit? Compare Acts vii. 51.

⁴ So Hippolytus, (?) * De Consummatione Mundi et Antichristo, cited by Mede, Book v. ch. 7. (p. 901, Ed. 1672.) After Christ's ascension, he says, *ανεισησαν τινες λεγοντες, Εγω ειμι ο Χριστος, καθως ο Σιμων ο Μαγος, και οι λοιποι, ων εκ εστι καιρος αρτι τα ονοματα μνημονευσαι.* So too Cyril Catech. 6, and Jerome on Matt. xxiv. 23.

⁵ See Bishop Newton's, Whitby's, (on Matt. xxiv,) or Lardner's (vi. 402—423) historical illustrations of these several points in Christ's famous prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem; illustrations taken chiefly from Josephus: also Greswell on Parables, v. 375—385; (who well observes on Josephus' designed abstaining from the use of the name *Christ* or *false Christ*, though implying that many of the false prophets mentioned by him were pretended Christs;) and Dr. Robinson's valuable Biblical Researches on Palestine, ii. 1—9.

⁶ Josephus' report (B. J. vi. 5. 3) of the voice, just before the taking of the city, from within the temple, "Let us depart hence," is known to all.

There is a singular Jewish tradition of a similar sign, said by the Rabbies to have occurred *forty years before the temple's destruction*; i. e. just at the time of the rejection and crucifixion of Christ by their nation. It is given in Kimchi's Comment on Zech. xi. 1—3, "Open thy doors, Lebanon," &c. Says he: "Our Rabbies of blessed memory have interpreted this chapter of the desolation of the second Temple,

* The real author of the Treatise De Consumm., as it now stands, cannot have been Hippolytus, the Bishop of Ostia in the 3rd century. See my notice of him in the History of Apocalyptic Interpretation, in the Appendix to my 4th Volume.

if to force the attention of the Jews, if so it might be; or, if not, of Christians at least, and perhaps of the heathen world itself, to the coming judgments as from heaven. And just after Paul in his Epistle to the Hebrews, and James too in his Epistle, had uttered their last warning voice in vain,¹ first the *war*, and then, three or four years after, the *siege* began;² and with it those unparalleled horrors that had been foretold by Jesus, when he looked on the city and wept over it. The sad story of the catastrophe was but too fresh in St. John's remembrance: the fulfilment of the predicted horrors too complete and notorious. No *Christian* eye indeed had beheld them in their progress. Warned by their Lord, the Christians had quitted the devoted city when they saw the vanguard of the Roman army under Cestius plant its idolatrous ensigns (was this the predicted "*abomination that was to make desolate?*") in the holy precincts of the Holy City.³ But many a wretched outcast Jew had since wandered into Asia, a living monu-

for *Lebanon* is the Holy Temple. They say that forty years before the destruction of the Temple, the doors of the sanctuary opened of themselves. Rabban Johanan ben Zakkai reproved them, and said, O sanctuary, sanctuary, how long wilt thou terrify thyself? I know that thy end is to be left desolate; for Zechariah has prophesied against thee long since, *Open thy doors, Lebanon.*" On which passage see Dr. M'Caul's Note, who says that the tradition is found in the *Babyloniau Talmud*, Treatise Yoma, fol. 39. Lightfoot, *Exercitatus* on Matt. xxvi. 3, (*Works*, Vol. xi. p. 309, Ed. Pitman,) also mentions the tradition.—Compare the fact of the rending of the veil of the temple at that precise time.

¹ The date of each of these Epistles is fixed by Whitby, Macknight, and other commentators, at about A.D. 62; only three or four years before the war broke out. Compare the warnings in Heb. x. 37, and James v. 8, on the imminence of the coming destruction of the Jewish polity, if not of the world.

² The chronology of the chief epochs of the Jewish war is as follows; according to Lardner Vol. vi. and Clinton in his *Fasti Romani*.

A. D.

- 66 May, War commenced with the Jews' revolt; its conduct being committed by Nero to Vespasian.
- September, Cestius Gallus' expedition against Jerusalem.
- 67 July, Jotapata taken, and Josephus in it.
- 68 Gadara taken.
- 69 War suspended, after Nero's death, and during the civil wars of Galba, Otho, Vitellius, and Vespasian.
- 70 War renewed by Titus; siege of Jerusalem begun April 14, about the time of the passover.


September 8, Jerusalem taken and destroyed.

³ See Josephus B. J. ii. 19. 4--7; also Euseb. H. E. iii. 5, and Greswell on Par. v. 318, 323, 326--333.—Another explanation of the *abomination of desolation* may refer it to the murders and other abominations committed in the city and the temple by the Jews themselves, both at the first revolt which brought on the war, and afterwards. See on this Josephus ii. 17. 10; "It seemed," says he, "to be a prelude to the Jews' own destruction. . . that the city was all over polluted with such abominations." This was just before Cestius' march against Jerusalem.

VESPASIAN'S MEDAL,
ON THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM.



THE JEWISH CANDLESTICK, FROM THE ARCH OF TITUS.



ment of his country's ruin: ¹ opprest alike by prince and people; and bearing, like Cain, God's mark of reprobation on his brow.² The learned and noble Jew, (alas, not *Christian Jew*,) Flavius Josephus, had recounted in his lately published History all the details of the siege in all their horrors; and Vespasian and Titus had themselves authenticated the narrative.³ Moreover the Christian disciples, alike in Rome and in Judea, spoke of memorials of the catastrophe, now visible in either place, a spectacle for the world:—in the one, the *Arch of Titus*, exhibiting in its nicely chiselled sculptures the captured furniture of the once Holy Place,—the table for shew-bread, the book of the law, and the seven-branched candlestick; ⁴ in the other, the *City itself desolate, and in heaps*; its ruins still stained

¹ So the author of the *Quæst. et Respons. ad Orthodox.* appended to Justin Martyr's Works, (Ed. Colon.) in *Quæst.* 108, respecting the *Jews*, after their later overthrow by Hadrian: Οἱ δὲ νῦν τῷ Χριστῷ ἀπειθουντες αὐτῶν, τῆς μὲν οἰκίας πατριδος ἀπελαθεντες εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἐλικμηθησαν, τοῖς δὲ ἐθνεσιν εἰς δουλειαν ἐξέδοθησαν ἴατιμον, ὡς τὰ πρᾶγματα στήλης βοῶν περιφανεστερον.

² It was the enactment of Titus that all Jews, wherever they were, should pay to the Capitoline Jupiter the same annual tribute of a didrachm that they had been previously accustomed to pay to their own temple: (see this exemplified *Matt.* xvii. 24 :) a payment in value equal to that enjoined by Moses, on occasion of numbering the people, *Exodus* xxx. 13, and which in course of time seems to have become annual. So we read in Josephus *B. J.* vii. 6, 6, and *Dion Cass.* lxxvi. 7. This "Judaicus fiscus," as Suetonius tells us, (*Domit.* 12,) was rigidly and oppressively exacted ("acerbissimè actus est") under Domitian. From Eckhel's observations, vi. 404, on Nerva's coin with the inscription, "Fisci Judaici calumnia sublata," it appears that certain unjust oppressions connected with the tax were remedied by Nerva. But the tax itself, as Eckhel adds, still continued. So Origen, *καὶ νῦν Ἰουδαίων το διδραχμὸν αὐτοῖς [Ῥωμαίοις] τελουμένων*, in his Letter to Africanus.—What a *primary* fulfilment, let me suggest, of *Deut.* xxviii. 64; "The Lord shall scatter thee among all people: and there shalt thou serve other gods, which neither thou nor thy fathers have known, even wood and stone." In Papal Rome they have been similarly taxed in support of *Papal* idolatrous worship.

The trembling Jewish mendicants at Rome are sketched by another contemporary of St. John in Patmos, I mean Juvenal, *Sat.* vi. 543; "Arcanam Judæa tremens mendicat in aurem."

³ *Χαραξίς τῷ ἑαυτοῦ χειρὶ τὰ βιβλία*, says Josephus of the emperor Titus, *Vit.* § 64. And so again in his *Book* against Apion, i. 9; saying that he had presented his History of the War first of all to Vespasian and Titus; and appealing to them as witnesses of its accuracy.

His History of the Jewish War was the first of his publications; and is referred by Whiston, iii. 244, (Ed. 1821,) to the year A.D. 75. His History of the Jewish Antiquities seems to have been published, as Whiston and Clinton (in his *Fasti Romani*) agree, A.D. 93, just before St. John's banishment to Patmos.

⁴ An engraving of the arch is given in Taylor's *Cabinet*, Montfaucon, and elsewhere. I have copied the candlestick from the latter; *Vol.* iv. B. v. c. 5.—They give too Vespasian's well-known medal, struck on the occasion, and which I have also copied: representing Judah as a woman-captive seated under a palm-tree, and a Roman soldier standing by; with the legend *Judæa capta*. What an illustration to the very eye of the fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecy, (iii. 26,) "And she, being desolate, shall sit upon the ground."

with blood, and black with fire ; and of its Temple especially (just as Jesus had predicted) not one stone left upon another, because the people knew not the time of their visitation.¹

Thus Jerusalem was no more ; and, as its city and temple, so the ritual, polity, and dispensation essentially associated with them, overthrown. But meanwhile a better dispensation had been striking its roots far and wide in the world ; with a better temple, better worship, better polity, and better hopes and promises attached to it :—the “ Most Holy ” of its temple being the heavenly presence, now opened by the blood of Jesus ;² its worship a spiritual worship, with Christ Himself the Lamb of God for its high priest and sacrifice ; its polity one constituted by community in a heavenly citizenship :³—the members of which polity, God’s election of grace, now in process of gathering from out of an apostate world,⁴ were at present indeed scattered, despised, persecuted ; but sure, after a little while, of being manifested complete in glory, number, and union, even at their Lord’s coming.⁵—Mighty had been the power of the world, mightier still the malice and the subtlety of Satan, the Prince of this world, to arrest its progress, and stop the promulgation of its doctrine by the Christian disciples. But in vain. In number few, so as that an upper room might almost contain them,⁶ at the time when charged by their risen Lord with the commission to go forth and disciple all nations, they had since then advanced and multiplied into the numbers of a great though scattered people, known through not Judea only, but the whole Roman world.⁷ Per-

¹ When the Romans had taken Jerusalem, Titus ordered the soldiers, says Josephus, to dig up the foundations both of the city and of the temple ; *την τε πολιν και τον νεων κατασκαπτειν*. B. J. vii. 1. 1. Only, as he adds, a part of the Western wall, and the towers of Phaselus, Hippicus, and Mariamme were left standing ; as a memorial of the strength of the captured city, and protection to a Roman garrison.

² Heb. ix. 24—26, x. 19—21, &c.

³ Phil. iii. 20 ; “ Our citizenship (*πολιτευμα*) is in heaven.”—So the beautiful description of Christians in the Epistle to Diognetus, written some eighty or ninety years probably after the Apocalypse, *Επι γης διατριβουσι, αλλ’ εν ουρανῳ πολιτευονται*. Lardner, ii. 142.

⁴ *Εκκλησια* ; lit. an assembly, or gathering, called out of ; i. e. out of the world. Hence the Latin *ecclesia* ; and the modern *eglise*, *chiesa*, &c. Our own words *kirk* and *church* are from the word *Κυριακη*. Together the two Greek words signify, *The Lord’s assembly gathered out of the world*.

⁵ John xvii. 20—23, Rom. viii. 18, 19.

⁶ John xx. 19, Acts i. 13.

⁷ Compare Christ’s predictions, Matt. xxiv. 14, “ And this gospel of the kingdom

secution itself had but strengthened the holy cause. The blood of the martyrs had proved the seed of the Church.—Here too the Lord's prophetic declaration had been advancing towards fulfilment. "The kingdom of heaven," He had said, "was like a grain of mustard-seed;" which, though itself the least of seeds, would yet become a great tree, such that the fowls of the air might lodge in its branches.¹

2. And thus what the *present* state of the Christian cause? Surely scarce a city was there, scarce a town, in the vast Roman Empire, but some little church had been gathered out of it; with its leaven spreading through the villages adjacent, and as what would yet more spread. So that when at any time the aged apostle, under permission to emerge to daylight from his subterranean prison, might look round from the rocky summit of Patmos, and follow with his eye in the distant horizon the indented coast first of Asia, then of Thrace and Greece, with its bays, and gulfs, and islands, and far-stretching capes and promontories, it would rest ever and anon on the sites of notable Christian Churches:—first, those of *proconsular Asia*, where Timothy had fallen asleep, where Antipas had recently suffered martyrdom,² and Polycarp still lived a faithful witness for Christ; churches under St. John's own immediate superintendence: then the Macedonian and Greek Churches of *Philippi*, and *Thessalonica*, and *Berœa*, and *Athens*, and *Corinth*:—while yet farther, beyond where the eye might penetrate, he knew that alike in the distant West on the one side, and the South and East on the other, Christian Churches existed there also, instinct with spiritual life,

shall be preached in all the world, for a witness to all nations, and then shall the end come," with St. Paul's strong statement, Col. i. 6, 23, that "the gospel had come into all the world, and been preached to every creature (or, *in all the creation*, *ἐν παντὶ τῆ κτίσει*) under heaven:" which Epistle to the Colossians appears to have been written about four or five years before the Jewish war.—Of course St. Paul's words must be considered the exaggeration of a common colloquialism, and to have had reference to the *Roman* world.

It is likely that a larger preaching of the Gospel, even over the *whole habitable world*, was here chiefly intended by Christ; as a sign of the great consummation, and his own second coming, being near at hand. But I conceive that a subordinate and smaller fulfilment was also intended, on the seal of the *Roman* world; as a sign of the approaching destruction of Jerusalem, and end of the Jewish dispensation, by his Providential interposition and judgments.

¹ Matt. xiii. 31, 32.

² Apoc. ii. 13.

in holy fellowship; from which the daily incense arose of prayer and praise and adoration to the same Saviour-God and to the Lamb.—There was the Church fondly gathered again round the ruins of *Jerusalem*, over which the aged Symeon still survived to preside.¹ There was the Church at *Antioch*, with its faithful Bishop Ignatius,² where the disciples had first received the sacred name of Christians. There was the Church of *Alexandria*, and other associated Churches in *Egypt* founded by St. Mark;³ that of *Cyprus*, where Barnabas had laboured;⁴ and of *Crete*, set in order by Titus.⁵ Yet once more, Westward,—omitting, but not forgetting, the blessed germs of Christianity among the provincials of *Spain*,⁶ and *Gaul*,⁷ and even *Britain*,⁸—there was that numerous and noble Church at *Rome*, where the beloved brothers Paul and Peter, under Nero's earlier persecution, conjointly with many others of the brethren, had sealed their testimony with their blood.⁹ There the heaven had

¹ He is said to have been chosen Bishop of Jerusalem after the murder of the Apostle James, A.D. 62 or 63; thither to have returned when the Christian refugees at Pella, some certain time after its destruction by Titus, returned to the vicinity of the ruined site of the once holy city; and there remained till A.D. 104, or 106, at which time he suffered martyrdom. See Euseb. H. E. iii. 11, 32.

Dr. Robinson, in his "Biblical Researches in Palestine," expresses his opinion that the Judæo-Christian Church as a body did not return from Pella to Jerusalem till after Hadrian's subjugation of the revolted Jewish remnant, and prohibition of Jews approaching Jerusalem thenceforward on penalty of death. But many probably returned much earlier, "accompanied," as Dr. Burton judges, (Church Hist. p. 141, 4th Ed.), "by their Bishop, and set up again a Christian Church amidst the ruins of their city."—After Hadrian's Jewish war the Christian Church at Jerusalem became, as Eusebius says, H. E. iv. 6, altogether a *Gentile* Christian Church.

² Bishop of Antioch from about A.D. 70 to 107, or perhaps 115. See p. 12 *suprà*.

³ He is reported by Jerome to have died at Alexandria, in the 8th year of Nero, or about A.D. 62; nearly the same time that St. James was martyred at Jerusalem. De V. I. c. 8. Lardner, iv. 443.

⁴ Acts xv. 39.

⁵ Titus i. 5.

⁶ In Rom. xv. 24, 28, St. Paul himself states his intention of visiting Spain. Whether he fulfilled it however is very doubtful; though Clement of Rome, c. 5, says that he preached the gospel *ἐπι το τέρμα της δυνσεως*.

⁷ Mosheim, ii. 1. 1. 5, thinks it very possible that the light of Christianity reached Transalpine Gaul before the conclusion of the apostolic age.

⁸ See Euseb. Demonstr. Evang. iii. 7, Usher. Brit. Eccles. Antiq. c. 1, and Gildæ Epist. apud Stillingfleet's Antiquities of the British Churches iii. 3.—Tacitus, ad ann. A.D. 58 (Annal. xiii. 32), speaks of *Pomponia Græcina*, the wife of Plautius, just before *Governor of Britain*, as "externæ superstitionis rea;" a phrase most naturally to be understood as a charge of *Christianity* against her. So Lipsius, and other commentators ad loc. This is certainly a remarkable circumstance, in reference to the question as to the time when Christianity first entered Britain.

On the whole the slight general notice of Gaul, Spain, and Britain in the text seems quite justifiable.—Compare the history of the early Christian Churches' evangelization given in Burton's and Waddington's Church Histories.

⁹ A.D. 65 or 66. This was after the burning of Rome by Nero; which act he charged on the Christians.—Tacitus, Ann. xv. 44, clearly implies that the number who then suffered as Christians was large. "Primo correpti qui fatebantur; deinde

penetrated not only into Cæsar's household,¹ but into the hearts of some of the nearest kindred of Cæsar. Whilst the aged Clement, whose name St. Paul had noticed as in the book of life,² was faithfully presiding as its bishop over the Church in that vast city, undeterred by the terrors of the persecution,³ another Clement, whose name was also in the book of life, the cousin-german of the Emperor, had just witnessed for Christ, even unto blood: and his wife Domitilla, with similar constancy of spirit, endured to be transported to the desolate island of Pandateria;⁴ where she was even now suffering the same punishment for the Christian faith as St. John himself.

As sorrowful but rejoicing,⁵ as rejoicing yet sorrowful,—such was the mixture of feeling which then, as in this world it ever must do, characterized the true Christian. Even upon its own account, and of the sufferings it entailed upon the Christian brotherhood, persecution such as that to which the church was now subject could not but be a cause of pain to the Apostle: but yet more, as considering whence it all originated; viz. from the enmity to God of a world lying under the influence of the Wicked One.⁶—Nor was *persecution* the worst or deadliest of that great enemy's weapons against the Christian Church, which the apostle had to lament and to fear. The *corruption* of the Church itself, through the intermixture of doctrines of altogether contrary spirit and origin with the pure and holy doctrine of Christ crucified,—this was a weapon of that subtle foe the Prince of this world, the Devil, yet more to be apprehended. Already indeed this corruption had begun to work in individuals and in churches, which yet called themselves after the name of Christ. Those

indicio eorum multitudo ingens, haud perinde in crimine incendii, quàm odio humani generis convicti sunt." He adds, with regard to the torments they were subjected to; "Pereuntibus addita ludibria, ut ferarum tergis conteeti, laniatu canum interirent; aut crucibus affixi, aut flammandi, atque ubi defecisset dies, in usum nocturni luminis, urerentur." ¹ Phil. iv. 22. ² Phil. iv. 3.

³ See Lardner, Vol. ii. p. 30—34, on Clement. He concludes that Clement became Bishop of the Roman Church about A.D. 91 or 92; and wrote his Epistle, after Domitian's persecution, about A.D. 96.

⁴ So Dion Cassius, lxxvii. 14, already referred to p. 45 *suprà*. Jerome, in his Epist. to Eustoch., written as the Epitaphium of her mother Paula, ch. 3, makes it the island *Pontia*.

⁵ 2 Cor. vi. 10.

⁶ εν τω πονηρω' 1 John v. 19.

grievous wolves against which the Apostle Paul had so solemnly warned the Ephesian elders, when parting from them at Miletus,¹ had already shown themselves in the professing Church at Ephesus and Laodicea, and far and wide elsewhere. The lovers of Judaic ritualism and Judaic fables,²—of the figments on heavenly things of human philosophy, and science falsely so called,³—of doctrines of asceticism,⁴ or of the lusts of the flesh,⁵—had each and all far and wide propagated their tenets, commixedly or separately,⁶ under the Christian name:⁷ superseding Christ's word and his apostles', as the rule of faith, by a human

¹ Acts xx. 29. Where mark the *ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν*, "perverse teachers from out of your own selves."

² The first alluded to by St. Paul in Gal. iii. 1, 2, Phil. iii. 2, &c.; the second in 1 Tim. i. 4, Titus i. 14, iii. 9, Col. ii. 16, &c.

³ So St. Paul, Col. ii. 8, "Beware lest any man spoil you through *philosophy and vain deceit*;" and 1 Tim. vi. 20, where he speaks of *ἀντιθεσεις της ψευδωνυμου γνωσεως* from their pretensions to which *γνωσις*, (*knowledge* falsely so called,) the *Gnostics* derived their name. Also Col. ii. 18; "Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility, and *worshipping of angels*, intruding into those things which he hath not seen;" &c. But see Note ⁶ infra.

⁴ So Col. ii. 21, 23, &c.

⁵ So some in the Corinthian Church, spoken of 1 Cor. v. vi; also those of Jude 4; and again the *Nicolaitans* in Proconsular Asia, mentioned Apoc. ii. 6, 14, 15.

⁶ The subject of the heresies that had crept into the Church by the end of the first century is, as Mosheim says, i. 2. 5. 2, one involved in much obscurity. But thus much is evident, alike from the inspired epistles, and from Irenæus and other early ecclesiastical writers, that *Judaism* and *heathen philosophy* had both a share in their production. And sometimes there was an easy commixture and fusion of the doctrines from the one source and the other. For example, the *Judaists*, with their rabbinical traditions about *angels*, (as Tobit, xii. 15, speaks of "*the seven angels that present the prayers of the saints*,") easily fell in with the *Platonic* doctrine of *dæmons*, and *demon-worship*, as mediators.—Again, in respect of the doctrines of *fasting from animal food*, and *washings and purifications*, they as naturally coalesced with the similar doctrines of the *Pythagorean* philosophy.—*Philo*, the celebrated Alexandrian Jew of this century, affords a notable *Jewish* illustration. And so too certain of the *Gnostics* under a *Christian* name.

Compare Whitty on Col. ii, Macknight's Preliminary Treatise to the Epistle to the Colossians, Mosheim i. 2. 5; and also Lücke on the Epistles of St. John, pp. 64 et seq.

⁷ Polycarp, within ten or twenty years of St. John's seeing the Apocalypse, marks prominently the *Christian profession* of the *Doketic Gnostic* heresiarchs, in Chapters vi, vii of his Epistle. *Ἀπεχομενοι των ψευδαδελφων, και των εν υποκρισει φερωντων το ονομα του Κυριου, οιτινες αποπλανωσι κενους ανθρωπους. Πας γαρ ος αν μη ομολογη Ιησουν Χριστον εν σαρκι εληλυθεναι κ. τ. λ.*—So too Lücke *ibid.* pp. 65, 66;—"This theosophical, not to say gnostical pseudo-propheta, [the *ψευδωνυμος γνωσις* of 1 Tim. vi. 20, and Col. ii. 8, &c.,] . . . pretended to embody and assimilate with itself Christianity, as well as Judaism. . . . Originally confused in itself, and threatening and seducing only from a distance, it now had nestled in the midst of Christendom." And again, p. 69; "The heretics [of 1 Joh. ii. 19], as it seems, . . . still externally kept up their connexion with the Christian community."—So Eusebius of Menander, Simon Magus' disciple, and other contemporary heresiarchs; *Ην δ' αρα διαβολικης ενεργειας δια τοιωνδε γοητων την Χριστιανων προσηγοριαν υποδομενων, κ. τ. λ.* H. E. iii. 26.

tradition in their own keeping;¹ and, in one way or other, superseding Christ himself, in his character of fallen man's only prophet, priest, mediator, atonement, and righteousness;² thereby teaching apostasy from the Head,³ and destroying the very essence of the gospel. Indeed they had not only drawn away many insincere professors into error, but partially infected even some of the faithful themselves.—So was the truth of another of the Lord's remarkable parables already illustrated. "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a man which sowed good seed in his field: but, while men slept, an enemy sowed tares; and when the

¹ Polycarp, in the immediate sequel of the extract given in the preceding Note, speaks of them as *perverting* Scripture to their purpose; *ὅς ἂν μεθοδεύῃ τὰ λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου πρὸς τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας*.—Irenæus, i. 1, 6, 17, &c., speaks of them as not merely *perverting* but also *falsifying* Scripture; and using moreover multitudinous apocryphal Scriptures, as if true. Further, iii. 2, he tells, in a very remarkable passage, how they made use of *their own tradition*, as authority, when hard pressed by Scripture testimony. Indeed it is so remarkable that I must cite the passage. "Cum ex Scripturis arguuntur, in accusationem convertuntur ipsarum Scripturarum; quasi non rectè habeant, neque sint ex auctoritate, et quia variè sint dicta, et quia non possit ex his inveniri veritas ab his qui nesciant traditionem. Non enim per literas traditam illam, sed per vivam vocem; ob quam causam et Paulum dixisse, 'Sapientiam loquimur *inter perfectos*, sapientiam autem non mundi hujus: '—He adds: "Cum autem ad eam traditionem que est ab apostolis, provocamus eos, adversantur traditioni; dicentes se, . . . etiam apostolis existentes sapientiores, sinceram invenisse sapientiam."—Compare Mosheim i. 2. 5. 8.

² The Gnostic teachers generally represented themselves, like their first head Simon Magus, as "the great power of God;" (Acts viii. 9, 10;) and as having *in themselves* those treasures of divine wisdom and knowledge, and being able to impart from out of them,* which, as St. Paul so strongly insists on in his Epistle to the Colossians, resided altogether in the Lord Jesus. Hence they superseded Christ in his character of *prophet*: while the merits of their gnosis and their ritual superseded him in his character of our *righteousness*; and themselves, and the Æons of their theogony,† in that of *priest* and *mediator*.

As to Christ's character as our *atonement*, that vital doctrine of the Christian faith (by the Gnostic perfected ones quite unneeded) was in a singular manner equally set aside by the two grand branches of the Gnostic heresy. The one, founded by *Simon Magus* originally, held that our Lord Jesus Christ was a *man* in *appearance* only; a set called in consequence *Doketæ*, or *Phantomists*: ‡ and thus made his really atoning death a mere *illusion of the senses* of the bystanders.¶ The other, that of *Cerinthus*, admitting the *humanity* of Jesus, denied his *divinity*; and thus, making his death to be that of a *mere man*, denied it the virtue whereby alone it could become a full and satisfactory atonement to the Divine Father for the sins of the world. ³ Col. ii. 19.

* "Omnes tument, omnes scientiam pollicentur." Tertullian De Præscr. c. 41.

† On the genealogy of their Æons, see Irenæus i. 1.

‡ Ignatius vehemently denounces the heretics on this point, in his Epist. ad Smyrnæos, § 2; οὐκ, ὡς περ τινες λεγουσι, τὸ δοκεῖν αὐτὸν πεποιθῆναι, αὐτοὶ τὸ δοκεῖν οὐτε, &c.

¶ Tertull. adv. Marcion. iii. 8, strongly marks this: saying that if Christ, were a phantasm, his was no true atoning death; and we are therefore yet in our sins.

blade was sprung up, and brought forth fruit, then appeared the tares also.”¹—Could things be so, and yet the Apostle not feel anxiety for the Church, as he looked into the uncertainties of the coming *future*?

3. And this the rather, as he could not forget what had been foreshown by the Holy Spirit respecting this *coming future*, to one and another of the apostles; and how some grand *apostasy from the faith* was to be expected, ere the second advent of the Lord Jesus. So especially St. Paul had been inspired to write to the Thessalonian Christians; “That day of Christ shall not come except there come *the apostasy* first:”² together with certain memorable words besides, respecting *the chief* of the predicted apostasy; “And that *man of sin* be revealed, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God.” Indeed to himself, St. John, the same issue of events had been revealed; and he had been directed to remind the Christian Church of this great coming enemy under the very notable name of “the Antichrist.”³—I say a name very notable! For it was not *pseudo-Christ*, like as of those false self-styled Christs, (in *professed* denial of *Jesus* being the Christ,) that the Lord declared would appear in Judæa before the destruction of Jerusalem,⁴ and who did in fact appear there and then:⁵ but was a name of new formation, expressly compounded, it might seem, by God’s Spirit for the occasion, and as if to express some idea through its etymological force which no older word could so well express, the name ANTICHRIST: even as if he would appear in some way as a *Vice-Christ*⁶

¹ Matt. xiii. 24—26.

² 2 Thess. ii. 3, ἡ ἀποστασία.

³ “Ye have heard that the Antichrist cometh.” 1 John ii. 18.

⁴ This first Epistle of St. John is thought by many to have been written before his banishment to Patmos, perhaps about A.D. 80; by others, as Basnage, as late as A.D. 98, or after the Apocalypse. To myself the earlier date seems the more probable; though it is possible that the later may be the true one, as I have already intimated at p. 7. In any case the license will readily be allowed me, considering the uncertainty of the question, to state the matter so as in the text.—See Macknight’s Preliminary Essay to St. John’s Epistles.

⁵ Matt. xxiv. 24, Mark xiii. 22.

⁶ See Josephus’ B. J., or Lardner, &c., alluded to p. 55 *suprà*.

⁶ Ἀντιχριστός. When *αντι* is compounded with a noun signifying an *agent* of any kind, or *functionary*, the compound word either signifies a *vice-functionary*,

in the mystic Temple, or *professing Church*; and in that character act out the part of Usurper and Adversary,

or a *functionary of the same kind opposing*, or sometimes *both*. The following two-fold tabular list of examples will show this.

I.

Αντανέρος, a man's substitute.
 Ανταδελφος, one in a brother's stead.
 Αντιβασιλευς, a vice-king.
 Αντιδιακονος, a servant's substitute.
 Αντιμισθωτος, a mercenary's substitute.
 Αντιπρεσβευτης, an envoy's substitute.
 Αντιστρατηγος, a pro-prætor.
 Αντιταμιας, a Roman vice-quæstor.
 Ανθυπατος, a proconsul.
 Αντιθεος, one in place of, or like God.
 Αντιφρουρος, a vice-sentinel.

II.

Ανταγωνιστης, an opposing combatant.
 Αντεραστης, a rival lover.
 Αντηρητης, an opposing tower.
 Αντιπλαιστης, a counter-wrestler.
 Αντιστασιωτης, an opposing factionary.
 Αντιστρατηγος, an opposing general.
 Αντιστρατιωτης, a soldier of the enemy.
 Αντιφυλαξ, a guard posted against another, a hostile sentinel.
 Αντιγραφειν, one who keeps a counter-reckoning, a check-clerk.
 Αντιδιδασκαλος, αντιχορηγος, αντιφιλοσοφος, &c. a rival teacher, &c.
 Αντισυγκλητος, a counter-senate.

Of which words three, it will be observed, have either meaning; viz. Αντιστρατηγος, Αντιβασιλευς, and Αντιφρουρος.*

The following from Dion Cassius, liii. 13, respecting Augustus' arrangement of the great Provincial Governors, will well illustrate the *first* of these lists. Τα ονοματα το τε του στρατηγου, και το του υπατου, εν τη Ιταλια εγηροσε τους δε εξω παντας, ως και αντ' εκεινων αρχοντας, προσηγορευσεν i. e. as said just before, named them αντιστρατηγους and ανθυπατους.

In the New Testament, I believe, the only precise compounds of the kind are used in the sense of the *first* of these lists; † as ανθυπατος, *Proconsul*, Acts xiii. 7, 8, 12, xix. 38. And both on that account, and yet more because the old word *pseudo-Christ* would almost have expressed the idea of an *adverse-Christ*, I conclude that *this* must be St. John's *chief* intended sense of *Antichrist*; the further idea however of an antagonist Christ, or rival and usurper of his place in the Church, being also necessarily, from the very nature of the case, included.

I shall have to add a few further remarks on the word in my Part iv, Chap. iii., § 2; where will be found a more direct notice of the prophecy respecting Antichrist, given in St. John's Epistle. Meanwhile it is important, most important, for the reader ever to bear in mind that the word cannot with etymological propriety mean simply any and every *person opposed to Christ*; but only a *Vice-Christ*, or an *opposing Christ*, or *both*. ‡ The point will recur, and be illustrated, as we proceed, both from the Fathers and from history.

* Similar to the use of *αντι* in compounds of the first list is the French use of *contre* in certain compounds: such as *contre-amiral*, a vice-admiral; *contre-maître*, a vice-master; &c.

† For *αντιδικος* (Matt. v. 25, &c.) is not such a word, as *δικος* is not a substantive: nor again, *αντικειμενος*; (2 Thess. ii. 4;) which is a compound of a neutral participle, not significative of an agent or functionary.

‡ Since this was written I have seen that both Grotius and, in our own time, Mr. Greswell have given explanations of the word to much the same effect. Says Grotius; "Sicut *Anti-Cæsarem* dicimus qui contra Cæsarem vult dici atque Cæsar haberi, sic *Antichristus* est qui se vero Christo opponit eo modo ut ipse Christus haberi velit." (Op. iv. p. 490, cited by Hurd in his 7th Warburton Lecture.)—And Mr. Greswell, on the Parables, vol. i. p. 372, after certain verbal illustrations observes; "The result of these examples is to show that the word *Antichrist* signifies neither more nor less than *another Christ*, a *pro-Christ*, a *vice-Christ*, a *pretender to the name of Christ*; who in every characteristic of personal distinction . . . sets himself up as the counterpart of the true." This is cited by Todd "on Antichrist," p. 92. Thus Dr. T. admits the truth of Mr. G.'s etymological criticism; but, agreeably with the necessities of his own theory, prefers to explain the term in that loose way which I

against Christ's true Church and Christ himself.—Nor could it fail to strengthen this anticipation that the Gnostics, and other heresiarchs, whom the Holy Ghost had taught him so to designate, did in a subordinate sense already act out that very part of a *pseudo-apostolical* Antichrist:¹ by setting Christ *practically* aside, while in mouth confessing Him;² and professing themselves *in his place* to be the power, wisdom, and salvation of God.³

But *when, how, and whence*, his manifestation? It was evidently the very same enemy to the Lord Jesus Christ and his saints, that had been long before foreshown to the prophet Daniel:⁴—and very singularly his prophecy seemed

¹ I use Professor Lücke's language, in his Comment on St. John's Ep. p. 13, "the *pseudo-apostolical Antichrist* then already appearing."

² As regards that statement about the Antichrist which we find in 1 John ii. 22, "This is the Antichrist that denieth the Father and the Son,"—if compared alike with the clause next preceding, "Who is the liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ," with the verse next following, "Whosoever denieth the Son the same hath not the Father," and also with the other plainly *Gnostic* characteristic of the Antichrists spoken of as then already manifested, (so 1 John iv. 3,)—it will at once be seen to contain nothing in it contrary to my description of St. John's Antichrist, as *in mouth confessing Christ*, while *practically* denying him, but rather absolutely to need such an explanation.—Compare the citation from Polycarp about the Gnostic heretics of his time given on my p. 62, Note⁷, just preceding.—Compare too Augustine's very remarkable comment on 1 John iv. 3, when denouncing as Antichrists certain heretics of his time *who yet made profession of being Christians*, which I must subjoin. "Ergo spiritus qui est apud hæreticos ex Deo est, quia confitentur Jesum Christum in carne venisse? Jam hic erigunt se forte adversus nos, et dicunt; 'Sed nos confitemur Jesum Christum in carne venisse. Quære ab Arianis, . . quære ab Eueuomianis, . . quære à Macedonianis, . . interroga Cataphrygas, . . interroga Novatianos, . . confitentur J. Christum in carne venisse. . . Non ergo pseudo-prophetæ sunt? Certè Antichristi sunt. . . Quid ergo facimus? Unde discernimus?—Quæsivimus quis neget [J. Christum in carne venisse]: quia nec nos negamus, nec illi negant. Et invenimus quosdam factis negare: et adhibuimus testimonium de Apostolo; qui ait [Tit. i. 16]; 'Confitentur se nosse Deum, factis autem negant.'" Tract. vi. in Epist. Joh. 12, 13.

³ See Note² p. 63 suprâ.—Thus *Simon Magus*, as there observed, gave out that "he was the great power of God." As Irenæus says of him, i. 20; "Hic à multis quasi Deus glorificatus est, et docuit semet ipsum esse qui inter Judæos quidem quasi Filium apparuerit, &c.": and again; "Ipsum venisse uti . . . hominibus salutem præstaret per suam agnitionem." Again of the *Carpocratians* Irenæus says, i. 24; "Ad tantum elationis proventi sunt, ut quidam se similes esse dicunt Jesu; quidam autem adhuc, et secundum aliquid, illo fortiores."—So too Tertullian De Præscrip. c. 46, of both *Simon Magus*, "qui ausus est summam se dicere virtutem, id est summum Deum," and his disciple *Menander*: whom (together with other professed Christian heresiarchs) Tertullian distinguishes from the *Jewish* false prophets; saying, "Ad eos me converto qui ex evangelio hæretici esse voluerunt."—So too Eusebius, H. E. iii. 26, of *Menander*; who, though a *Christian in profession*, (see my Note⁷ p. 62,) yet represented himself as the real Saviour of men. Ἐαυτον μὲν ὡς ἀρα εἰη λεγων ὁ σωτηρ, ἐπι τη των ανθρωπων ανωθεν ποθεν εξ αορατων αιωνων απεσταλμενος σωτηρια.

⁴ Dan. vii. 8, 20, 24, 25, and xi. 36.

have shown that the etymology will not admit, of teachers who by their false doctrine (simply) were enemies or opposites of Christ.

to connect this Antichrist with the *Roman Empire*; the last of those four kingdoms that were to hold in succession the supremacy of the world, until the times of the Gentiles were fulfilled: even as if he were to be the head or chief over it, not indeed in its *present*, but in some *subsequent and divided form*.¹—With which view well accorded what was added in his prophecy by St. Paul. For he spoke of the principle of the apostasy, which was to bring forth Antichrist, as already sown:² but that a *certain hindrance* needed first to be removed out of the way,³—a hindrance well understood in the Church to mean *the Roman Empire as at that time constituted*;⁴ ere room could be made for the Antichrist's development.

And when then might the first of these changes occur, and imperial heathen Rome fall to make way for him? Was the awful and increasing moral corruption of the mass of its population,—a corruption which the heathen Juvenal⁵ (even as if in illustration of St. Paul⁶) had just recently been portraying in its naked turpitude,—was the alienation of the public mind from its imperial rulers, through disgust at their long and almost uninterrupted career of vice, folly, and cruelty, which was the subject of so many of Tacitus' dark picturings,⁷—and again were the successes of the Dacian, Pannonian, and other barbarians, hovering on the frontiers of the empire, who under Domitian's reign had crossed those frontiers, and boldly attacked and defeated

¹ This great subject of prophecy will of course be again reverted to by me; indeed again and again, at certain historical epochs, as we advance in the Commentary.

² 2 Thess. ii. 7; "The mystery of iniquity doth already work," &c.

³ "Only he that letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way: and then shall that wicked one be revealed," &c. Ibid.

⁴ So Tertullian.—But I must again refer to the subsequent parts of my work for the fuller explanation of these points: and first to my comment on the 5th Seal, where the passage referred to from Tertullian is given.

⁵ *Juvenal* is supposed to have died in Trajan's reign, and at the time of the Apococalypse to have been filling a governorship to which he had been appointed by Domitian on the borders of Egypt:—an honorary kind of banishment, as it would seem, for the caustic satirist. Mr. Gifford (whose *Life of Juvenal* seems to me well considered in regard of the points of difference with Dodwell) supposes him to have finished his 2nd, 3rd, 5th, 6th, and perhaps 13th Satires, during the latter years of Domitian. If we merely take the 2nd, what a picture of the depravity of Roman manners then prevalent, and testimony to the truth of St. Paul's awful descriptive sketch!—The disinterment of Pompeii, after sixteen centuries, has in certain of its paintings and statuary furnished a silent, and almost more awful, corroborative testimony; disclosing together, as it has done, visible memorials alike of the sins and the punishment.

⁶ Rom. i. 21—32.

⁷ *Tacitus* too was a contemporary of St. John: and, like him, died under Trajan.

more than once the Roman legions,¹—were these several signs of the times, internal and external, to be regarded as indications that the dissolution of the empire in its present form was near at hand; and so the first great step about to be taken, in the progress of events, towards the consummation?—And then as to the *Antichrist* that would follow, how long was to be the time of his reign and triumph? Mystical periods in Daniel were given ~~twice over~~ to measure it: in one place “time, times, and a half time,” or 1260 days;² ~~and again in another, yet more particularly, 1260, 1290, and 1335 days;³ a period reaching apparently to the time of the enemy’s destruction by some judgment of fire like that which destroyed Sodom,⁴ and of the revelation of the brightness and blessedness of Christ’s coming.~~ But were those days meant as simple days?⁵

¹ Tacitus (Agricola c. 41) thus briefly sketches the foreign political relations of the empire just before Agricola’s death, A. D. 93. “Et ea insequuta sunt Reipublicæ tempora quæ sileri Agricolam non sinerent: tot exercitus in Mæsiâ Daciâque, et Germaniâ Pannoniâque, temeritate aut per ignaviam ducum amissi; tot militares viri cùm tot cohortibus expugnati et capti: nec jam de limite imperii et ripâ, sed de hibernis legionum et possessione dubitatum.” See too on the *internal* evils and oppressions then prevailing, *ib.* ch. 45.

Suetonius and Dion Cassius may also be consulted for the history.

² Dan. vii. 25.

³ Dan. xii. 7, 11, 12.

⁴ Dan. vii. 11, 2 Thess. i. 8, ii. 8, Luke xvii. 29, 30, Jude 7, &c.—Perhaps the very recent and terrible destruction of the cities of Herculaneum and Pompeii by volcanic fire might also occur to the apostle’s mind, as no inapt illustration, on a small scale, of that later and yet more awful catastrophe.

⁵ A curious illustration of the manner in which these mystical periods were thought of about the time of St. John’s being in Patmos, as well by heretical sects that called themselves Christians, as by the faithful Christians themselves, occurs, if I mistake not, in the Apocryphal *Vision of Isaiah*, lately translated from the Æthiopic, and published by Archbishop Lawrence: to which work, chiefly from its speaking of but *one* past persecution, viz. Nero’s, (an indication however by no means sufficient of itself to prove the point,) the Archbishop assigns a date before Domitian’s persecution, and the end of the first century. The writer (a Judaizing Christian Gnostic) thus alludes to the expected coming of Antichrist. “Berial shall descend, the mighty angel, the prince of this world, which he has possessed since its creation: he shall descend from the firmament in the form of a man, an impious monarch, *the murderer of his mother*, in the form of him *the sovereign of the world*.”—Thus, according to the well-known expectation of many in the second century, (compare Victorinus and the Sibyl’s prophecies,*) he suggests *Nero* as him that would revive to act the part of the Antichrist.—The writer adds that he was to have power *three years, seven months, twenty-seven days*. And Archbishop Lawrence explains this of the interval that actually occurred between the time of Nero’s persecution of the Christians, on the conflagration of Rome, and his death. For the latter happened June 9, A. D. 68; and three years, seven months, twenty-seven days, measured back from that epoch, would reach to Oct. 30, A. D. 64, which is *nearly* the time fixed by Mosheim for the commencement of Nero’s persecution.

But considering that the period was stated by the writer of the *Vision* not as that

* See Lardner iii. 167, 173, and the references there given by him.

Was Antichrist's reign thus to be very short; the apostle himself possibly to live to see its beginning and end; and so that memorable saying of Christ, "If I will that he tarry till I come," to be fulfilled according to the interpretation which many of the disciples had originally put upon it? ¹—A clearer light on these great subjects was needed. And perhaps that light might not unreasonably be expected. For the Lord had promised just before his death, that he would by his Spirit foreshow to the disciples the things to come; ² and the promise had scarcely as yet received its due fulfilment.

I think we can hardly err in supposing that thoughts like these were much in the mind of the beloved disciple, during his time of exile and penal suffering in Patmos; and that they must have often broken out into fervent prayers. If so, just as in the case of the prophet Daniel, ³ the visions of the Apocalypse may be considered as an answer to them. It was one Lord's day during his sojourn there, (perhaps the *Easter Sunday*, ⁴) before sunrise,—con-

of a past tyrant's persecution, but of the duration of an antichristian tyrant yet future, and considering too the exactness of the specification of the number of days of that predicted tyrant's reign, a number which only *approximates* to the length of Nero's, measured from the commencement of his persecution to his death, it seems to me that we must look elsewhere for another and better solution. And I think we shall find it in Daniel's predicted 1335 days between Antichrist's rise and the time of blessedness. For the period in question, resolved into days, is as follows:

3 years	=	365	×	3	=	1095 days	}	= 1335 days, <i>exactly</i> .
7 first months of the 4th year	=				=	212 days		
Add for leap year						1 day		
27 days						27 days		

Indeed I think there can scarcely be a doubt but that this is the true solution.*

¹ John xxi. 23; "Then went this saying abroad among the brethren, that this disciple should not die," &c. Perhaps Christ's saying in Matt. xvi. 28 may have strengthened the expectation, "There be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom;" though another and quite different explanation of either passage might of course be given.—Tertullian (*De Animâ* c. 50) refers to the expectation. "Obiit et Joannes, quem in adventum Domini remansurum frustra fuerat spes."

² Τα ερχόμενα. John xvi. 13.

³ Dan. x. 12.

⁴ So Hammond in *loc.* and Daubuz, p. 82: the latter referring to a passage in Tertullian (*De Idol.* c. 14) in which he thinks the Easter Sunday to have been meant by *Dominicus dies*. But this seems doubtful. The Paschal Sunday was called in later times ἡ μεγάλη κυριακή ἡμέρα. Eichhorn however takes the word here as Hammond and Daubuz; inferring this chiefly from the definite article prefix.

The Paschal festival, I may remark, is said to have been observed, or rather begun

* Since this was printed in my 1st Edition, Professor M. Stuart's Apocalyptic Commentary has been published, suggesting (i. 47) the same solution: whether taken from me, or thought of independently, I know not.

formably with the season and hour of Christ's resurrection from the dead, some sixty-three years previous,—that a voice was heard behind him which told that the revelation was to be given. "I was in the Spirit," he tells us, "on the Lord's day;"¹ that is, rapt in ecstasy from the earthly scene before him: "and I heard behind me a great voice as of a trumpet, saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last." It was the Lord himself that spoke. The sound of the voice, locally *behind* him, might be meant to imply, according to a mode of interpretation then prevalent, that the visions about to be shown would have reference to events *yet future and behind* in the course of time:² and the Lord's own injunction, "Write the things which are, and *the things which are to happen after them*," expressly declared that such would be in part their character.—The grand hero of the revelation was anticipatively hinted in the words, "I am Alpha and Omega, saith the

to be observed, by St. John on the 14th day of the lunar month, whatever the day of the week. So Irenæus, as quoted by Eusebius, H. E. v. 24. For he says that Polycarp could not be persuaded by Anicetus, the Roman Bishop, not to keep it on the 14th day of the moon; "because he had always on that day kept it with *John the disciple of the Lord*, and other of the apostles."*

In the case before us, however, we may suppose the 3rd day after the then 14th day of the moon to have fallen on a Sunday.

¹ See on the *κυριακη ημερα* my criticism on the Futurist system, in the Appendix to Vol. iv.

² So Daubuz, pp. 83, 84; who instances from Suetonius' Domitian, c. 23, (a passage which will come before us again under the 1st Seal,) that emperor's dream of a golden neck growing out from his own neck *behind*, as the emblem of a *future* race of emperors, who would introduce a golden age.

Compare further Homer's *ἀμα προσσω και οπισσω*, Il. A. 343, said, as the Scholiast explains it, of things present and *future*; Herodot. i. 75, *εν τοισι οπισω λογοισι*; meaning the *subsequent* or *later* Books of his History; and Virgil's "*Necum etiam geminos à tergo respicit angues*," (*Æn.* viii. 697,) said, writes Servius, to signify, "*Nondum videbat mortem futuram*."

* There seems to me to be not a little obscurity in the reports of the ancient ecclesiastical historians as to the time of observance of the Easter-feast, or festival of Christ's resurrection, by the Asiatic Christians, mainly from the dubious meaning of the word *πασχα*. Eusebius (*ibid.* 23) says that these Christians judged it right to observe the feast *τε σωτηριε πασχα* on the 14th day of the moon, ("that same on which the Jews were commanded to sacrifice the lamb,") and then to end their previous fastings, whether of two days or more (*ibid.* 24); while the Churches of the West judged that the fastings should only end on the *Lord's day*, as the day properly commemorative of the resurrection. We might hence naturally infer that the Asiatics commemorated Christ's *resurrection*, as well as *death*, on the 14th of the moon. But I think, from the nature of the case, it can only have been the paschal feast commemorative of Christ's *death* that they then celebrated; and that, as Mosheim (*ii.* 2. 4. 9) and Waddington (*Vol.* i. p. 18) state the matter, they commemorated the *resurrection* three days later. So too Neander, *Vol.* i. pp. 406, 407; (*Clark's Ed.*) who there notes the ambiguity about the ancient Christian writers of the word *πασχα*.

Lord; the beginning and the ending, the first and the last." And the command to send what was written to the seven churches of Asia, showed that the revelation was not intended for the Evangelist himself alone, but for the Church at large: the declaration that was added, "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear¹ the words of this prophecy," being alike an injunction and an encouragement from the Divine Spirit to all members of the Church to peruse and study it.

CHAPTER II.

THE PRIMARY APOCALYPTIC VISION, ON "THE THINGS THAT ARE."

It is not my purpose to enter at all fully into the particulars of this primary vision, and of the Epistles therein dictated by the Lord Jesus to the seven Churches of Asia. The subject is one rather for the minister, or the theologian, than the prophetic expositor; and of matter sufficient in itself to constitute a volume.² I shall only notice in it a few points respecting the *symbolic scene* now apparent in vision, *the state of the seven Churches severally depicted*, and *the rewards promised to the faithful in them*; these being the three chief points that have a bearing on the *visions of the future*, subsequently revealed, my more proper subject.

1. *The symbolic scene.*³—And this appears to have been

¹ i. e. church readings and hearings as of a *book inspired*.

² It constitutes, I think, the subject of three out of the four Volumes of Irving's Lectures on the Revelation.

³ Apoc. i. 1. "The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to shew unto his servants the things which must shortly come to pass; and he sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant John: 2. Who bare record of the Word of God, and of the testimony of Jesus Christ, and of all things that he saw. 3. Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein: for the time is at hand.

4. John to the seven churches which are in Asia: Grace be unto you, and peace, from him which is, and which was, and which is to come; and from the seven Spirits which are before his throne; 5. And from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, and the first begotten of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth. Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, 6. And hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be the glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen! 7. Behold he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him: and all tribes of the earth (or land) shall wail be-

a chamber like that of the Holy Place of the Jewish Temple; with not indeed a seven-branched candlestick or lamp, but seven separate lamps, lighted and burning in it: ¹ and Christ walking among and overseeing them, habited as the ancient High Priest; though with the glory of divinity attached to his human priestly semblance. ²—Of these seven lamps an explanation was given by Christ himself: they symbolized *the seven Churches* of Proconsular Asia. In which expression the definite article used implied their being either the *only* churches, or the *chief* churches, then existing in the province: an intimation which, with regard both to the specification of the church of Laodicea, and the omission of the once famous churches in its near neigh-

cause of him. Even so, Amen! 8. I am Alpha and Omega, [the beginning and the ending,] saith the Lord; which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.

9. I John, who also am your brother, and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ. 10. I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day; and I heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet, 11. Saying, [I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and] what thou seest write in a book, and send it unto the seven churches [which are in Asia]; unto Ephesus, and unto Smyrna, and unto Pergamos, and unto Thyatira, and unto Sardis, and unto Philadelphia, and unto Laodicea. 12. And I turned to see the voice that spake with me. And, being turned, I saw seven golden candlesticks; 13. And in the midst of the seven candlesticks one like unto the Son of Man, clothed with a garment down to the foot, and girt about the paps with a golden girdle. 14. His head and his hairs were white like wool, as white as snow; and his eyes were as a flame of fire; 15. And his feet like unto fine brass,* as if they burned in a furnace; and his voice as the sound of many waters. 16. And he had in his right hand seven stars: and out of his mouth went a sharp two-edged sword: and his countenance was as the sun shineth in his strength. 17. And when I saw him, I fell at his feet as dead. And he laid his right hand upon me, saying unto me, Fear not; I am the first and the last: 18. I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore; [Amen;] and have the keys of hades and of death. 19. Write the things which thou hast seen, and the things which are, and the things which shall be hereafter; 20. The mystery of the seven stars which thou sawest in my right hand, and the seven golden candlesticks. The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches: and the seven candlesticks which thou sawest are the seven churches."†

¹ It would seem probable that the seven branches of the Jewish Temple lamp-sconces were removable from the central chandelier: (see Patrick on Exod. xxv. 31:) perhaps to typify how under a future dispensation, (viz. the Gentile,) the Church would lose the form of visible unity that it had possessed under the Jewish, and be scattered in its different branches over the world.

² Apoc. i. 14, &c. Compare Dan. x. 5, &c.

* χαλκολιβανος, rather *amber*, says Lowth on Ezek. i. 4; where the corresponding Hebrew word is so rendered in our English authorized version.

† In the above I have rendered φυλαι *tribes*, according to its usual rendering, instead of *kindred*; and suggested (verse 7) *land* as perhaps the better rendering for γη, instead of *earth*; so marking more clearly, as probably intended, a reference to Zech. xii. 10—14. I have also enclosed in brackets the clauses of the received version which are rejected by the critical Editions, as wanting in the best Greek MSS.

bourhood of Colossæ and Hierapolis,¹ we have seen illustrated from the record of certain physical changes made by an earthquake in the district; very shortly after the date of the Apostle Paul's Epistles to the Colossian Church and to Philemon.²

Now the *temple scenery* thus presented to view, with Christ's own authoritatively attached *Christian* explanation of its chief article of furniture, was precisely that which might best prepare the Evangelist for the similar application to the *Christian Church* of similar symbols, borrowed from the old *Jewish* tabernacle or temple; should they appear, as in fact they did appear, in the visions of the *future*.³—In the same way the emblem here seen of the

¹ That churches were founded at the time of St. Paul's Epistle to the Colossians in the two neighbouring towns of *Laodicea* and *Hierapolis*, appears from Col. iv. 13; "I bear him (Epaphras) record, that he hath a great zeal for you, and them that are in Laodicea, and them in Hierapolis." Of which two towns, *Laodicea* was situated some ten or twelve miles north of Colossæ, *Hierapolis* the same distance north of Laodicea. There seems every probability in favour of Theodoret's and Lardner's (vi. 151) opinion, that St. Paul himself, while preaching in Phrygia, founded these churches. See Acts xvi. 6, xviii. 23.

² It has been already mentioned, (see p. 45 supra,) that in the time of Nero the three cities *Laodicea*, *Hierapolis*, and *Colossæ* were destroyed by an earthquake; also that *Laodicea* was not very long afterwards rebuilt. Hence it is natural to suppose that the main body of the Christians of all the three cities soon congregated thither. On the other hand the earliest historical information, I believe, that we have respecting the restoration of the Church at *Hierapolis*, is that which arises out of the fact of Papias having been its bishop in Trajan's reign, i. e. somewhere between 98 and 117. And as to *Colossæ*, I am not aware that either city or Church is noticed by any writer in the second century.

In a Laodicean medal of Domitian's reign, given by Mionnet and noticed also in Rasche, there appears the following inscription, *Λαοδικεων Σαρδι*: the coin thus furnishing its interesting and silent memorial of the union and communion of the two towns of Laodicea and Sardis, ("Laodicensium et Sardoniorum concordia," Rasche,) at the very time when the two Churches there established were addressed conjunctively in the Apocalyptic epistles.

³ E. g. viii. 3, xi. 2, 4, &c.—There seems to me nothing to contravene this view in the use of the word *Jews* in Apoc. ii. 9, iii. 9; ("I know the blasphemy of them which say they are *Jews*, and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan;" "I will make them of the synagogue of Satan, which say they are *Jews*, and are not, but do lie, to come and worship before thy feet, and to know that I have loved thee;") but the contrary. For I cannot doubt the use of the word in a mystical and Christian sense, as of all that was Jewish in the visible scenery. So Vitringa on Apoc. ii. 9. "Nomen *Ιουδαίος* mysticè accipiendum est. יהודה Hebræis est confessor; ab יהודה *confiteri*, præ se ferre veram fidei professionem. Erant inter ipsos Christianos qui se appellari et denominari cupiebant *Judeos*, hoc est veritatis purioris confessores."—There could surely have been little trial to the Christians from *actual Jews*, at the time of the Apocalyptic visions: a time when Jerusalem was fallen; its nation outcast; and those outcasts, among the Romans, as among the Assyrians and Babylonians in olden time, "despectissima pars servientium:"* moreover when *actual professing Jews* were by the Christian

* Tacit. Hist. v. 8.—Compare Juvenal vi. 543, already referred to p. 57; also his line, iii. 14, *Judæis quorum cophinus sænunque supellex*.

seven stars that Christ held in his hand,¹ coupled with his explanation of them as meaning *the seven angels, or rulers and presiding ministers of the churches*, would prepare St. John to interpret the symbol of *stars* (should they occur in the subsequent visions), of *ecclesiastical rulers*, where ecclesiastical things were concerned;² as also of *secular rulers*, I may add, where the subject was of secular things.³ — It was observable, that this Holy Place and its candlesticks seemed to represent the state of the churches, not as seen by the eye of man, but by the eyes of him that seeth in secret; just as the *Holy Place* of the Jewish Temple was only accessible to the priest, while the *altar-court* was the scene of what was *publicly visible* in the worship.⁴ This was a fact also to be remembered for application afterwards.—Nor was it of unimportant use to note the representation of *Jesus Christ* here given, as the *Priest* of the churches; and the designation of their ecclesiastical presidents or *bishops* simply as *angels*, a term borrowed not from the Temple, but the *Synagogue*:⁵ in token, thus early, that the offices of the Levitical priests were to be re-

body universally held in abhorrence. Hence my persuasion that *false professing Christians* were here meant.—Nor does difficulty on this head arise from the word *συναγωγή*, *synagogue*. It is a word used of Christian assemblies by James ii. 2: and even were it only an appellative of *Jewish* assemblies for worship, its symbolic use to signify *Christian Church* assemblies, would be only in keeping with the symbolic use in a Christian sense both of the word *Jeus*, and of the pictured *Holy Place* of the Jewish sanctuary on the Apocalyptic scene.—Compare Gal. iv. 26, vi. 16.

¹ In a medal of *Faustina's consecration* that I have seen, she appears carried upward on an eagle, and holding over head a circular band with *seven stars* in it.

² E. g. Apoc. xii. 1, "A woman having on her head a crown of *twelve stars*;" and xii. 4, "And his tail (the Dragon's) drew the third part of the *stars of heaven*, and did cast them to the earth."

³ E. g. Apoc. vi. 13.

⁴ Compare my observations on the Apocalyptic scenery in Ch. iv. *infra*; also those subsequently given on the temple-scene figured in Apoc. vi. 9, viii. 3, xi. 1, 2.

⁵ "Dictio Græca ἄγγελος της εκκλησιας respondet Hebrææ שְׁלִיחַ בְּבֵית יְהוָה, *legatus, sive delegatus ecclesie*. Dicebantur autem *Legati ecclesie* in Synagogâ exercitati quidam doctique viri, et in his præcipuè doctores, qui solenniter *delegabantur* ad preces pro cœtu publico fundendas, sive in ordinariis sive in extraordinariis casibus: ut adeo per angelos ecclesie hic intelligi debeant Præpositi ecclesie Christiane, quorum erat preces publicè ad Deum in ecclesiâ mittere, sacra curare, et verba facere ad populum. . . Et cum precandi et docendi officium in ecclesiâ præcipuè incubuerit τῷ πρῶτῳ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, primo presbyterorum, quem ætas recentior *Episcopum* vocavit, facile patior *Præsides* presbyterorum ecclesie Christiane hic potissimum à Domino notari." So Vitringa ad loc.—Professor Stuart suggests also, from the use of a similar Hebrew word in Haggai i. 13 ("Haggai, *the Lord's messenger*,") the sense of *prophet* or *chief teacher* of the Church; a sense well uniting with the former.

garded as fulfilled by CHRIST;¹ and that the functions of the Christian bishop, or minister in the Church, were those of leading the devotions, and directing and animating the faith of the flock; not functions sacrificial or mediatorial, as with the Levitical priests of old.²—Besides all which it will be well to notice the view that is here presented of *the Devil*, or *Satan*, as the real though unseen actor on the different and hostile scene of *this world*,³—the secret indwelling instigator of the persecuting emperors and people of heathen Rome. This might fitly prepare the evangelist for any symbolic picture, or any explanatory comment, in the subsequent visions of the future, embodying or hinting the same great truth.⁴

2. With regard to *the seven moral sketches of the seven Asiatic churches*,⁵ the question arises whether these had a *prophetic* application, besides and beyond their primary and literal application to those Asiatic Churches then existing;

¹ Compare Heb. x. 21; "Having an high priest over the house of God;" (viz. Christ;) and iii. 6; "Whose house are we," &c.: the *temple* being meant by *God's house*, as in Matt. xxi. 13, &c.

² The *theological* importance of the point (which will begin strikingly to appear in the history of the Church, when we come to the Sealing Vision, Apoc. vii.) has induced me to quote the above from Vitringa at length. Daubuz, p. 109, (on Apoc. ii. 1.) vainly attempts to gainsay the view thus given, and to attach a *Levitical* character to the Christian ministry; a theory supported by his own interpretation of the twenty-four elders in Apoc. iv, v, as signifying the same. But it will appear, I trust, in the Exposition ensuing, that the twenty-four elders meant no such thing.

³ Apoc. ii. 10.

⁴ Compare Apoc. xii. 9.

⁵ Apoc. ii. 1. "Unto the angel of the church in *Ephesus* write; These things saith he that holdeth the seven stars in his right hand, who walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks; 2. I know thy works, and thy labour, and thy patience, and how thou canst not bear them which are evil: and thou hast tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars: 3. And hast borne, and hast patience, and for my name's sake hast laboured, and hast not fainted. 4. Nevertheless I have somewhat against thee, because thou hast left thy first love. 5. Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works; or else I will come unto thee [quickly], and will remove thy candlestick out of its place, except thou repent. 6. But this thou hast, that thou hatest the deeds of the Nicolaitanes, which I also hate. 7. He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches. To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the [midst of the] paradise of God.

8. And unto the angel of the church in *Smyrna* write; These things saith the first and the last, which was dead, and is alive; I know thy [works, and] tribulation and poverty, (but thou art rich;) and I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan. 10. Fear none of those things which thou shalt suffer: behold, the devil shall cast some of you into prison, that ye may be tried; and ye shall have tribulation ten days: be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life. 11. He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches. He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death.

12. And to the angel of the church in *Pergamos* write; These things saith he which hath the sharp sword with two edges; 13. I know [thy works, and] where thou

and signified further *seven several phases* that the Church Catholic would present to Christ's all-seeing eye, in its progress through coming ages, down to the consummation. Such is the view taken by not a few commentators; and which has been illustrated at large in a former age by Vitrunga and Sir I. Newton, in the present by Mr. Trotter. I subjoin a chronological diagram of their respective

dweldest, even where Satan's seat is:* and thou holdest fast my name, and hast not denied my faith, even in those days wherein Antipas was my faithful martyr, who was slain among you, where Satan dwelleth. 14. But I have a few things against thee, because thou hast there them that hold the doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balak to cast a stumbling-block before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed unto idols, and to commit fornication. 15. So hast thou also them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitanes, in like manner.† 16. Repent: or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will fight against them with the sword of my mouth. 17. He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches. To him that overcometh will I give [to eat] of the hidden manna; and I will give him a white stone, and on the stone a new name written, which no man knoweth save he that receiveth it.

18. And unto the angel of the church in *Thyatira* write; These things saith the Son of God, who hath his eyes like unto a flame of fire, and his feet are like fine brass; 19. I know thy works, and charity, and service, and faith, and thy patience, and thy works; and the last to be more than the first. 20. Notwithstanding I have a few things against thee, because thou lettest alone‡ that woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, and teacheth, and seduceth my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed unto idols. 21. And I gave her space to repent of her fornication; and she repented not. 22. Behold, I will cast her into a bed, and them that commit adultery with her into great tribulation, except they repent of their deeds. 23. And I will kill her children with death; and all the churches shall know that I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts: and I will give unto every one of you according to your works. 24. But unto you I say, [and unto] the rest in *Thyatira*, as many as have not this doctrine, and which have not known the depths of Satan, as they speak, I will put upon you none other burden. 25. But that which ye have already, hold fast till I come. 26. And he that overcometh, and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations: 27. and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers: even as I received of my Father. 28. And I will give him the morning star. 29. He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches.

iii. 1. And unto the angel of the church in *Sardis* write; These things saith he that hath the seven spirits of God, and the seven stars; I know thy works, that thou hast a name that thou livest, and art dead. 2. Be watchful, and strengthen the things which remain, that are ready to die: for I have not found thy works perfect before God. 3. Remember therefore how thou hast received and heard; and hold fast, and repent. If therefore thou shalt not watch, I will come on thee as a thief; and thou shalt not know what hour I will come upon thee. 4. Thou hast a few names even in *Sardis* which have not defiled their garments; and they shall walk with me in white: for they are worthy. 5. He that overcometh, the same shall be clothed in white raiment: and I will not blot out his name out of the book of life; but I will confess his name before my Father, and before his angels. 6. He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches.

7. And to the angel of the church in *Philadelphia* write; These things saith he

* Kitto notes on the word *Pergamos*, that this statement about it may refer to the Pergamenes' worship of a serpent, as the emblem of *Æsculapinus*.

† A, C, have *ὁμοίως*, instead of the received *ὁ μισω*, "which thing I hate."

‡ A, B, C, *ἀφεις*, instead of the received *ἔαγ*.

schemes, for the reader's information.* To myself the

that is holy, he that is true, he that hath the key of David, he that openeth, and no man shutteth, and shutteth, and no man openeth: 8. I know thy works: behold,

* Vitringa's, Sir I. Newton's, and Mr. Trotter's Schemes of the Epistles to the Seven Churches as prefigurative.

Ephesus.	V.	From St. John to the Decian persecution, A.D. 250.
	N.	Do. to the Diocletianic persecution, A.D. 303.
	T.	Apostolic Age to St. John's death. Decline in first love.
Smyrna.	V.	From the Decian to the Diocletian persecution, A.D. 311.
	N.	Church under Diocletian's ten years' persecution, and that of Licinius, 303—324.
	T.	From St. John to Constantine. Ten persecutions to stay the progress of the declension.
Pergamos.	V.	From the end of the Diocletian persecution to A.D. 700.
	N.	Church under Constantine's monarchy, 324—340.
	T.	From Constantine to establishment of Popery about 7th century. Sinful alliance of Church with world.
Thyatira.	V.	From 700 to A.D. 1200, and the rise of the Waldenses.
	N.	Church under divided empire of sons of Constantine, 340—350.
	T.	Popery of the dark ages; idolatrous, persecuting, Jezebel-like, to near the Reformation, A.D. 1500.
Sardis.	V.	From A.D. 1200 to 1500 and the Reformation.
	N.	Church under Constantius' sole monarchy, 350—361.
	T.	Protestantism after the Reformation; orthodox in creed; name to live; but, except few names in Sardis, dead.
Philadelphia.	V.	The earlier times of the Reformation, in its political weakness.
	N.	Church faithful in Julian's persecution, 361—363.
	T.	Feeble faithful remnant, during the great professing body's preponderance, which is called Satan's synagogue. (Qu. contemporarily with the æra of Sardis?)
Laodicea.	V.	The lukewarm state of the Protestant Church following its establishment, to 1700, &c.
	N.	Church lukewarm under Valentinian and Valens, apostasy beginning, 363—378.
	T.	Professing Church's last state of high pretensions, but lukewarm.

In my first four Editions I gave the Scheme of the Rev. E. Girdlestone. But in 1847

view seems quite untenable. For not a word is said by Christ to indicate any such prospective meaning in the

I have set before thee an open door, and no man can shut it: for thou hast a little strength, and hast kept my word, and hast not denied my name. 9. Behold I will make them of the synagogue of Satan which say they are Jews, and are not, but do lie: behold, I will make them to come and worship before thy feet, and to know that I have loved thee. 10. Because thou hast kept the word of my patience, I also will keep thee from the hour of temptation, which shall come upon all the world, to try them that dwell upon the earth. 11. Behold, I come quickly: hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown. 12. Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God, and he shall go no more out: and I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, which is New Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God: and I will write upon him my new name. 13. He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches.

14. And unto the angel of the church of the *Laodiceans* write; These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God; 15. I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. 16. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth: 17. because thou sayest I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked. 18. I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire, that thou mayest be rich; and white raiment, that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear; and anoint thine eyes with eyesalve, that thou mayest see. 19. As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten; be zealous, therefore, and repent. 20. Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me. 21. To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne; even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne. 22. He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches.*

Mr. G. published a Pamphlet, entitled "Notes on the Apocalypse;" in which he intimates a renunciation very much of his original view; adding, as his more mature opinion, that the seven epistles, together with an *historic* sense somewhat similar to Vitringa's, have also further a yet unfulfilled *prophetic* sense, as bearing "with special application" on the state of the Church in "the crisis of the last days." I have therefore thought it better to give, instead, the later scheme of Mr. Trotter, one of "the Brethren," so called, at York. It will be found in his Volume of "Plain Papers on Prophetic and other subjects;" published A.D. 1854. See its pp. 254—256.

In the "Monthly Review of the London Prophetic Society," (1857,) pp. 455—458, I published a review refuting this Scheme of Mr. Trotter's; from which I beg to cite the extract following. "It is inconsistent with plain fact; because in more than one of the Epistles the prominent characteristics of the church address disagree utterly with the state of the Christian Church at the æra to which Mr. T. assigns it. So e. g. very specially in that to *Thyatira*. For Mr. T. most strangely, and by means really of what is nothing less than mutilation, . . . explains it to represent the Church's state under the all-dominant Popery of the dark ages, when irreligion prevailed everywhere, and the very witness for Christ was all but extinguished: whereas the Epistle depicts a high state of piety as prevalent in the general professing body at *Thyatira*; and with the power in their hands, which it was their grand fault not duly to exercise, of interdicting and stopping the teaching of the woman Jezebel. Mr. T.'s eye has been on the exception Jezebel, not on the church *Thyatira*. This is the 4th and central epistle of the seven. And, if his centre be thus broken, Mr. T. will hardly, I think, care to contend for the rest."

* The bracket marks [] indicate, as before, omissions in which the chief MSS. agree. The few different readings from those of our received English version are specified in the foot notes.

descriptions. On the contrary, in the two-fold division of the Revelations given to St. John, a division noted by Christ himself,—“*the things that are,*” and “*the things that are to happen after them,*”¹—it seems to me clear that the Epistles to the seven Churches were meant to constitute the first division, being a description of the state of things in the Church *as they then were*: and that the visions that followed,—visions separated with the utmost precision from the former, alike by a new summons of the trumpet-voice, and a scene and scenic accompaniments altogether new also,—constituted (alone and distinctively) the visions of the *future*. Indeed the summons itself expressly so defined it; “Come up, and I will [now] show thee *the things which must happen hereafter.*”²—With this simple, striking, and strongly marked division made by the Divine Revealer, the hypothesis of the seven Epistles depicting seven successive phases of the Christian Church appears to me an interference altogether rude and unwarranted. Besides that it were easy to show how ill the states of these seven Asiatic Churches, here described in *local* order,³—I say how ill these severally depicted ecclesiastical sketches answer to any seven chronologically successive phases of the professing Church, or Christendom, that human wit and research can ever frame out of its actual history.⁴

Not but that we may admit of an *universality of application* attaching to the moral pictures here set before us. Such is the case with all the historical and biographical sketches in holy Scripture: especially, for example, with the pictures from time to time presented of the moral and religious state of the Jewish people, in the course of their long history. The character which belongs to all holy Scripture, of being profitable always and to all, applies of course to this section of it, as much as to the rest. And, thus considered, where is the Church, where the individual

¹ Apoc. i. 19; και ἄ εἰσι, και ἄ μελλει γινεσθαι μετα ταυτα.

² Apoc. iv. 1; ἄ δε γινεσθαι μετα ταυτα.

³ That is, in the order of a circuit, such as we may suppose St. John to have travelled in his visitation of them.

⁴ It may suffice on this point to refer to my examination of the *Church-scheme of the Seals*, which will be found in the Appendix to this Volume. The reader will easily apply the reasoning there drawn out; and make for himself the necessary *mutata mutanda* in its transference to the argument in the Text.

Christian, that may not have made profitable use and self-application of all the several addresses, at one time or another: with their words of searching and of warning, of promise and consolation, of expostulation and reproof, of sympathy and compassion;—in regard respectively of the consistent faithful disciples, and the tempted, the lukewarm, or the fallen? The words, “He that hath an ear to hear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches,” are, as Ambrose Ansbert has observed,¹ a direct intimation that this universality of use and application was intended in them; even to the end of time. And, doubtless, he whosoever has seriously and with prayerful mind perused them, will have experienced in his own heart the truth of the declaration, “Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy.”—But this is very different from the view combated.

I must not omit to add further that these descriptive sketches of the seven Asiatic Churches seem to have been intended by its great Head as representative specimens, if I may so say, of the *then* existing state and character of the Church in general.² And in the admixture which they unfold of evil intermixed with the good, error with truth, vice with holiness, there is very strikingly set forth to us Christ’s own view of the energizing within its bosom, even thus early, of the Spirit of the Wicked One; of the inrooting of the tares, or mock-wheat,³ sown by him among the true wheat; and the budding of that germ of evil which, as St. Paul had foreshown, was still to go on working till it should expand into the grand Apostasy.

3. With regard to the *promises* made to conquerors in all these various churches, it can scarcely fail to strike even a superficial reader, that there is a correspondence very marked between *them*, and the blessings described as the privilege of the saints in the Millenary state, or that of

¹ “Cum hic . . . non unam Ephesi ecclesiam ad audienda dicta Spiritus, sed ecclesias invitet, patet certè quia quod uni dicit omnibus dicit.” B. P. M. xiii. 434.

² So Augustine, Ep. xlix. 2; “Johannes scribit ad septem ecclesias quas commemorat in illis partibus constitutas: in quibus etiam *universam ecclesiam* septenario numero intelligimus commendari.” So too in his C. D. xvii. 4. 4.

³ ζιζανια.

the New Jerusalem. Thus to the faithful ones that overcame in the *Ephesian* Church, it was promised, "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life which is in the midst of the paradise of God:"¹ while in the description of the New Jerusalem it is said, "On either side of the river was the tree of life. . . . Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life."²—To the conquerors of the Church of *Smyrna* it was promised, "He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death:"³ a promise answering to that which we find assigned to the partakers of the first resurrection at the opening of the Millennium; "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; for on them the second death hath no power."⁴—To the overcomers at *Sardis* it was promised, "They shall walk with me in white, and I will not blot out their names out of the book of life."⁵ Of which double promise the former part was seen fulfilled alike in the case of the white-robed palm-bearers, led by the lamb beside the living waters,⁶ and of the bride, the Lamb's wife, figured as the New Jerusalem, to whom it was given to be arrayed in fine linen clear and white;⁷ the latter part in those who, on the judgment of the great white throne, were recognised by Him who sate thereon as having their names written in the book of life.⁸—The same is the correspondence between the promise to the *Laodiceans*, "To him that overcometh I will give to sit with me on my throne,"⁹ and the millenary privilege of reigning enthroned with Christ during the thousand years, and for ever.¹⁰ The thoughtful reader will easily perceive what important and interesting considerations arise out of this coincidence. Let me suggest two. The first is how beautifully it helps to mark the dramatic unity, from first to last, of the Apocalyptic prophecy; the second how great the interest it must have added in St. John's mind to the progress of the drama, to know before-hand that its finale to the saints would be one of such blessedness.

¹ Apoc. ii. 7.² Apoc. xxii. 2, 14. So according to the received reading. The parallelism however does not depend on this. It exists if we follow the more critical reading, "they that wash their robes."³ Apoc. ii. 11.⁴ Apoc. xx. 6.⁵ Apoc. iii. 4, 5.⁶ Apoc. vii. 14, 17.⁷ Apoc. xix. 8.⁸ Apoc. xx. 12, 14, 15.⁹ Apoc. iii. 21.¹⁰ Apoc. xx. 4, xxii. 5.

But it is time to leave this preliminary vision, and proceed to the second and grand division of the Apocalyptic revelations.

CHAPTER III.

THE OPENING VISION OF THE HEAVENLY THRONE AND COMPANY, PREPARATORY TO THE REVELATIONS OF THE FUTURE.

IN the two preceding chapters of the Apocalypse “the things *that were*,”—the state of the church then existing,—had been described to the Evangelist. Then the voice ceased of Him that had been communing with him; and the scene passed from his view of the seven lamps, and the heavenly High Priest that walked among them. It remained that the promised revelation should be made of things *future*,—*ἀ μελλει γινεσθαι μετα ταυτα*,¹—the things which were to follow after the state then existing of the church and of the world.

And for this another and higher scene was deemed suitable. The revelations to be made him were to be communicated to beings of a higher order also; that so “unto principalities and powers in heavenly places might be made known,” through this history of the Church, in its prefiguration, as afterwards both in its evolution and in its retrospect, “the manifold wisdom of God.”² So a door appeared open in heaven; ³ and the voice which had before addressed him was heard again speaking, “Come up, and I will show thee what must happen hereafter.” Then was he again in the Spirit: and he seemed to enter at the door: and a vision of heavenly glory, and scene as of a new world, burst upon his view.

The vision is thus described. “Behold a throne was set in heaven, and One sat on the throne. And He that sat was, to look upon, like a jasper and sardine stone. And

¹ Apoc. i. 19.

² Eph. iii. 10.

³ So in Ezek. i. 1; “The heavens were opened, and I saw visions of God.”

there was a rainbow round about the throne, in sight like unto an emerald. And round about the throne were four and twenty thrones: and upon the thrones I saw four and twenty elders sitting, clothed in white raiment; and they had on their heads crowns of gold. And out of the throne proceed lightnings, and thunderings, and voices. And there were seven lamps of fire burning before the throne, which are the seven Spirits of God. And before the throne there was a glassy sea, like unto crystal. And in the midst of the throne, and round about the throne, were four living creatures, full of eyes before and behind. And the first living creature was like a lion, and the second like a calf, and the third had a face as a man, and the fourth was like a flying eagle. And the four living creatures had each of them six wings about him. And they are full of eyes within. And they rest not day and night, saying, Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come. And when those living creatures give glory, and honour, and thanks to Him that sitteth on the throne, who liveth for ever and ever, the four and twenty elders fall down before Him that sitteth on the throne, and worship Him that liveth for ever and ever, and cast their crowns before the throne, saying, Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honour, and power; for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created.”¹

Thus the vision, like those of Isaiah and of Ezekiel,² exhibited, as its first and grand object, Jehovah, King of saints, seated as Lord of all on the throne of the universe. It seems probable that a *cloud* accompanied this revelation of God, just as in the Shekinah and other manifestations of the Divine presence:³ the throne of glory rising, as we may conceive, out of it; and the thunderings and

¹ I have deviated from the authorized version in the above, in translating *θρονοι*, *thrones*, instead of *seats*; *υαλινη*, *glassy*, instead of *of glass*; and *ζωα*, *living creatures*, instead of *beasts*.

² Is. vi. 1, Ezek. i. 4, 26.

³ So in the way from Egypt to Sinai, Exod. xiv. 24, xvi. 10:—at Sinai, Exod. xxiv. 16, 18;—in the tabernacle, Levit. xvi. 2;—in Solomon's temple, 1 Kings viii. 10;—in Isaiah's vision, (so W. Lowth,) Isa. vi. 4;—in Ezekiel's, Ezek. i. 4, x. 3, &c.—So, I see, Rosenmuller ad loc. “Thronus Dei comparatur eum nube, ex qua fulgura et tonitrua exeunt.”

In the book of Ecclesiasticus, xxiv. 4, the throne is spoken of as in the pillar of the cloud; *ο θρονος μου εν στυλη νεφελης*.

lightnings, here and elsewhere spoken of in the Apocalypse proceeding therefrom.—And then that *glassy sea*, as it were, *like crystal*,¹ spread before the throne, (the space before, or in front of the throne, being the only part unoccupied, and therefore visible,²) may be explained, from other parallel Scriptures, as the firmament of blue transparent ether³ above the heads of the four throne-upholders, in which the cloud floated. For a basement just similar is described as connected with the throne, both in the vision of Ezekiel, and in that seen by the Israelitish elders at Sinai. “The likeness,” says Ezekiel, “of the firmament on the heads of the living creatures was as the colour of the terrible (*or admirable*) crystal; . . . and above the firmament was the likeness of a throne.”⁴ And Moses; “There was under the feet of the God of Israel as it were a pavement of a sapphire stone, and as it were the body of heaven in its clearness:”⁵—the heavenly firmament then visible reflecting the glow of the sapphire throne⁶ immediately beneath it; but melting beyond into its clear and proper blue.⁷—

¹ ὡς θαλασσα ὑάλινη. So Scholz, Tregelles, and other critical editions, with the ὡς.

² Because the thrones of the elders, on either side of the divine throne, would there apparently hide the basement from view.

³ So Cowper, of the blue liquid firmamental ether, (Task, B. v.)

Ye shining hosts

That navigate a sea that knows no storms.

⁴ Ezek. i. 22—26.—A Note in the Pictorial Bible on this passage in Ezekiel, observes that the term הַקִּרְבַּת הַנִּירָה, rendered *terrible crystal*, “seems to have been a term of pre-eminence for the *diamond*; which is indeed an admirable crystal for its brilliancy and hardness.”

⁵ Exod. xxiv. 9, 10.—In the Septuagint translation of Ezekiel, the word for firmament is *στειρωμα*; answering nearly (as does also our word *firmament*) to the “pavement,” or “paved work,” that Moses tells us of as seen by the Israelitish elders.—In Gen. i. 6 we read of the first creation of this *firmament*. On which passage Robertson (in his *Clavis Pentateuchi*) observes: “רָקִיעַ, propriè *expansum, aer, atmospheria*.” And then in a Note as follows. “Vox propriè notat *metallum solidum, mallei ictu diductum. Ad cælos transfertur Job xxxvii. 18; ‘Expandes, deduces cum illo nubila tenuissima, firma ut speculum fustum.’ Pavimentum solii divini, quod ex glacie concretum viderat, vocatur רָקִיעַ Ezek. i. 22, 23: quod, cum pedibus Dei tonantis subjectum sit, à calcando dicitur.”*

⁶ Ezek. i. 26, x. 1.

⁷ So Milton, P. L. vi. 757, after notice of the four Cherubim, as supporters of the chariot of God:

Over their heads a crystal firmament,
Whereon a sapphire throne, inlaid with pure
Amber, and colors of the showery arch.

The epithet ὑάλινη, applied to the firmamental expanse, like the English *glassy*, or Latin *vitreus*, is a word simply expressive, I conceive, of clearness and transparency; thus answering to the “body of heaven *in its clearness*,” in the passage from Ex-

Above was the *Form of glory*: “Thou hast set thy glory above the heavens.” And, resembling as it did in colour the red jasper or sardine, there must doubtless have been something in the appearance very awful, as well as glorious. Nor without meaning. For indeed, even under the Christian dispensation, “our God is (in his holiness) as a consuming fire.” But there appeared round about the throne, as if to re-assure the Evangelist, a *rainbow* in which the soft green was predominant, “in sight like unto an emerald;”—the well-known and lovely memorial of the covenant of grace.¹—Next his eye was arrested by the appearance of *seven lamps* burning before the throne. And what their meaning? They were, we read, the “seven Spirits of God:” ~~a designation, I conceive, of the Divine Spirit, the third person of the blessed Trinity, in respect of his sevenfold influences.~~² Else how that invocation of grace and blessing in *Apoc.* i. 4, from “the seven Spirits before the throne,” conjunctively with the Father and the Son?³ And I think, considering the septenary number of

odus. So in *Job* xxxvii. 18, the passage just cited from Robertson; “Hast thou spread out the sky as a molten looking-glass?”

The explanation of the *glassy sea* above given is the same as *Vitrino’s*; and it is now, I believe, generally acquiesced in by the best expositors. There are some indeed that still explain it to signify the *brazen laver*, or *sea*, in the Jewish temple. But, 1st, the Evangelist is here describing what was in the inner sanctuary, not what was in the court *without* it: 2ndly, it seems difficult to explain why, if the laver was meant, it should be represented as of glass, and not brazen: 3dly, there appears no allusion whatever to any such laver in any of the Apocalyptic visions.

¹ Compare *Gen.* ix. 12—17, and *Isa.* liv. 9, 10.

² *Isa.* xi. 2. So the Hymn in our Ordination Service:

Come, Holy Ghost, our souls inspire,
And lighten with celestial fire!
Thou the anointing Spirit art,
That dost thy seven-fold gifts impart, &c.

³ “John to the seven churches which are in Asia, Grace be unto you, and peace, from Him who is, and who was, and who is to come, and from *the seven spirits which are before his throne*, and from Jesus Christ.”—But for this we might have explained the *seven lamps before the throne* of seven *angelic* spirits: agreeably with the word *seraphim*, *burning ones*; and the figurative description in *Heb.* i. 7, “He maketh his angels *spirits*, and his ministers a *flame of fire*.”*

* Prof. M. Stuart, however, advocates the meaning of seven *Seraphim*, as the true explanation of these seven lamps of fire before the throne; as also of “the seven spirits before God’s throne,” *Apoc.* i. 4. See his vol. ii. pp. 17—23. His two chief arguments for this are as follows. 1st, the position being *before the throne* was simply that of ministering servants. To which I reply, that such was also the Lamb’s position when he took the book, as described *Apoc.* v. 6. 2dly, in *Apoc.* viii. 2 seven chief angels are expressly spoken of as so standing before God. To which I reply; But these are only called angels; and moreover they received trumpets, and other-

these lamps of fire, and the fact of no mention being made elsewhere of other seven lamps of the inner sanctuary, such as St. John had seen in his primary vision, in type of the Christian churches,—that we may with probability suppose a reference to *them* in the present symbolization; seeing that the burning flames of those several lamps, which ascended up before the Almighty One, were but in each case the enkindlings of the Divine Spirit, and so might fitly figure his holy influences.¹

But what the meaning of the *twenty-four elders*, seated round the throne of the Deity? And what of the *four living creatures*,² yet more nearly surrounding it?

We may be thankful that what is most essential to be known respecting these emblematic beings, in order to our right understanding of the Apocalypse, is expressly revealed to us. Whatever their distinctive characters respectively, both the one and the other were unquestionably *representatives of the redeemed* from among the children of men. For this was the song of thanksgiving to the Lamb in which they were heard uniting in common chorus soon afterwards; “Thou hast redeemed us unto

¹ So the Holy Spirit was figured under the symbol of *twelve tongues of fire*; in regard of his communication to the twelve Apostles of the gift of tongues. See Acts ii. 3.—It is perhaps a corroboration of this view, that Christ designates himself (Apoc. iii. 1) as “He that holdeth the seven spirits of God, and the seven stars:” a natural combination, if the former, as well as latter, had a direct relation to the seven churches.

² Ζωα. The word is one used by Clemens Alexandrinus in his Pædag. i. 8, of *man*. He calls him *καλλιστον και φιλοθεον ζων*.

wise acted inconsistently with the symbol of the seven lamps of fire, which seem to have been stationary in the Holy Place.—In reply to the obvious counter-argument (urged above by me) from John’s invocation of grace and blessing from the seven spirits before the throne, the Professor urges as analogical passages, for comparison, 1 Tim. v. 21, “I charge thee before God, and Jesus Christ, and the elect angels;” Luke ix. 26, “When he shall come in his glory, and of the holy angels;” and Luke xii. 8, “Him shall the Son of Man confess before the angels of God:”—“these presence-angels,” says he, “together with God and Christ, constituting (so to speak) the supreme court of heaven.” But the parallels cited are surely all quite insufficient and inappropriate. There is not one passage in the Bible, I believe, where grace is invoked from angels.—As to the Professor’s reference to Tobit xii. 15, it may be useful to observe that that Apocryphal book’s designation of the seven angels before God as those that “*present the prayers of the saints*” to Him, is directly opposed to the Apocalyptic description of the seven presence-angels: who in Apoc. viii. 2 are spoken of as those to whom the seven trumpets were given; but the incense-receiving and prayer-offering angel expressly designated as *αλλος αγγελος*, quite another.

God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and nation.”¹

Moreover, as regards the *elders*, thus much was also evident, that they represented the redeemed saints in the character of a *royal priesthood*. For in their case, the intent of the emblematic insignia,—I mean of the thrones on which they sate, the crowns on their heads, their white robes, and perhaps too of what is after noted, their incense bowls² and their harps,—was almost interpreted by the song itself, “Thou hast made us unto God *kings* and *priests* ;”³ and well accords moreover with St. Peter’s designation of the saints as βασιλειον ιερατευμα, a *royal priesthood*.⁴—Again, as to their number 24, it might be explained either, as some expositors suggest, by reference to the twelve patriarchs, the heads of the Old Testament church, and the twelve apostles of the New; or rather, as others, by reference to the heads of the twenty-four courses of the Jewish priesthood, the fit representatives of the whole priestly body.⁵

But of the *four living creatures* the explanation is more difficult; and very careful consideration is needed to solve the question at all satisfactorily.

The first step to a right understanding of the point in

¹ Dean Woodhouse explains the Apocalyptic living creatures as *angels*; observing that no objection has been made to this explanation, but their joining in the song, “Thou hast redeemed us by thy blood.” We might have thought that that one objection would have sufficed to convince him of its untenableness.

Ignatius seems to have had an opinion, (according to Archbishop Wake’s reading of the passage,) that the death of Christ was influential in the salvation of angels. See Ignatius’s Epist. to Smyrna, ch. 6. So that *he* might consistently have entertained the interpretation. But the Dean evidently had no such opinion; and it is, I believe, altogether without warrant of Scripture.—Besides which the living creatures speak, in common with the presbyters, of being redeemed *out of every nation and tongue*.

² Apoc. v. 8; εχοντες φιαλας χρυσας γεμουσας θυμιαματων, αι εισιν αι προσευχαι των αγιων: the αι taking its gender from the substantive following, not that preceding. A construction this not infrequent. So Mark xii. 42, λεπτα δυο ο εστι κοδραντης; also Gal. iii. 16, Eph. i. 14, &c.

I have rendered φιαλας *bowls*, rather than *vials*, as the Hebrew word corresponding with φιαλη in the Septuagint is often rendered in our English version; e. g. Numb. vii. 13, 19, 25, &c. “Evidently,” says Prof. M. Stuart in loc., “a vessel *with a broad mouth or opening* is designated; to which species of vessel our word vial as now employed does not at all correspond: for the incense is to be burned in it for the sake of diffusing over the place the sweet odour which it would yield.” As Doddridge and Lowman observe, it was a kind of *censer*.

³ Ib. verse 10.

⁴ 1 Peter ii. 5, 9.

⁵ So Rosenmuller, M. Stuart, &c. See 1 Chron. xxiv. 3—19, on the 24 courses of priests; each of which had its head. These 24 heads seem meant in Jer. xix. 1, where they are called “the *ancients of the priests*,” contradistinctively to “the *ancients of the people*.” So A. Clarke ad loc. In Ezek. viii. 16 and xi. 1, the 25 apostate priests spoken of seem to have been these 24 and the high priest. So M. Stuart.

question is obviously a reference to the very parallel vision in Ezekiel.¹ In that, too, Jehovah appeared enthroned in a fiery cloud; though not at rest, as here, but *chariot-like* in motion: and with *four living creatures*, as supporters of the throne or chariot, which in almost every point resembled the four in the Apocalyptic vision. Their faces were similarly like those of a lion, an ox, a man, an eagle; they were similarly winged, and similarly full of eyes in their whole body: moreover, emerging, as they were first seen, "out of the midst" of the cloud of enthronization, they might similarly seem to have been *within* the throne, as well as round about it.² Now of these we are expressly told by Ezekiel (x. 20) that "he knew them to be *the cherubim*." To understand his meaning of which word, and the class of beings intended, we must refer to the earlier notices of cherubim in Scripture. And first there is that memorable record of them in the book of Genesis; wherein they are described as having been placed by God at the east end of the garden of Eden; and, with flaming swords that turned every way, keeping the way of the tree of life.³ In which passage the meaning of the word seems unequivocal. They were evidently *angelic beings*.—The next notice that occurs of cherubim is in Moses' description of the sanctuary figurings;⁴ which, being figurings ordered by God Himself, were necessarily a true, though symbolic, expression of heavenly realities. In these the same angelic order seemed still intended. And I cannot but just pause to remark, that whereas the first recorded employment of cherubim was, as we have seen, for the expulsion of guilty man from paradise, and guarding against his return to the source of life, the next was that, as *here* represented, of bending in admiration over the mercy-seat, whereby man had a way of access to the source of life again opened to him:—"which things," says St. Peter, in evident allusion to the cherubim in the sanctuary, "the angels desire, bending over, to look into."⁵—In Ezekiel's own vision there is

¹ Ezek. i. and x.

² Ezek. i. 5, 10, x. 12.

³ Gen. iii. 24.

⁴ Exod. xxv. 18—20.

⁵ 1 Peter i. 12, *εις ἃ επιθυμουσιν ἄγγελοι παρακνῦσαι*. The same word is used in Luke, ch. xxiv. 12, of Peter stooping over to look into the sepulchre; *παρακνῦσας βλέπει τα ὑθονια*.—On the posture of the cherubim over the ark, see Exod. xxv. 20.

yet another evidence of the angelic nature of the cherubim. For they were in part like unto *burning lamps of fire*: a symbol the same as that applied by St. Paul to angels; ("Of the angels He saith, He maketh his angels spirits, his ministers *a flame of fire*;"¹) and which serves also, I may add, to identify them with the *seraphim*, or *burning ones*, seen beside the throne by Isaiah.²

Thus the nature of the four ζῶα of *Ezekiel* was evidently angelical.³ And what their then employments and functions? They were represented to the prophet as supporting the throne of Jehovah, attending His presence, like as the chief ministers of state might attend that of an eastern monarch, carrying out their glances of intuition on every side into the dominions of their Lord, listening reverentially for his commands, and going and returning on them like a flash of lightning: in short, as the angelical intelligences admitted nearest to his own presence and counsels, and most confidentially employed by Him in His present providential government of the world.—The wheels of the throne that they supported, intersected each other like the great circles of a mundane sphere. These they appeared to direct, animate, and move. For "the spirit of the four living creatures was in the wheels: whithersoever the Spirit was to go, they went."⁴ As to the intent of the mysterious faces assigned them, of a lion, an ox, a man, an eagle, respectively, though all with human hands and likeness,⁵ we can but conjecture. Royal thrones were framed sometimes with carved inanimate supporters in these animal forms:⁶ and possibly there might be a certain reference to

¹ Heb. i. 7.

² Isa. vi. 2, 3. Their place (the reader must observe) was *beside* the throne, not *above* it, so as our translation renders the Hebrew word. See Lowth ad loc. Prof. Lee, p. 414, translates it *over against*.

³ This seems to me so clear with reference to the cherubim of the Old Testament that I am surprised that Fairbairn in his *Typology*, after Bahr, and Dr. Wilson, in the *Addenda* at the end of his "Bible Student's Guide," after Fairbairn, should have explained them as symbols of "redeemed and glorified manhood."

⁴ "The appearance of the *wheels* . . . was like unto the colour of a beryl (sky-blue mixed with green, says Lowth): . . . and their appearance and their work was, as it were, a wheel in the middle of a wheel; . . . and their rings were full of eyes; . . . and when the living creatures went, the wheels went by them. . . . Whithersoever the Spirit was to go, they went; . . . for the spirit of the living creatures was in the wheels." Ezek. i. 16, &c.

⁵ Ezek. i. 5, 8.

⁶ So in the account of Solomon's throne, 1 Kings x. 18, 19; "The king made a

this custom in the figuration.¹—Whether or not the qualities of courage, patience, intelligence, and heavenly soaring in the cherubim might, as some expound the similitudes,² have been further indicated thereby,—or whether they may have been meant to intimate how these angelical attendants on the divine behests, “themselves instinct with spirit,” acted in and upon the animate, as well as inanimate creatures of God, so as to overrule them all in subservience to the designs of His providence, (a view which some others have appeared to entertain,)³ seem to me questions beyond our solution. Nor is the Rabbinical tradition that the animals, whose likenesses severally the cherubim bore, were the devices on the four grand standards of Israel, (a tradition on which yet another view of the Apocalyptic figure has been founded,)⁴ at all more to be depended on.⁵ All these ideas, I say, must be regarded as uncertain.⁶

great throne of ivory, and overlaid it with the best gold. The throne had six steps; and the top of the throne was round behind: and there were stays on either side on the place of the seat; and two lions stood beside the stays; and twelve lions stood on the one side and on the other, upon the six steps.”

¹ “The whole imagery is to be conceived of thus: The throne on which the Divine Majesty is seated rests upon four living creatures who form its animated and moving basis. Instead of being like the throne of earthly kings, i. e. resting on inanimate and lifeless substances, its support is constituted of living, moving, rational creatures, ever watchful, and ever ready to move, as Ezekiel says, like a flash of lightning.” So M. Stuart, Apoc. Comment. ii. 113.—In Ps. lxxx. 1 Hengstenberg translates, “Thou that sittest enthroned upon the Cherubim;” in reference to these cherubim. If *between*, the reference must be to the two on the mercy-seat.

² So Mr. Scott, &c.

³ Perhaps Novatian, or rather Novatus, quoted below, had some such idea.

⁴ So Sir I. Newton, on the Apocalypse, and others.

⁵ On the uncertainty, improbability, and late origin of this Jewish tradition, see the Note on Numb. ii. 2, in Bishop Patrick.

⁶ Let me add, in further illustration of this difficult subject, the paraphrastic comments of a learned Latin Father of the middle of the third century, and of a still more learned English poet of the seventeenth.

First of *Novatus*, De Trinitate, c. 8; ap. Opera Tertulliani, (Venice, 1701,) pp. 433, 434: a work which Jerome speaks of as a kind of epitome of a work of Tertullian; and which is on this account, I suppose, appended to Tertullian’s works in the Venetian Edition. See Lardner, iii. 79, &c.

“Pertingit ejus [sc. Dei] ad usque singula quæque cura, cujus ad totum, quidquid est, pervenit Providentia. Hinc est quod et desuper *cherubim* sedet: id est præest super operum suorum varietatem; subjectis throno ejus *animalibus* præ cæteris principatum tenentibus: cuncta desuper *chrysallo* contegente; id est cælo omnia operiente. Quod in firmamentum de aquarum fluente materiâ fuerat Deo jubente solidatum; ut glacies robusta aquarum terram pridem contegentium dividens medietatem; dorso quodam pondera aquæ superioris, corroboratis de gelu viribus, sustineret. Nam et *rotæ* subjacent; tempora scilicet, quibus omnia semper mundi membra volvuntur: talibus pedibus adjectis quibus non in perpetuum stant ista, sed transeunt. Sed et per omnes ortus [qu. orbes?] stellatæ sunt *oculis*: Dei enim opera

But from what seems certain respecting Ezekiel's four living creatures, or cherubim, the natural and almost necessary inference respecting the four that appeared to St. John is surely this, that as in their form and position they resembled Ezekiel's cherubim, so in their nature and functions they must have resembled them also; and thus have symbolized beings of angelic nature, appointed, in that character, to ministrations near and confidential in the conduct of the Lord's providential government. The only question is, how this could consist with what has been before noticed,—their joining as *Christ's redeemed ones* in the song of redemption: in other words, how the redeemed of the children of men could with propriety be symbolized as in *angels'* places, and with *angels'* employments. A question undoubtedly difficult. And yet, if I mistake not, there is that in holy Scripture which will furnish a probable solution of the difficulty, and show how the whole may consist together.

For let it be remembered that this was one of Christ's declarations respecting the state of the saints after the resurrection on his second coming, that they should be then *ισαγγελοι*,¹ *equal and like to angels*; similarly near therefore, we may suppose, to the divine throne, and employed in similar ministrations. A declaration illustrated, as it seems to me, by the apostle's statement,² that *the world to come* is not to be put in subjection to angelic government: but to Jesus the God-man; and, conjointly with him, to the saints, his assessors on the throne.³ Now it is to this

pervigili obtutu contemplanda sunt. In quorum sinu carbonum medius est *ignis*: sive quoniam ad igneum diem judicii mundus iste festinat; sive quoniam omnia opera Dei ignea, nec sunt tenebrosa, sed vigent. . . . Hic est igitur *currus Dei*, secundum David." (sc. Psalm lxxviii. 17.)

Secondly, *Milton*, P. L. vi. 749.

———— forth rushed, with whirlwind sound,
The chariot of Paternal Deity,
Flashing thick flames; wheel within wheel undrawn,
Itself instinct with spirit; but convoyed
By four cherubic shapes: four faces each
Had wondrous: as with stars, their bodies all,
And wings, were set with eyes; with eyes the wheels
Of beryl, and careering fires between,
Over their heads a crystal firmament, &c. (See p. 84.)

¹ Luke xx. 35, 36, "They which shall . . . obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, . . . are *ισαγγελοι*, equal to the angels." ² Heb. ii. 5.

³ So 2 Tim. ii. 12, "If we suffer, we shall also reign with him;" Matt. xix. 28,

their resurrection-state, that is, to their state after Christ's coming and taking the kingdom, that the *elders'* insignia of crowns and priestly white robes would seem to have had reference; according to the usual reading of the passage, with the verb in the *future* tense, βασιλευσομεν, "Thou hast made us to our God kings and priests, and we *shall* reign on the earth."¹ In which case it is surely not unreasonable to suppose that the appearance and the position of the four living creatures, those other representatives of the redeemed, may have been intended to symbolize the *angelic*, as well as royal and priestly functions, (indeed the angelic might be deemed the highest of the royal functions,) which, in that *world to come*, the redeemed were destined to fulfil.—Or, if we read βασιλευουσιν in the *present* tense,² then a present sense may be ascribed to the Apocalyptic picturing of redeemed ones as cherubim-upholders of the divine throne, by reference to Christ's assumption *even now* to a full part in God's government of the world; as He said, "All power is given unto me in heaven and on earth:" a power exercised, as it is intimated by St. Paul, for "his body's sake, the Church." Indeed in any case this holds true. For even in trial true Christians are more than conquerors; and all things are made to work together for their good.³

"Ye which have followed me shall, in the regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory, sit also on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel;" and Luke xxii. 30.—Compare Luke xii. 44, 1 Cor. iv. 8, &c.

¹ Compare Rev. xx. 4, 6, where the saints were seen to take the kingdom.

So *Victorinus* ad loc. "Viginti quatuor patres et apostolos judicare populum suum oportet;" citing Matt. xix. 28, just quoted by me, and so fixing his meaning to the saints' *future* reign.—So too the yet earlier Father *Clement of Alexandria*. In his *Strom. Lib. vi*, he says; "Such an one, though here *on earth* he be not honoured with the first seat, *shall* sit upon the twenty-four thrones, judging the people, as John says in the Revelation." In which passage *he* also evidently refers to Matt. xix. 28, as Lardner observes, ii. 245; and construes the symbols of the twenty-four Apocalyptic Presbyters, as *anticipative* of a reign in the *world to come*.

² Griesbach here reads βασιλευουσιν, in the 3rd person plural, instead of the received βασιλευσομεν; and so too Scholz, Tittman, M. Stuart, &c. The *sense* remains the same.

³ This is the reading preferred by Tregelles.

In the clause preceding, in the same verse 10, *αυτες* is read by all the critical editors instead of *ημας*, "Thou hast made *them* kings, &c.:" the reference in this case being, as M. Stuart says, (ii. 133,) to the elect out of the tribes and nations. Thus reading, the interchange of the *ημας*, ver. 9, and *αυτες*, verse 10, will mark the union and communion of the saints below and saints above. The received *ημας* is more simple; the sense in either case substantially the same.

³ Matt. xxviii. 18, Eph. i. 20—23, Rom. viii. 28, 37.

Thus, and in this manner, I conclude that the twenty-four elders, and four living creatures of the Apocalyptic vision, symbolized the church of the redeemed ones.—And whereas there are two grand divisions of that church, the larger one that *of the departed in Paradise*, the other that *militant on earth*, it seems that it is specially the *former* that we must suppose figured here. Such I conceive to be the inference from the position of the elders and living creatures in the inner Temple, the place of the manifested presence of God. Besides which, there appears in their garb and their demeanour nothing either of that sense of defilement, or fear and awe, which generally characterized God's saints and servants, when admitted, while still in their mortal state, to the sight of God; so, for example, as in the cases of Isaiah, of Daniel, of the High Priest Joshua, and of St. John himself.¹ Nor again was there any change from their garb of triumph to one of mourning; as the figurations proceeded, and the trials and persecutions of the church on earth were the subject depicted.—Hence, on the whole, they must, I think, be regarded as symbolic representatives specially of the church in Paradise, or spirits of just men made perfect.² Yet ~~not so but as~~, in a certain sense, to signify the feelings and the desires of the church militant on earth likewise: forasmuch as *in heart* the latter also dwells above where Christ is;³ and, in respect of all that concerns the advancement of his kingdom and glory, is with the former in desire and sympathy even as one. Whence perhaps, on occasion of the Apocalyptic Book being opened, the circumstance of the twenty-four elders being depicted with harps and incense-bowls, expressing *generally* the prayers and gratitude of the saints.⁴

The *future* view of the elders and cherubim, first suggested, receives illustration from what our Lord said in parable respecting himself, when referring to the interval

¹ Isa. vi. 5, Dan. x. 8, Zech. iii. 3, Apoc. i. 17.

² So Rosenmuller. "Videntur 24 presbyteri esse imago optimorum et præstantissimorum civium regni cælestis, qui *olim* in his terris virtute et meritis enituerunt."

³ Col. iii. 3.

⁴ Apoc. v. 8. M. Stuart, after Vitringa and Ewald, explains the incense-bowls of the prayers of the twenty-four presbyter-saints themselves, only; just as the *harps* of their own feelings of gratitude and adoration.

between his ascending to the Father, and his coming again at the second advent. "A certain nobleman went into a far country, to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return."¹ In which words he alluded to a custom, prevalent in those times, of subordinate kings going to Rome to receive the investiture to their kingdoms from the Roman emperor, and then returning to occupy them and reign; intimating thereby that he was about to receive from the Father, after his ascension, the *investiture* to his kingdom; but with the intention not to *occupy* it till his return at the second coming. Indeed it seems to be in token of this investiture that, in the vision before us, he takes his seat as the Lamb on the divine throne.² Just similarly, the twenty-four elders and the four living creatures, representing specially that part of the church which has past from earth to paradise, might appear with their insignia of *investiture* to the high offices destined them in Christ's coming kingdom: the same of which, in their militancy on earth, they had received the *promise*; and of which the actual *enjoyment*, as we have seen, was yet to come.

Such was a part of the company gathered on this august occasion. Besides which, as we read presently afterwards, there were *Angels* attendant, in numbers without number.—It was indeed a glorious gathering, albeit only in symbol, of no little part of the magnificent assemblage told of by St. Paul to the Hebrew Christians. There was the germ of the general assembly of the church of the firstborn, whose names were written in heaven; there were the spirits of just men made perfect; there was an innumerable company of Angels: all in presence of God the judge of all; and presently after, as the Evangelist proceeds to tell us, of Christ the Lamb of God. For as they waited, all attent and eager, we may be sure, for the promised revelation, the question arose, where and who the Revealer that was to open it to them? There was a book in the right hand of Him that sat upon the throne, in which they knew it was written. But the book was closed and sealed. And

¹ Luke xix. 12.

² See Note⁴ p. 95.

when an Angel,—a *strong* Angel, as he is somewhat singularly called,¹—made proclamation if there was any one *worthy* to open it, not an individual could there be found of merit sufficient, among angels or men, in heaven or on earth. Yet one there was who was indeed worthy, of a higher nature. As the Evangelist, not merely from personal feeling, but as the *representative* also of the Christian earthly church and ministry,² (I must beg the reader to mark thus early this his representative character on the scene,) was weeping at the disappointment of his hopes, one of the elders bade him “weep not.” And he therewith pointed to him a lamb standing in the hemicycle of the throne, and of the four living creatures, and the elders: one that bore marks as if it had been slain; and yet had *seven horns*, the symbol as of *all power* in heaven and on earth, and *seven eyes*, as of the *spirit of omniscience*. It was evidently the Lamb of God, the fellow of Jehovah, that had been slain, and now appeared alive again; yea and was alive for evermore, to make intercession, and to receive gifts for his people.—Having made the promise to his disciples, ere ascending, that he would show them *the things that were to come*,³ He now came to fulfil it. Advancing to the throne, He claimed and received the book from Him that sat thereon: and forthwith, taking his seat beside Him,⁴ prepared to open the Seals, and reveal the secrets of futurity.—Then the acclamations of heaven burst

¹ Perhaps the epithet, *otherwise unmeaning*, may be meant to suggest that this was the individual angel who in other times had talked with Daniel, and bade him seal up the book of his prophecy; him whose name was Gabriel (גַּבְרִיֶּל), or, “My strength is God?”

There are but two other passages in the Apocalypse where the epithet *ισχυρος* is applied to an angel. In both of these the subject is of a nature to call for the exertion of strength. The *first* in x. 1, on occasion of a memorable intervention of the Angel of the covenant to vindicate his own rights, and deliver his church, at the time when the gates of hell seemed prevailing: the *second* with reference to the forcible overthrow of Babylon, Apoc. xviii. 21.—Such is not the case here.

The reader need scarcely to be reminded of the close connection of the prophecies of Daniel and the Apocalypse; such indeed that the statement has been made by Mede that Daniel is but the *Apocalypsis contracta*, (that is, in respect of their common subject, the history of the fourth kingdom,) and the Apocalypse *Daniel explicatus*. (Mede's Works, Bk. iv. Ep. 32.) Sir I. Newton says more generally, “He that would understand the old prophets must begin with this.” In Apoc. ch. i. ad fin.

² So, generally, the patristic Commentators ad loc. and many moderns.

³ John xvi. 13; τα ερχομενα αναγγελει υμιν.

⁴ So I infer from comparing Apoc. vii. 17, iii. 21, xxii. 1.

forth in adoration of Him. The song was begun by the living creatures and the elders : and it was responded to by the whole angelic choir, and echoed back from all creation. "When he had taken the book, the four living creatures and four-and-twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden bowls full of odours, which are the prayers of the saints. And they sung a new song, saying, 'Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth.'¹—And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many Angels round about the throne, and the living creatures, and the elders: and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands; saying with a loud voice, 'Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing.' And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, 'Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever.'² And the four living creatures said, Amen! And the four-and-twenty elders fell down, and worshipped³ [Him that liveth for ever and ever]."⁴

¹ I prefer the readings ἡμας and βασιλευσομεν, as observed before.

² This expression concerning the voice of all creation may either be *figurative*, as denoting the voice that it *appears* to have in the ears of the saints: or perhaps *pre-figurative*; like that used by St. Paul in Rom. viii. 19, 22, about the longing expectation and groaning of the creation after a better state to come.

³ Compare Phil. ii. 8—10, &c. "He humbled himself unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow; of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth, &c."

⁴ Omitted in all the best MSS.

CHAPTER IV.

THE MODE AND MANNER, PLAN AND ORDER,
OF THE REVELATION.

AND what then was to be the *mode* and *manner* of the unfolding, before the august company thus assembled, of this great revelation of the coming future? Was it to be simply, as in the case of some other revelations from God,¹ by the reading out of what was written in the Book? Not so. The subject-matter therein contained was, in a manner far more interesting, to be *visibly enacted*, even as in a living drama; and, for the requisite scenery and agency, alike heaven and earth put in requisition. Nor, again, was the beauty of dramatic *plan* and *order* to be wanting; indeed of dramatic plan and order the most perfect.—And I think that, before entering on the prefigurative visions themselves, it will be of real advantage to consider these two points preparatorily: I mean, first, *the scenic imagery* made use of in the development of the prophecy; secondly, its *plan, order, and chief divisions*, as marked in the seven-sealed book containing it. Let us then address ourselves to this in the present Chapter.

I.—THE APOCALYPTIC SCENERY.

Now of the *apocalyptic scenery*, as the reader will be aware, no detailed or connected account is given us. We have only incidental notices of it. These, however, occur perpetually; and, if carefully gathered up and compared together, will be found wonderfully to harmonize; so as indeed to indicate a scenery designedly provided for the occasion, consistent and complete. And the importance of an early and familiar acquaintance with it will hence sufficiently appear, in that it is that from which the character and meaning of many important points in the apocalyptic

¹ As in that communicated through Jeremiah, Jer. xxxvi. 2, 6, 32.

prefigurations is alone to be deduced; and that too which connects and gives unity to them as a whole.

The scene then first visible, and which remained stationary throughout the visions in the foreground, was that of the *interior*, as it were, of a *temple*; including in its secret and inmost sanctuary the throne of Jehovah already spoken of, and the blessed company attendant round it. For this did not appear in open space: but, as seems manifest in the progress of the prophetic drama, and is indeed in one place directly intimated, within the inclosure of a temple sanctuary.¹—It was a temple resembling Solomon's; or, yet more, the tabernacle framed earlier, "after the pattern shown him in the mount,"² by Moses in the wilderness; although on a grander scale, at least as regards the inner sanctuary,³ and with other marked peculiarities. The which resemblance is also expressly intimated to us. For it was called upon one occasion "the temple of God;" on another, in words only referable to the Jewish temple or tabernacle, "the temple of the tabernacle of witness, in heaven."⁴—Moreover in its parts and divisions it well corresponded with that of Israel. The temple proper, or *sanctuary*, was similarly constituted of the *holy place* and that *most holy*; save that there was no *vail*, as of old, to separate them: the one being characterized by the *golden altar of incense*, and, I think too, by the *seven burning*

¹ xvi. 17; "There came a great voice out of the temple [of heaven],* from the throne." Thus the position of the Apocalyptic throne, like as of that seen by Isaiah, (Is. vi. 1,) was fixed as within the temple: the *opening* of which, so as there described, is noticed as a *new thing* Apoc. xi. 19, xv. 5.

² Exod. xxv. 40, xxvi. 30, Heb. viii. 5.


³ Compare Heb. ix. 11.

⁴ xi. 19, xv. 5. Compare Acts vii. 44; "Our fathers had the *tabernacle of witness* in the wilderness."

The old tabernacle was first called "the tabernacle of testimony," or "of witness," in Exod. xxxviii. 21, immediately after its completion by Bezaleel. It seems to have been so called from having "the ark of the covenant" in its most holy place; into which ark Moses was directed to put "the testimony," or "two tables of testimony;" viz. those on which the ten commandments were written. See Exod. xxv. 16, 21, 22, xxxi. 18, xxxiv. 29. Hence the ark of itself is frequently afterwards called in brief "the testimony." So, by anticipation, Exod. xvi. 34; and afterwards Exod. xxvii. 21, &c. The two tables, the ark, and the tabernacle, were thus all a testimony to Jehovah's covenant with Israel, as their lawgiver and king.

As there were afterwards placed in the ark, by God's direction, a pot of manna also and Aaron's rod that budded, the ark contained thenceforth within it a testimony to Christ in his character of High Priest and Bread of Life, ("the hidden manna"), as well as in that of lawgiver to Israel.

* Probably to be omitted. So Griesbach, Tregelles, and other textual critics.



J. R. Esbans

APOCALYPTIC TEMPLE OR TABERNACLE, WITH ITS ALTAR-COURT AND COURT OF THE GENTILES:
MOUNT ZION ADJACENT, AND LANDSCAPE OF WORLD BENEATH.

See Apoc. VIII 7 and Apoc. XI. 1 &c.

lamps; ¹ the other by the *divine glory*, and the *ark of the covenant*.² Moreover a *court* appeared attached to this sanctuary, just as to the Jewish, and one similarly marked by an *altar of sacrifice* standing in it: ³ besides that there was the similar appendage of an *outer court* also, as if of the *Gentiles*.⁴

As the visions proceeded, other objects appeared in connected landscape, around and beneath the temple. Nearest was seen the Mount Zion and its holy city: ⁵ not the literal Jerusalem, which had been levelled to the ground, and was now literally in bondage with her children; ⁶ but that which, though in some things different, sufficiently resembled it to have the likeness at once recognised, and to receive the appellation:—then, beneath and beyond, far stretching, (even as it might have appeared from that high mountain, whence were seen in a moment of time the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them,⁷) the miniature but living landscape of the Roman Empire.—Both the

¹ See my observations on “the seven burning lamps,” p. 85 *suprà*. Since the “altar of incense” is spoken of Apoc. viii. 3, ix. 13, as “before the throne,” the local station “before the throne,” which is assigned in Apoc. iv. 5 to the seven lamps, does not negative the idea of its position in the holy place. Compare Exod. xxvii. 21, where the seven-branched candlestick is spoken of as “before the testimony;” which is equivalent to “before the Lord.”

² iv. 5, viii. 3, ix. 13, xi. 19.—The absence of a *vail* between the *holy place* and that *most holy* appears from this, that what passed in the one, as well as the other, was alike visible to St. John: whose station, from its commanding the view both without the sanctuary and within it, we may not improbably suppose to have been near its entrance door. This difference might perhaps have been expected in a temple symbolic of the Christian church; the vail having been rent at Christ's death, and the way made open into the holiest. Compare Matt. xxvii. 51, with the apostle's exposition, Heb. ix. 8, x. 19, 20: also Bishop Lowth's remarks on Isaiah's vision of Jehovah enthroned in the temple, Is. vi; where the Bishop similarly supposes the vail to have been taken away, because of the vision figuring the times of Christ's kingdom.

³ The first notice of the *altar* is under the fifth seal, vi. 9; “I saw under the altar the souls,” &c.—It is to be observed that wherever in the New Testament the word *altar* (*θυσιαστηριον*) occurs alone, the *brazen altar of sacrifice* will be found to have been intended by it. So Matt. xxiii. 19, 35; Luke xi. 51; 1 Cor. ix. 13; Heb. xiii. 10; Apoc. vi. 9, viii. 3, 5, xvi. 7. I might add Apoc. xi. 1, xiv. 18: only here the *altar-court*, as well as *altar*, would seem to be included. (See on this my Paper vii. in the Appendix to Vol. ii.)—Where the *altar of incense* is meant, it is expressly so designated. So Luke i. 11; “The angel of the Lord appeared unto Zacharias standing on the right of the *altar of incense* ;” and Apoc. viii. 3, ix. 13: “the *golden altar* before the throne.”

⁴ The *outer court* is noticed, xi. 1.

⁵ Apoc. xiv. 1, xi. 2.

⁶ Gal. iv. 25.

⁷ Matt. iv. 8. On which supernaturally extended view Milton observes in his *Paradise Regained*, iv. 40;

By what strange parallax, or optic skill
Of vision multiplied through air, or glass
Of telescope, were curious to inquire.

Mount Zion and the temple seem to have appeared high raised above the earth, although not altogether detached from it; and the former, as well as latter, in near proximity to the heavenly glory within the sanctuary. So that while, on the one hand, the throne, which was in the innermost temple of vision, was said to be placed in heaven, and the temple was called "the temple of the tabernacle of witness *in heaven*," (a temple of which the altar-court was the local scene evidently of the worship of the citizens of the holy city and Mount Zion,)—yet, on the other, the outer court of the temple appeared accessible to the inhabitants of the earth below, and the holy city susceptible of invasion from them.¹

Such was the standing scenery throughout the Apocalyptic visions. Nor was it depicted before St. John as a mere ornamental appendage; but was to be made use of, as I have already intimated, both *emblematically* and *chorographically*,—to furnish figures and to designate localities,—just as the scenery of countries elsewhere prophesied of, with a view to the elucidation of the prophecy.

It is to be remembered that the subject of the promised revelation was large and complex,—“the things which should happen thereafter.” It was to be the same, in effect, as that which in its retrospective delineation constitutes the combined secular and ecclesiastical history of Christendom:—the former, or *secular*, comprehending the grand political changes and revolutions of the Roman world, with the agencies instrumental in causing them, whether from without or from within: the latter, or *ecclesiastical*, the outward fortunes, adverse or prosperous, of the Church; its purity or corruptions of doctrine and worship, its general apostasy

¹ Apoc. iv. 2, xi. 19, xv. 5; also xiv. 1, 2, and xi. 1, 2.

In xi. 19, xv. 5, we may perhaps prefer to connect the heaven spoken of with the verb “was opened,” thus;—“the temple of the tabernacle of witness was opened in heaven:” but iv. 2, the first passage cited, is decisive on the point that I am illustrating. Compare the connexion of the heavenly glory (which appeared enthroned at first in the sanctuary of vision, then removing from it) with the earth in Ezekiel x.

There was pictured also in the apocalyptic scenery the atmospheric and the starry heaven, as well as that of the divine presence; and good use was made of these for the illustration of the prophecy, as we shall presently find. (See p. 103 *infra*.) Indeed here and there some care is needed to distinguish clearly which is the heaven meant. Generally, however, this is sufficiently manifest from the context.

in the course of time, the coalescing of the apostatizing church with the world, and the separation, sufferings, faith, protection, and ultimate triumph of the saints, that is of the true people, the spiritual church of God.

Such being the subject, so large, various, and complex,—and the more complex from the events of its two great divisions, the secular and the ecclesiastical, often intermingling,—the difficulty must be obvious of fitly exhibiting it; especially in respect of marking the due connexion of events, and with the proper unity of effect. It is a difficulty that has been frequently felt and noticed by those who have delineated it in history; and must apply of course in full measure to its foreshowing in prophecy. Which being the case, it is really most interesting to observe how suited the provision of the apocalyptic scenery was to lessen, if not to overcome it.

In the first place, to represent CHRIST'S CHURCH in respect of its *worshipping*, (that Church which is "the house of the living God,"¹) there was the symbolic *temple*:—its inmost or *most holy place* including, as the fit locality, that part of the church-constituency, the spirits of the just, which was then with Christ *in heaven*,² and of which I have in the preceding chapter already spoken: its outer sanctuary, or *holy place*, (the vestibule and passage to the former,) figuring, by what might be noticeable within it, the *secret* spirituality of the worship, as observed and cherished by Christ, the high priest, of his saints *on earth*; (a point beautifully illustrated in the primary Apocalyptic vision;³) and the *temple-court*, and what past therein, what was *publicly observable* in their public and corporate worship.⁴—Further, to symbolize their peculiar

The same variety of meaning in the use of the word *heaven* occurs often elsewhere. So e. g. Matt. vi. 9, 26. In 2 Cor. xii. 2 Paul speaks of the heaven of God's presence as the *third* heaven. In the Jewish and the Apocalyptic inner sanctuary the manifestation of this presence, and the heavenly adjuncts attending it, marked its connexion with the church below.

¹ 1 Tim. iii. 15. Compare Eph. ii. 21.—The symbol is often adopted by the Fathers. So Clemens Alex. Strom. vii; (given by Suicer on *Naos*;) *Naos δε εστιν, ο μιν μεγας, ως η εκκλησια κ. τ. λ.* Lactantius, M. P. 2, in Apocalyptic figure calls it in one place "the heavenly temple;" "tyrannus [sc. Nero] prosilivit ad ex-scindendum *cæleste templum*:" and again, in e. 15, says of its constituency, "*verum Dei templum quod est in hominibus.*" ² Compare Heb. ix. 24, Phil. i. 23.

³ Apoc. i—iii. See ch. ii of this Introduction, on "The things which are."

⁴ So Bishop Hall in his Contemplation on Zachary in Luke i. 9; "The *outer Tem-*

polity and *citizenship*, there appeared the *holy city and Mount Zion*; as if in visible picturing of St. Paul's ideal metropolitan city of the Christian body,¹ with its base on earth, its mountain-top towards heaven:—a symbol of the saints, in truth, as significant as it was beautiful: forasmuch as they are members of a city and kingdom different from those of this world;² while *in* the world being not of the world,³ but having their citizenship, ~~their~~ *πολιτευμα*, in heaven.⁴—Besides all which, in order the better to signify events, views, or changes of importance, affecting or characterizing at any time *the true apostolic line of the Christian ministry*, there was the further and very remarkable help of the Apostle John's own presence on the scene, in his *representative* character; (for such I doubt not will

ple was the figure of the whole Church upon *earth*; like as the Holy of Holies represented *heaven*." An idea adopted and applied in one of our well-known hymns; "The holy to the holiest leads."

¹ Heb. xii. 22; "Ye are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God," &c.

² It should be remembered that *heavenly* is a word often used of things on earth, which have a heavenly origin, association, or ending. So in Heb. viii. 5, St. Paul speaks of the things in the Jewish temple as a "shadow of *heavenly* things;" meaning thereby things spiritual in the Christian church. And so too Christ's *kingdom of heaven*, spoken of in the Gospels, embraces the saints on earth. Similarly what is called "the heavenly Jerusalem," or, "the Jerusalem above," (Heb. xii. 22, Gal. iv. 26,) in either case an ideal city, embraces them also. Thus it was used by St. Paul as a type of the whole Christian church,—militant as well as triumphant; and seems in that sense to have been visibly represented to St. John.—In Gal. iv. 26, St. Paul contrasts Mount Zion, or the Jerusalem above, as the type of the Christian church, with Mount Sinai, as the type of the Jewish. On which passage Macknight, in his Paraphrase, observes: "The catholic church, consisting of believers of all nations, which is formed on the covenant published from Mount Zion, St. Paul calls *the Jerusalem above*, because its most perfect state will be in heaven." And Whitby on Heb. xii. 22; "It is styled the *heavenly* Jerusalem: not that heaven is primarily intended by it, and not the *church of Christ on earth*: but *propter originem et finem*; as having its rise from heaven, and as leading to it."

³ John xvii. 14.

⁴ Phil. iii. 20, Ἦμων το πολιτευμα εν ουρανῳ ὑπαρχει.—Compare Augustine's well-known similar view of the saints as the *Civitas Dei*, "civitas sancta, civitas fidelis," which, "in terris peregrina, in cœlo fundata est." (Sermon cv. 9, on Luke xi. 5—13.) Also the beautiful view of them given in the Epistle to Diognetus, by an author, Justin Martyr's contemporary:—"Christians are not separated from others by country, by language, or by customs. They are confined to no particular cities, use no particularity of speech, adopt no singularity of life. Dwelling in the cities, as every man's lot is cast, following the customs of each country in respect of dress, diet, and manner of life, and, like other men, marrying and having children, they yet display the wonderful nature of their *peculiar polity*. They dwell in their own country but as sojourners: they abide on earth, but they are citizens of heaven. In a word, they are in the world what the soul is in the body. The soul is diffused through all the members of the body, and Christians through the cities of the world. But the soul, though dwelling in the body, is not of the body; and Christians dwell in the world, but are not of the world."

be found to have attached to him;) himself to take part in the sacred drama, and enact as a living actor the roll assigned him.¹

In contrast with all which, and to represent the WORLD as distinguished from the *saints*, there was the terrene landscape of the *Apocalyptic* or *Roman earth*,² and its *great city*; the earth being the fit emblem of those who, in heart, only dwelt on earth.³ In the event, which was soon to take place, of its inhabitants nationally abandoning Paganism, and professing Christianity, the symbol of the Gentile or outer court of the Temple was at hand, as joined on to that of Israel, to represent their profession as proselytes;—as excluded therefrom, to mark their complete and recognised apostasy.⁴—In the firmamental heaven which overlooked the terrene landscape, and its sun, moon, and stars, there was that which might fitly designate, as in other prophecies, the secular powers of the world; whether in the lustre of supremacy, or as eclipsed and cast down.⁵ There was in the movement of atmospheric storms, the overflowing of rivers, and other such changes, visibly passing from without upon the landscape, the ready symbol of foreign invasions; and again in its earthquakes, that of political commotions and revolutions from within.⁶—Further, as there seems to have been a *chorographical* truth in the general landscape, and the four quarters of the Roman earth (with its inland sea, frontier rivers, and other notable localities) to have been designated,⁷ there was a scenic facility of not merely symbolizing invasions, or other such events occurrent, but of visibly marking the particular localities originating or affected by them, if in any case deemed requisite.

¹ So especially in Apoc. vii, x, and the beginning of xi; where the point will be more fully discussed.

² See the proof of this identity Note ¹ p. 121 infra.

³ So Apoc. xiii. 12, "The earth and they that dwell in it," in the sense of "the earth, or they that dwell on it;" the one including and symbolizing the other. Just as xii. 12, "The heavens, and they that dwell therein;" and xi. 1, "The altar, and they who worship therein." The figure is not infrequent.—The frequent Scriptural use of the phrase "inhabitants of the earth" as a symbol of the men of this world is noticed by Jerom ad Dardanum, exemplifying from Apoc. viii. 13.

⁴ Apoc. xi. 2.

⁵ Apoc. vi. 12—14, viii. 12, &c.

⁶ Apoc. viii. 7—9; and vi. 12, xi. 13, 19, &c.

⁷ Compare Apoc. vii. 1, ix. 14, viii. 7, 8, &c.

Besides all which it must be remembered that there was the opportunity of superadding, from time to time, supplemental hieroglyphic signs or symbols, such as in chaps. xii, xiii, for example; symbols associated for the most part with the scenic landscape: and, finally, that the connexion of the histories of the world and of the church,—the intermingling of events secular and ecclesiastical,—might be easily and at once made manifest to the eye in the Apocalyptic imagery; as its glances were directed from Mount Zion, or the temple, and what passed therein, to the earth below; from the earth to the temple and Mount Zion.

II. Next as to THE PLAN AND ORDER OF THE REVELATION.

It is evident that *plan* and *order* must have been essential to the distinctness of so extended a prophecy. And while, no doubt, one object of representing the events of the coming future as written in the Book in the right hand of the enthroned One, was to mark them as all preordained in his eternal counsels, yet the chief object of their being there written must have been, I think, that of signifying what it is now our purpose to consider,—the plan, order, and grand divisions of the prophecy.

The form of the Book seems to have been that of a *roll*. Such was the common form of books among the Romans; and the almost universal one, I believe, at least of sacred books, among the Jews.¹ The divisions externally and at once apparent on it were twofold. *First*, the Book appeared as one *written within and without*; *secondly*, as one sealed with *seven seals*: the seals being all visible on the outside; and so arranged as that they could be only opened in succession.²—Further, after the seventh seal had

¹ This presumed form of the Apocalyptic book, as a *scroll*, is well illustrated by the comparison in Apoc. vi. 14; where it is said that the heaven passed away from the Evangelist's view "as a book ($\beta\iota\beta\lambda\iota\omicron\nu$) rolled up."—The same form is noticed in Jer. xxxvi. 2, "Take thee a *roll* of a book." And we may compare also Ezek. ii. 9, 10, Zech. v. 2.

² A construction of this kind would be very simple. It is easily conceivable how, in folding a parchment-scroll, we might at any particular point seal the lower part of a projecting slip of the parchment (like those of the Seals that project in the Apocalyptic Chart which follows this Introduction) to the part of the scroll previously folded: in which case, ere the unfolding began, one and all of the Seals would appear

been opened, intimation was given of other divisions. There appeared seven angels with *seven trumpets*; which trumpets were successively sounded, and symbolic visions connected with them, successively exhibited: each, I conceive, like the visions of the *seals* before them, with its counterpart either written or painted, (for the word ~~γεγραμμενον~~ will admit of either meaning,) in the columns of the seven-sealed Book.¹—Finally, on the seventh trumpet's sounding, and after a *retrospective digression* somewhat long and varied, *seven vials* were poured out, each having its subject described in the Book also; the last reaching to the close of the present dispensation, and the triumph and glorious reign of Christ and his saints.

Thus the question arises, what might be the nature and relation of these several divisions? What of the *writing within and without*? What of the *seals, trumpets, and vials*?

And as regards that primary mark of division, its being *written within and without*, does it not seem natural to suppose that, according to the forms of writing then customary, what was *without* might be probably intended as a part *supplemental* of that *within*:—supplemental, not accidentally, or as occasioned by an unexpected and overflowing redundancy of matter, so as was often the case in the rolls of human writing; but purposely and with premeditated design: perhaps so in fact as to answer to, and comprehend, the very retrospective explanatory *digression* after the seventh trumpet just spoken of? Such, I think, it will prove.²—Again, as to the relative chronological position of

on the outside; and in the unfolding, as each successive Seal was broken, the scroll only unfold to the point where the next occurred.

¹ Compare Jer. xxxvi. 23; "When Jehudi had read three or four *leaves* [of the roll], he cut it with a penknife." On which Lowth observes that these were *columns, or partitions*, into which the breadth of the parchment was divided." Just such *columns, or partitions*, I conceive to have been in the seven-sealed Apocalyptic scroll.

As regards both this *columnar* division of the scroll, and also what I have suggested from the word *γεγραμμενον*, as to the possible union of *painting* with *writing* in it, a beautiful illustration exists in the celebrated manuscript of the Book of Joshua, in the Vatican Library. This parchment-scroll, which is thirty-two feet long, is said to be a Greek manuscript of the 7th century; and represents the history given in the Book of Joshua in a series of columnar miniature illuminated paintings, with short descriptive words or sentences superadded. So too some of the Egyptian hieroglyphic MSS in the British Museum.

² See on this view of the subject-matter of the Apocalyptic *opisthographism* the beginning of my Part IV, Chap. i: also my Chart, which depicts it at once to the eye.

the Apocalyptic *seals*, *trumpets*, and *vials*, would not the most natural arrangement of them seem to be that which supposes each of the latter series of sevens to be consecutive on the former: the seventh seal comprehending within it the seven trumpets, and the seventh trumpet the seven vials; the trumpets carrying on the history chronologically from the end of the sixth seal, and the vials from the end of the sixth trumpet? Such, in fact, appears to myself the self-commending simplicity of this view of the Apocalyptic structure, that I think to the mind of the Evangelist it must almost at once have suggested itself; and almost at once carried its own evidence of truth along with it.¹

Besides which divisions there were noted from time to time important *chronological periods*, in the development of the prophecy; periods most useful, especially in the case of the great *supplemental digression* just spoken of, to fix the order and connexion of certain of its constituent parts:—the most notable of these periods being that of the *time, times, and half a time*, or *1260 days*: as one whereby not merely, it is to be well observed, was the connexion indicated between different parts of the Apocalyptic drama; but also between them and certain celebrated prophecies of Daniel, to which the same chronological and most remarkable period attached.—Thus, on the whole, was the most perfect *order* and *plan*, as well as the fittest *scenery*, provided for the due unfolding of the Apocalyptic drama.

As to the *dignity* and *grandeur* of this drama, who can express it? Its *subject* was nothing less than the prolonged conflict, even to its termination, between the antagonistic powers of Christ's true Church and the world: its *moral* that, whereas at the beginning the crown and glory of earthly dominion appeared attached to the potentates of this world, and the Church oppressed and low,—at the ending dominion and crown and glory were all seen to pass away from the men of this world, and to be transferred to the saints and Church of Christ!—And then, such a the-

¹ So Mede and most historical expositors. And let me add, as illustrative of the obviousness of this view of the Apocalyptic structure, that both Moses Stuart of the German Præterist school, and Burgh, the father of the modern English Futurist school, alike adopt it. "The seven Trumpets," says M. Stuart, ii. 150, "were most palpably mere subdivisions of the 7th Seal, and growing out of it." See too Burgh, p. 183.

atric scene! such music! such an audience! How, in the comparison, must the boasted splendour of the grandest of the imperial theatric displays, not long before exhibited in the then proud capital of the world, have seemed to St. John to fade into meanness!¹

And more especially was its pre-eminent grandeur manifest in this additional circumstance characterizing it, that the Evangelist was admitted, as it were, behind the scenes, in the figuration of the great mundane drama; and, in what passed in the secret recess of the Holy of Holies, permitted to behold Him, and his acting, who was the Almighty Overruler of all. I have already just hinted at this matter; and I must now beg for a little while to detain the reader; that he may consider with me beforehand, somewhat in detail, the grand lessons which thus, as the drama proceeded, were set before St. John.

And, *first*, there was thus manifested to him the real origin of events in the *throne* of God and of the Lamb. Hence, he saw, the lightnings, thunderings, and voices, that had their echoes in the changes of this world: hence the commissioning of angels, with their invisible and mysterious agencies!—Man is apt in these things to look only to second causes. The inner-temple vision, in the exact spirit of Bible history, directed the apostle's eye to the great first cause of them all, in the glorious high throne of the heavenly sanctuary.²

Secondly, there was thus strikingly marked out to St. John the very reasons and motives which dictated these counsels of Him that sate upon the throne, thus ordering all things. In language alike true and sublime our great philosopher depicts the divine mind as the *sensorium of the*

¹ I refer especially to the famous *Ludi Seculares*, exhibited by Domitian at Rome in the year 88, seven years before the visions in Patmos.

With direct reference to the same *Ludi Seculares*, as exhibited by the Emperor Severus A. D. 204, or somewhat above a century afterwards, Tertullian wrote his Treatise *De Spectaculis*: (see Pamelius' Preface to it;) and in it he contrasts with those imperial theatric shows the grandeur, not indeed of the *Apocalyptic prefiguration* of the great Christian drama, so as I here do, but of its actual *realization*. "Quale autem spectaculum in proximo est; adventus Domini jam indubitati, jam superbi, jam triumphantis? Quae illa exultatio angelorum! Quae gloria resurgentium sanctorum! Quale regnum exinde justorum! Qualis civitas Nova Jerusalem! &c." De Spectac. c. 30.

² Apoc. iv. 5, xiv. 15, 17, xvi. 1, &c.

*universe.*¹ And, as the Evangelist marked what was said and what was done in the inner Temple, he might see that there was nothing of all that passed on earth unobserved by the divine mind, nothing unfelt by it. Thither, he perceived, came up the memorial of the sins of its inhabitants, while immature as yet, and when fully ripe;² each with its own call for judgment: thither, in striking contrast, what concerned his own people, his saints of the church militant. Not a sigh could escape from, nor a suffering vex them, but its pulse was evidently felt *there*. Thither tended, as to their proper centre, the cries of the souls slain beneath the altar; thither, as sweet incense, the prayers and adorations of the saints.³ And then mark the result! It was on the cries of the martyrs rising up that the political heaven, the figure of the supremacy of their oppressors, was seen to pass away. It was in requital of its oppression of the saints that great Babylon was made to drink of the wine-cup of the wrath of God.⁴ And amidst all the commotions and changes, the woes and judgments on the earth, he heard declarations made by the Spirit, from time to time, and saw heaven-sent visions given, to assure his people of the provision made for their safety, and that all things should work together for their good.⁵

A *third* point notable in what passed within the Temple, —and indeed in what passed without also,—was the employment of *angelic agency* in producing the varied eventful changes in this world. Most truly, as well as beautifully, has it been said by Milton, “Millions of spiritual creatures walk the earth, unseen, both when we sleep and when we wake.” He has said it truly, because it is precisely according to the uniform representations of Holy Scripture. When the firstborn in Egypt, or the army of the Assyrians was to be slain, it was by the agency of a destroying angel. When Elisha or Peter was to be delivered, it was still, as represented in Scripture, by angelic instrumentality. Under the present dispensation, we are told, they are employed as ministering spirits to the good, destroying spirits to the

¹ Sir I. Newton, *Principia*, ad fin.

² Apoc. viii. 5, xiv. 18.

³ vi. 10, 11, viii. 3, 4.

⁴ vi. 11—14, xviii. 6.

⁵ Apoc. vii. 3, ix. 4, &c.

evil. Similar was the view presented to St. John in this prophecy. Numbers of them, indeed, without number were seen engaged in the heavenly temple in contemplation and praise. But to others he saw given commissions in the sphere of active employment: and, in fulfilment of these, they appeared afterwards directing the tempests, sounding the trumpets, pouring out the vials, scattering the fire, gathering the vintage.¹ The language indeed is figurative: but the truth I speak of can scarce be mistaken as exhibited under it.

Yet once more it was evident from what passed within, how in *time*, as well as in measure and manner, every event was ordered,—even to the minutest accuracy. It needed not that there should be any dial-plate in the sanctuary. That infinite mind was seen to be to itself its own measure of succession. *There* was marked the passage and the progress of time, alike in its minutest moments and largest cycles; the hour, and day, and month, and year: the time, times, and half a time; one day as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day:—the exact and fittest moment of loosing or restraining, of deliverance or judgment;—the hour known to no man, no, not to the angels in heaven, of the harvest and the vintage, of the mystery of God ending, the consummation of all things, the day of judgment.²

I must not forget to observe, in conclusion, that where-soever explanation might be needed, each class of the blessed ones present in the temple-scene appeared prompt to communicate with the Evangelist. From the *elders* there came one to point out the palm-bearing multitude to him, and tell their origin and their history.³ An *angel* was the party to show him the closing scene of Babylon, and the glories of the New Jerusalem. Lastly, voices of an unseen one from heaven, as of the *Spirit of Jehovah*, spake

¹ Apoc. vii. 1, 3, viii. 6, 7, &c., ix. 14, 15, xiv. 17, 18, xvi. 1, &c.

² ix. 15, xii. 14, xiii. 5, xiv. 15, 18, x. 6, 7, &c.

³ Supposing the received text correct in vi. 1, 3, &c., ερχου και βλεπε, I might have noted the *four living creatures* as also communicating with St. John. But the *και βλεπε* must be eliminated, after the more critical editions, and the ερχου otherwise applied. Still the sympathy of the four living creatures is implied in that of the 24 elders, as part of the same body of the redeemed. See pp. 86—93 *suprà*.

from time to time to him of what he was writing; as if superintending it, in order that there might be in it no error, no deception. And *Jesus himself*, the beloved one of his soul, as He had begun the revelation, so in his own person and with his own promise ended it: "Surely I come quickly."¹—It was a beautiful exemplification of that union and communion of the saints below with beings of a higher order above, of which ~~St. Paul had~~ written to the Hebrew Christians: "Ye are come to (or are in association with) the general assembly and church of the first-born, whose names are written in heaven, and the spirits of just men made perfect, and an innumerable company of angels, and Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant, and God the judge of all." Indeed the whole passage is most illustrative of the subject we have been discussing. For, if we include its previous and commencing clause, "Ye are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem," it brings before us the very *scene*, in part, as well as *celestial company* present in the apocalyptic visions. Insomuch that I cannot believe the resemblance fortuitous. The ideal imagery seems to me to have been dictated by God's Spirit to one apostle, almost purposely as the intended prototype of what was here, some thirty years after, to be visibly represented to another in the visions of Patmos. For, "no Scripture is of private interpretation; but holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."²

CHAPTER V.

ON THE ENSUING HISTORICAL EXPOSITION OF THE REVELATION.

AND now, as the conclusion of this introductory Part, it may perhaps be useful to set before the reader a brief general statement of the *principles, plan*, and (as I hope)

¹ vii. 13, xvii. 1, xxi. 9, x. 4, xiv. 13, xxii. 16, 20, compared with i. 17, 18.

² 2 Peter i. 20: *ιδίας επιλυσεως* meaning, I suppose, a prophecy's separated, detached interpretation. See Bishop Horsley's Sermon xv, on the text.

evidence of truth, that he will find to characterize the following *Exposition* of the apocalyptic prophecy.

Its subject-matter I assume to be *the continuous fortunes of the church and of the world*, (that is of the Roman world and Christian church settled therein,) *from the time of the revelation being given*, or time of St. John's banishment, to the end of all things. This its commencing date I consider, as already observed, to have been fixed by Christ's own words, "I will show thee *the things that must happen after these things.*" (ἀ δεῖ γινεσθαι μετὰ ταῦτα.) If the words "these things" mean the state at that time of the apocalyptic churches, as described in the seven epistles,—a point which, I suppose, few will doubt,—then must Christ's declaration, as it seems to me, distinctly and all but necessarily imply that the foreshowing of the future should begin *from the time of John's banishment*, or soon after.¹ This is indeed admitted by the most competent judges.² And the importance of this canon of historical exposition of the Apocalypse, thus fixed, cannot be over-estimated. It sets aside of itself,—what there is indeed, as I think, superabundant other evidence also to set aside,—interpretations based on the principle of the Apocalypse being a prophecy figurative only of the times yet future³ of the second Advent. I believe the words ἀ μελλεῖ γινεσθαι μετὰ ταῦτα must have positive violence done them, in order to extract therefrom any other meaning than that which I have given.

¹ Such is the use of the μετὰ ταῦτα perpetually elsewhere in the Apocalypse; as iv. 1, vii. 1, xviii. 1, xix. 1, &c. And so in other books of Scripture; e. g. Joh. vii. 1, xxi. 1, &c.

² See the extract from Michaelis given Note 4, p. 8 *suprà*.—To much the same effect is the judgment of Augustine; C. D. xx. 8. 1.; . . . "totum tempus quod liber iste [Apocalypsis] complectitur, à primo scilicet adventu Christi usque in seculi finem."

³ By certain advocates of the futurist scheme it has been alleged that there are cases where the interval signified is as great as what they here contend for; e. g. 1 Pet. i. 11, where the apostle speaks of the Spirit foreshowing to the old prophets Christ's sufferings, καὶ τὰς μετὰ ταῦτα δόξας; viz. say they, the glories of his yet future kingdom. But does not Christ himself represent his personal glory as beginning immediately after his ascension, Joh. xvii. 5, &c.? Moreover, even if the glories meant be those of the saints at Christ's coming again, are not Christ's sufferings inclusive of those of the Church, which is his body? (See 2 Cor. i. 5, Col. i. 24.) So again as regards Acts xv. 16, "Μετὰ ταῦτα I will return, and build up the tabernacle of David," it is a disputed question what the time may be which is referred to, and interval implied. At any rate the usual intent of the phrase *in a context such as that in the verse before us* is unquestionably such as I here contend for.

In the divine foreshowing of its great subject I have felt persuaded, and have carried out my exposition on the persuasion, that the two following rules must have been observed :—*first*, that the *epochs* and *events* selected for prefiguration must have been such as are confessedly the most important and eventful ; (by *confessedly* meaning in the judgment of what are considered standard authorities ;) *secondly*, that the figuring *emblems* must have been, in some approved consistent sense, characteristic and distinctive. Such would be the case were a master-mind among men to develop the great general subject in a series of descriptive sketches or pictures. How then can we suppose it otherwise in the prefigurations of the Omniscient Spirit ?

The *direct evidence of truth* hence arising, in case of agreement between the symbol and the historical object it is applied to, will at once be felt by the intelligent reader : specially from the circumstance of the symbols being not expounded after the interpreter's own fancy, that bane too often of prophetic exposition : but in a sense, as I said, *approved* ; that is, according to their recognised meaning, more especially at the time and in the country supposed to be referred to : or perhaps as otherwise fixed ; e. g. by some *local* or *geographical* peculiarity, strongly marked in the prefiguration.—Of course the evidence will be felt strong in proportion to the number of details combined in the symbol, their distinctiveness of character, and the exactness of their application to the æra and the subject. It might be expected *à priori*, and will be found in fact, that in the long series of prophetic figurations there will be some more circumstantial, distinctive, and striking than others ; and some indeed quite brief, and comparatively general in character. But the former will be found, I believe, much more frequent than the latter ; and certainly abundantly sufficient in frequency and strength to serve as effectual buttresses to the sacred building, and to keep up its continuity unbroken.—Nor will the seeker for truth fail to consider the *argument cumulative* in this case : and how, if in a long continuous series of prefigurations one, and another, and another, each in its precise order of time, be shown to have had its fulfilment, the strength of the

evidence of truth must needs rapidly increase each step; indeed with almost the rapidity of geometrical progression.

Besides which *direct* evidence the Reader will find offered from time to time in the ensuing Exposition a species of *indirect* evidence, hitherto unnoticed I believe, of the nature of what I may call *allusive contrast*. Examples will best illustrate it. But I may thus briefly explain its nature. Supposing the great subject of the Apocalyptic Revelation to be the histories, in connexion or in contrast, of Christ's faithful church and of the world, (of the latter, either in its primary state of avowed Heathenism, or its subsequent state of corruption and apostasy under the Christian name,) then,—just as in God's actual interventions at one and another crisis, for the revival of his Church, and vindication of his own rights and honour, the revelations of gospel-light and truth made by Him would be necessarily in marked contrast and opposition to the then prevalent errors and corruptions,—so in the Eternal Spirit's foreshowings of the same, a similarly marked contrast must be expected to appear, on putting the Apocalyptic picturing of the heavenly revelation side by side with the historic picturing of the chronologically correspondent corruption and heresy. The same too, partially, in the Spirit's prefigurative sketchings, from time to time, of its faithful ones; faithful among the faithless. Some three or four examples of this will be substantiated, if I mistake not, in the ensuing Commentary, specially in Apoc. vii, viii, x; the view of St. John in *his representative character*, hitherto quite barren of results, furnishing under *this* head, as well as under the *former*, most important accessions of evidence.—Nor let me pass on without just hinting the theological importance of each such substantiated allusive prefiguration: inasmuch as it must present not merely evidence of the fulfilment of prophecy in matters of historic fact, but evidence of the divine judgment in matters of religious doctrine.

With regard to the *plan, order*, and chief *divisions* of the Exposition ensuing, they have been already almost intimated in the preceding chapter. For that which an expositor may have declared to be in his opinion the most

natural plan, order, and chief divisions of the Prophecy, those self-same, except for very cogent reasons, he ought of course to follow out in his own Exposition. Accordingly the three septenaries of *Seals*, *Trumpets*, and *Vials* will be interpreted by me as connected and consecutive series;—the seventh Seal unfolding itself in the seven Trumpet-Visions, the seventh Trumpet in those of the seven Vials: and this with no intermission or interruption; save only that of the *supplemental retrogressive Part*, (marked as such by clear internal evidence,) which I have supposed to have occupied the *outside* of the Apocalyptic Scroll.—Hitherto this scheme of arrangement has not, I believe, been consistently developed. There are some expositors who, though admitting the consecutiveness of the three septenaries, have yet encumbered its development by the surely strange supposition of the seven-sealed Book containing but a part of the Revelation, and its other and larger part being inscribed in the little Book held by the rainbow-crowned Angel of Apoc. x.¹ Others again have explained the witnesses' death and resurrection, noted apocalyptically under the sixth Trumpet, as having reference to events long subsequent to those which are the main subject of that Trumpet, and indeed to the sounding of the seventh Trumpet after it.² Hence an involved structure at the best; and a proportionate want of the self-evidence of the simplicity of truth.

And, turning from the prophecy to the history, there seem to me on the whole to be six chief PARTS, or ACTS, clearly defined in the sacred prefigurative drama before us; (a division well agreeing with that more obvious one already noted, of the succession of Seals, Trumpets, and Vials:) their historic subject-matter being, respectively, as follows:—

I. That of the coming *temporary prosperity*, and then the *decline and fall of Rome Pagan*, before the power of Christianity:—the subject of the six first Seals.

¹ E. g. Mede. See the notice of his Scheme in my Vol. iv, Appendix.

² E. g. Keith. So at least in the Signs of the Times ii. 32; 3rd Ed. In his 8th Edition he regards the 7th Trumpet as yet future.

II. The *ravage and destruction of Rome Christian*, after its apostasy, in its divisions both of east and west; of the western empire by the *Goths*, of the eastern by the *Saracens* and *Turks*:—the subject of the first six Trumpets.

III. The history of the *Reformation*, as introduced about the middle of the sixth Trumpet.

IV. The supplemental and explanatory history of the *rise, character, and actings* of the *Papacy* and *Papal Empire*, which sprung out of the Gothic inundations of Western Europe:—a part corresponding, as I conceive, with the *writing without* on the prophetic roll; and which was exhibited preparatorily to the figuration of the Popedom's final overthrow.

V. The preliminary judgments on, and then the final *overthrow* of, the *Papacy* and *Papal Empire*, under the out-pouring of the Vials of God's wrath; followed by the coming of Christ to judgment.—Consequent on which is depicted,

VIthly, The glorious consummation; including the *descent* of the *heavenly Jerusalem*, and the *reign of Christ and his saints* on the renovated earth.

Of which Parts the first four seem to me to have been accomplished already; and of the fifth the prefigured events to be now far advanced in progress of fulfilment.

In the following Treatise it is my purpose, first, to trace the historical fulfilment of the four former Parts, together with that of the six earlier Vials of the fifth Part, more at length: then, in regard of the remainder, as yet unfulfilled, to inquire briefly and cautiously into the grander and more prominent points that may seem prefigured in it, as destined to take place in the coming future.—The circumstance of the fifth prophetic Division having been only in main part fulfilled, as I view it, in part still future, will cause this measure of divergence in my actual arrangement from the Division just sketched, that I shall include what seems to me unfulfilled of the *fifth* Part under the *sixth* and last of the prophecy.

But what a field for historic research lies here before us! A field extending over seventeen centuries, and over coun-

tries many more than those of European Christendom!—With reference to which point, and ere I enter on the exposition, let me call upon the reader to admire with me the divine wisdom in so ordering things that, amidst the partial wreck that there has been of the literary records of some of the centuries here prefigured, and the original paucity of those of others, (especially of the earlier part of the dark middle ages,) there should yet remain to us documentary evidence sufficient whereby to illustrate almost all of the events foreshown, and to evince the truth and accuracy of the prefigurations.—And, again, let me suggest it as a thing admirable, that He should so have overruled the intellectual tendencies of a mind like *Gibbon's*, in these latter days, as to direct it to the development of the same period, and nearly the same subject, as the larger half of the Apocalyptic prophecy. It is scarcely needful, I presume, to detail his peculiar qualifications as an illustrator and a witness:—endowed as he was with powers of research and memory very rare, and an absolute enthusiasm in his subject, such as precisely the best to fit him for searching out historic truth, even where obscurest;—endowed, too, with a comprehensiveness of view and philosophic sagacity, which led him, instinctively almost, to mark the relations of things, trace results to their causes, and, amidst the multiplicity of details, to appreciate the real importance and grand bearing of events and epochs:—besides the being possess of a turn of mind and imagination eminently dramatic and picturesque; such as to suggest a development of his general subject with no little of dramatic unity of effect, and a grouping and painting of the details in graphic descriptions, that approach, as near almost as descriptive language can do, to the mode of exhibiting them here chosen, viz. by actual pictures.—Thus was the infidel Gibbon prepared to become unconsciously the best illustrator of no small part of the prophecy: that self-same heavenly prophecy which he has himself made the subject of a sneer.¹ The absolute need of such a pioneer to Apocalyptic interpretation has been well set forth by Michaelis, in his sketch

¹ “A mysterious prophecy which still forms part of the sacred canon; but which . . . has very narrowly escaped the proscription of the Church.” Gibbon, ii. 304.

of the pre-requisites for a proper Apocalyptic expositor.¹ Nor is there any one that can so fully as the Expositor himself appreciate the immense advantage derivable from his pioneering.—It is however an advantage in which the Reader may also participate. Gibbon's work on the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire offers him a book of reference easily accessible, and in secular history almost always to be depended on,² whereby himself to test the correctness of the historic views and statements propounded to him by the Expositor. It will be my object to facilitate such reference. The use will soon appear.

¹ Ch. xxxiii. § 6, p. 505, &c. After specifying as the first qualification a competent knowledge of the Greek and Hebrew, as the second a taste for poetry and painting, he adds, as the third and most important, a complete knowledge of history, more especially of the history of Asia. And then he notes the palpable defects on that point of nearly all former expositors.

² See Guizot's testimony to Gibbon on this point, in his Preface to the French Translation of Gibbon. It is quoted in the Quarterly Review, Vol. 1. p. 289. Mr. Milman has borne a similar testimony.

PART I.

FIRST SIX SEALS.

THE COMING TEMPORARY PROSPERITY, AND THEN THE DECLINE AND FALL, OF THE EMPIRE OF HEATHEN ROME.

A. D. 96 TO 395.

APOC. CHAPTER VI.

“AND I saw when the Lamb opened one of the seven seals; and I heard one of the four living creatures saying, as it were with a voice of thunder, Come! And I looked, and behold a white horse! And he that sat on it had a bow: and a crown was given unto him: and he went forth conquering, and to conquer.—And when he opened the second seal, I heard the second living creature saying, Come! And there went out another horse that was red: and power was given to him that sat thereon to take peace from the earth, and that they should kill one another: and there was given unto him a great sword.—And when he opened the third seal, I heard the third living creature saying, Come! And I looked, and behold a black horse! And he that sat on it had a pair of balances in his hand. And I heard as it were a voice in the midst of the four living creatures saying, A chœnix of wheat for a denarius, and three chœnixes of barley for a denarius; and see thou hurt not [or, wrong not in regard to]¹ the oil and the wine.—And when he opened the fourth seal, I heard the voice of

¹ και το ελαιον και τον οινον μη αδικησης. I shall have to remark under my third Seal on the alternative translation here given.

the fourth living creature saying, Come! And I looked, and behold a pale horse! And his name that sat on him was Death, and Hades followed with him. And power was given unto him over the fourth part [or, over the four parts]¹ of the earth to kill with the sword, and with famine, and with pestilence, and by the wild beasts of the earth.—And when he opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held. And they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Master holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? And a white robe was given unto each one of them: and it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a little season; until their fellow-servants also, and their brethren that should be killed as they were, should have been completed.—And I beheld when he opened the sixth seal, and there was a great earthquake. And the sun became black as sackcloth of hair: and the full moon became as blood: and the stars of heaven fell unto the earth; even as a fig-tree casteth its untimely figs, when it is shaken of a mighty wind. And the heaven departed as a scroll when it is rolled together: and every mountain and island were moved out of their places. And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the chief captains, and the rich men, and the mighty men, and every bondman and freeman, hid themselves in the caves and in the rocks of the mountains; and said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of Him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb. For the great day of his wrath is come; and who is able to stand?²

¹ So Jerome's Vulgate, "super quatuor partes terræ." I shall have to remark on this various reading under my fourth Seal.

² I have in the above followed Tregelles' text: of the deviations of which from the received text the most observable is the omission of the *και βλεπει*, after *ερχου*, on the opening of each of the four first Seals; in which omission Scholz, Tittman, and others have preceded him. I shall remark more fully on it under my first Seal.—I have also generally followed Mr. Tregelles in his translation; and, like him, have deviated from the received version in translating *ζωα living creatures*, instead of *beasts*; and *αδης Hades*, instead of *hell*. I deviate from both in translating *χοινix chonix*, instead of *measure*; *δηναρion denarius*, instead of *penny*; *θανατω pestilence*, instead of *death*; *θηριων wild beasts*, instead of *beasts*: also *λιμω famine*, and *ολη σεληνη full moon*.

The passage above quoted constitutes the first Act in the heavenly drama;—that which was represented under the first six Seals.

Its general subject I have presumed to be the *decline and fall*, after a previous *prosperous era*, of the empire of *Heathen Rome*. And it may be well to observe by anticipation, that, though it was only in a later part of the prophecy that the *Apocalyptic earth*, which the Seals soon began to speak of, was expressly identified with the *Roman earth*,¹ yet there was in the emblems of the very first Seal, if I mistake not, that which, instead of leaving its reference doubtful or indistinct, must almost at once have suggested the *Roman empire* and *emperors* as its intended subject of figuration:—at least to an observer unprepossessed by other expectations as to the intent of the prophecy; and conversant, like the Evangelist, with the manners and customs of the age. The evidence of this I trust soon to bring not only before the mind, but even the eye of the reader.—Before doing so, however, it may be useful to make a few preliminary remarks, bearing on the right interpretation alike of the symbols of this first Seal, and of those of the three next following; which four comprehend that quaternion of horses and horsemen, with the succession of which the revelations of the future given to St. John opened. The principles suggested will be found very simple; and such, I trust, as will readily approve themselves to the common sense of the intelligent and candid reader.

And 1st, the *chronological reference* of each vision, as fixed by the prophecy itself, is evidently a point most necessary to attend to:—that of the first Seal being determined by its position, next after the Angel's *ἀ δεῖ γενεσθαι μετὰ ταυτα*, to signify what was to happen soon after the epoch of St. John's seeing the visions in Patmos; that of the second, third, and fourth, in like manner, being fixed to events, or changes, that were to have commencing dates

¹ In Apoc. xvii. 18 we read that the woman, or Roman seven-hilled city, was the great city which ruled over *των βασιλειων της γης*, "the kings of the earth." And so in verses 2, 5, 8 of the same chapter. The 8th verse speaks of "the inhabitants of the earth" as in connexion with, and subjection to, the Beast who was associated with the woman. So too in Apoc. xiii. 8, xi. 10, &c.; whereby the *γη*, or earth, of Apoc. xvii may be traced back to, and probably identified with, the *γη*, or earth, of the Trumpets and Seals preceding.

each in chronological sequence to the commencing dates of the events, or changes, signified in the vision of the Seal next immediately preceding.¹—Hence the inadmissibility not merely of such directly anti-chronological explanations as that of the martyrologist Foxe and Mr. Faber,² which interprets the four horses and horsemen of the *four successive military empires of Babylon, Persia, Macedon, and Rome*, the three first of which had already some centuries before St. John passed away:—but also of such as is proposed by Dr. Keith, who would interpret them to symbolize the four successive religions of *primitive Christianity, Mahommedanism, Popery, and Infidelity*; though elsewhere insisting on the establishment of the reign of Popery and the Popes, as dating near a century before the rise of Mahommedanism.³—Hence too the probable exclusion of that very old and recently revived explanation,⁴ which makes the first Seal to symbolize *Christianity* and its *gospel-preaching* in triumphant progress, the three next the several evil agencies of *war, famine, and pestilence*, introductory to Christ's second advent: these being not supposed to follow each other in any distinctly marked order of chronological sequence, on a grand scale; but rather to occur in a series of recurring exemplifications, on a small scale, all chronologically intermixt together; after the type of those predicted by Christ, as what would occur before the destruction of Jerusalem.⁵

¹ Of course there may be a certain overrunning by the subject of one vision into the period of that of the vision succeeding; supposing these subjects of the two visions to be not incompatible, but rather (as, for example, in the case of *famine* and *pestilence*) altogether consistent with, and the one implying the continuance of, the other.

² See Faber's *Sacr. Cal.* ii. 205 (2nd Ed.); and, for Foxe's view, my notice of him in the *History of Apocalyptic Interpretation* in the Appendix to Vol. iv.

³ I have noticed this in my *Vindiciæ Horariæ*, pp. 9, 20.

⁴ E. g. Victorinus of old; (see my notice of him in the *Hist. of Apoc. Interpretation*;) and in our own times Mr. Burgh, and I believe the Futurists generally.

⁵ Our Lord's prophecy Matt. xxiv. 7, 14, is referred to for authority, both by ancients and moderns: "For nation shall rise against nation, . . . and there shall be famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes, in divers places." Where, mark the plural of these nouns, and the "divers places" ascribed to them, *λιμοι και λοιμοι και σεισμοι κατα τοπων*; also the correspondent account in history of their various occurrences before the destruction of Jerusalem; (see p. 55 *suprà*;) in contrast with the Apocalyptic distinctness of chronological order and succession.

Mr. Burgh, p. 159, (4th Ed.) to make the parallel more striking, adds the further statement in Matt. xxiv. 9, "Then shall they deliver you up to be afflicted," &c., as answering in order, as well as subject, to the vision of the 5th Seal. But in Luke xxi. 12 it is said, (after notice of the *famines, &c.*) "But before all these things they shall lay their hands on you," &c.

2. The presumption against this last-mentioned view seems to me strengthened by the fact that *abstract ideas*, such as of *war*, *famine*, and *pestilence*, are I believe never depicted elsewhere in Scripture under the form of symbolic impersonations, after the manner of these introductory Seals. *Death* stands alone in this respect; and, from the very singularity of the circumstance, needed to be specifically named, where his personification occurs in the 4th Seal: while *war* and *famine* (the supposed subjects of the two preceding symbolic impersonations) are specified in that same Seal in simple literal language, as two out of the four agencies by which Death was to kill.¹—It will be seen hereafter that the price of barley named in the 3rd Seal, as well as what is said of the oil and wine, suffice to put the idea of *famine* being there intended altogether out of the question.

3. Abstractions being thus presumptively set aside, we seem very much reduced to the idea of some *nation* and *empire*, or else *the Christian Church*, being the main subject of the four symbolizations. And I think it will be admitted on this head that, whichever of these two be chosen, the *homogeneity* of the symbols of a *horse and horseman*, common to the four first Seals, would seem to require a homogeneous interpretation of them. Hence, the exclusion of views like Mede's; who would explain the first Seal's horse and rider with reference to *Christ* or his *Church*, the three next Seals' horses and riders with reference to the *Roman empire* or *emperors*.²—The rule is of course applicable in detail. What *the horse* singly is meant to symbolize in the first Seal, whether the Church or an empire, that it might reasonably be expected to symbolize in the three next Seals, though under new and different aspects. And in the first three Seals *the rider* too ought to be interpreted on the same common principle. I say in the first three Seals; the case of the fourth Seal's rider being, as before remarked, peculiar.

¹ "And his name that sat thereon was Death: . . . and power was given unto him to kill with sword, and with famine, and with pestilence," &c. Apoc. vi. 8.

² So Vitringa, p. 310. "Si fata Romani Imperii symbolicis imaginibus priorum quatuor sigillorum depingerentur, necesse erat ut Romanum Imperium, continuâ temporis serie, sub quatuor his prodiisset aspectibus qui his imaginibus exhibentur." This he says in refutation of Mede's exposition.

4. As to the grand question just mooted, whether it be *Christ's Church*, or some *nation and empire*, that is designated under the figure of the *horse* in these four Seals, the presumption in favour of the former idea which many have entertained, in consequence of its being Christ that appears crowned as the rider on a white horse in a later vision, (Apoc. xix. 11,) like as the first Seal's rider too, sate crowned on a white horse,—that presumption, I believe, will utterly vanish, before a more careful comparison of the two symbolizations. For the only real point of resemblance will be found to be the mere indistinctive one of riding a white horse: while the differences will appear so many and so marked, as to place the two symbolizations (so as I have suggested before when speaking of the *moral* of the drama¹) in the light of a marked *contrast*, not an *identity* of subject.²—The impracticability, according to Vitringa, (the most eminent probably of the Church-system advocates,) of carrying out an explanation of the horse and horseman on this system into the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th Seals, otherwise than as of one compound emblem,³ increases the already

¹ At p. 106 *suprà*.

² I have urged this point fully at pp. 10, 11 of the *Vindiciæ Horariæ*. I there observe as follows:

“In the one case it is simply a rider on a white horse, without a single declared attribute, name, or emblem of divinity; bearing in his hand a bow, receiving a crown (*στέφανον*), and with the simple destiny of conquering on the earth, so as any mere *human* conqueror might do, and that he should conquer. In the other case it is One with eyes like a flame of fire, and on his head many diadems (*διαδηματα*), and with his vesture dyed in blood, and the incomprehensible name, the WORD OF GOD, written on him, and in his hand a sword, (not a bow,) and his point of egress not earth, (whereon the Church-theory of the Seals would require him to have been progressing victoriously ever since his first outgoing,) but heaven.”—I then further state that the one and only point of similarity in the two cases, viz. that of *riding a white horse*, is anything but a distinctive: seeing that neither in Psalm xlv, nor Habakkuk iii, (passages cited as parallels,) is the colour of the Messiah's horse specified; and that in the vision of Zech. i. 8, where we read of horses (with riders on them) red, speckled, white, it is on a *red* horse, not *white*, that the Messiah is there represented as riding.—I also show that the mere difference of time, to which the visions of Apoc. vi and Apoc. xix respectively refer, does not account for the vast multitude of differences in the representation, were the rider in the first case, as in the second, really Jesus Christ: seeing that much of the same divine glory that appeared attached to him in the vision of Apoc. xix, appeared attached to him also in the primary Apocalyptic vision (Apoc. i. 14—16); and that the *many diadems* could only signify the same universal kingdom which the *crown* did, were the Church-scheme of the Seals correct; Christ's investiture to this universal kingdom having taken place immediately on his ascension.

In fine, I conclude that the differences are purposely made thus many and great, in order to set aside all idea of identity between the two riders, in the one case and the other.

³ “Videbam interpretes qui per *equum album* hic intelligunt *ecclesiam Christi*, . . vehementer laborare in *sequente emblemate* rectè exponendo.” p. 328.

strong presumption against that view: besides that the fitness of a *horse* to designate the Church, even supposing Vitranga's difficulty to be overcome, seems very questionable.¹ Nor, I am persuaded, will human learning or ingenuity ever be found able to carry out satisfactorily a detailed historical explanation of the four Seals, on this view of the horse as signifying the Church.²

Hence, in fine, the *a priori* probability of the Apocalyptic horse meaning a *nation* or *empire*: and, if so, then of course that nation with which, more than any other, Christ's Church both was, and was to be, locally connected, and which consequently was the subject long before of Daniel's prophecy; viz. the *Roman* nation. \times The circumstance of other heathen nations, or empires, having been elsewhere similarly symbolized in Scripture prophecy, not merely as *wild beasts*, (their emblems in the *persecuting* character,) but under figures also, with reference to their mere national history, of certain of the domesticated animals, (e. g. the Persian nation as a *ram*, and Macedonian as a *goat*,³) is one confirmatory of this view. And the fitness of the *war-horse*, sacred to Mars, to signify the *martial Roman nation*,—especially as they claimed to be the *Mavortia proles*, with *Mars* for their father,—seems almost self-evident. Of which their fabled parentage the memorial, we read, was ever publicly kept up: at spring and at autumn, each year as it rolled round, from Romulus' time, it is said, down to the time of the emperors, the Romans being wont to see the horse exhibited in sacrifices and in games, as the animal sacred to their father Mars.⁴—Nor, if the appropriateness

¹ The horse and his rider is an expression continually used in Scripture in designation of a *heathen* military power. So Exod. xv. 21, Jer. li. 21, Ezek. xxiii. 6, Hagg. ii. 22, Zech. ix. 10, &c. There is but one passage in the Old Testament where the symbol of a horse is used of any but a military heathen power, viz. Zech. x. 3; where God speaks of making Judah "his goodly horse in battle:" and there it is borrowed, if I may so say, from the custom of Judah's enemies boasting (ib. 5) of their horses and riders. Indeed horses were expressly forbidden to the Jews: see Deut. xvii. 16, Ps. xx. 7, &c.—Moreover *Judah* is not the *Christian Church*.

² See my review of the Church-Scheme of the Seals in the Appendix to this Volume.

³ Daniel viii. 20, 21.

⁴ The *sacrifice of the horse*, in one annual festival to Mars, is noted by Festus in *Octob.* and the *horse-races* by the same author, in *Equiria*, as at another.—So Tertullian de Spectac. c. 5; "Dehinc *equiria* Marti Romulus dixit;" just afterwards mentioning Romulus as Mars' son. On which passage Pamelius illustrates the institution from Varro, Festus, and Ovid. The horse's consecration to Mars is also noted

of the Scriptural emblems of the ram and the goat to Persia and Macedon has been evidenced to us by those nations' actual adoption of them for types on their coinage, (so as Persian and Macedonian coins still extant prove to us,¹) is similar ocular proof of symbolic fitness wanting in the present instance. Multitudinous Latin, or, as I may truly call them, *Roman* coins, of early date and beautiful fabric, such as the reader now sees engraved before him, still remain to illustrate to modern eyes this recognised connexion of *Mars*, the *horse*, and the *Roman people*.² Besides that a horse too was one of the ancient Roman war-standards.³—Nor should I omit to observe, though somewhat anticipatively, since symbols were often borrowed from real life, that in the times of St. John the horse was frequently seen by Romans in association with riders to whom such insignia belonged as those on the first three Seals, the *crown*, the *sword*, and the *balance*,—the first more especially:⁴ that in this association moreover occa-

by Tertullian, ib. 9.—See this subject more fully investigated in my Essay on it in the Appendix to this Volume, No. 3.

¹ Engravings of these coins will be given in my 3rd Volume.


² On these coins see Eckhel, vol. v. pp. 46—49; who explains the *horse* on them to have been the *Roman horse*, sacred to *Mars* at Rome. "Ad Romana hic typus sacra pertinet. Refert Festus; 'Equiria ludi quos Romulus Marti instituit per equorum cursum, qui in Campo Martio exercebatur.' De equo dicto Octobri, qui singulis annis Marti in Campo Martio immolabatur, vide eundem Festum in October equus."—From a mistaken impression as to the chief districts where the coins were found, and for some other reasons, Eckhel supposed them to have had a Campanian local origin. And Niebuhr also, in his Chapter on the internal history of the Republic during and after the second Samnite war, suggests that they may probably have been there coined, but by a *community of Roman colonists* already settled at that time, under a Roman Præfect, at Capua and elsewhere in Campania; their date having been somewhere between the times of the second Samnite and first Carthaginian wars. For, says he, at this time "Capua was a part of the Roman state. From the year u.c. 431 wardens (præfecti) had been sent thither; and the Prætor L. Furius composed laws for the city." (Niebuhr, Translation by Smith and Schmitz, Vol. iii. pp. 289—291. London, 1842.) Thus, even if they were coined in *Campania*, it was as a *Roman* coinage. More recent researches however have assigned them to *Latium*, as their chief locale, rather than *Campania*. See my Paper on this subject, in the Appendix at the end of this Volume.

Some coins of this class, Eckhel adds, were restored, as *Roman*, by Trajan. "Quod non mirum: nam numi hi, etsi peregrini, tamen Romæ fuerunt obvii; et cum in iis expressum Romæ nomen legeretur, poterant monetæ Romanæ accenseri." Ib. p. 46.

³ So Pliny H. N. x. 4; "Erat et antea aquila prima cum quatuor aliis. Lupi, minotauri, equi, aprique singulos ordines anteibant." So up to the time of Marius.

⁴ See Lipsius' interesting and illustrative Note on Tacit. Ann. xv. 7: where he notes from Dionysius (Ant. Rom. x. 24) the Roman custom of a public gift of a horse to a general, on his election, with the dictatorial or consular insignia, according to his rank; "specimen et notam dignitatis." Certain notices on the point will occur also under my 1st, 2nd, and 3rd Seals respectively.

THE ROMAN HORSE . SACRED TO MARS .



sions sometimes arose when the horse was viewed momentarily; and that it was then, by a natural principle, interpreted with reference to those whom the official rider might be ruler over; that is, a Roman army, or the Roman people.⁵

The meaning of the Apocalyptic *horse* thus presumptively settled, that of the other details of the symbol will readily suggest itself. Its *colours*, in the successive Seals, marked obviously the successive symptomatic phases that the body politic which the horse represented would exhibit, from that of high health and prosperity at the first to that of mortal dissolution; its *riders* the characteristic *agents* or *agencies*, by whom, during the times respectively intended, it would be thus acted on and influenced;—the *instrumental causes*, in effect, of these *symptomatic phases*.—To prevent mistake as to the particular agents or agency signified in each case, the rider bore, or had given him, in the successive visions, some distinctive *badge* of his class, as *the crown, bow, sword, balance, &c.* I say of his *class*:—for in each case, I conceive, it was not an *individual* that the rider was likely to represent; but, conformably with the *corporate* signification of the emblematic horse, and other such symbols in prophecy, a *collective body, class, or series*.

Thus simply, if I mistake not, were the main points that Gibbon deemed it important to mark in his philosophic history of the Roman empire, set forth before the Evangelist in the four first of the Apocalyptic figurations:—I mean, not the *events* or *changes* alone in that empire's history; but, together with them in each case, the *instrumental cause* and the *symptomatic phase*.—Nor let me omit to add, with reference to the *epochs* and *æras*, as well as *subjects*, chosen as I presume for delineation, that they

¹ So Plutarch relates, as an omen of the destruction of Crassus and his army in the Parthian campaign, that one of his *war-horses* richly caparisoned (I suppose with the consular insignia) leapt into the Euphrates, and was seen no more. (c. 36.) And Tacitus too, in narrating the consul Pætus' passage over the Euphrates, on some military expedition in the time of Nero, says that it was made "*tristi omine*:" because "in transgressu Euphratis, quem ponte transmittebat, nullâ palam causâ turbatus, equus qui consularia insignia gestabat retro evasit." (Annal. xv. 7.) So the retreating back of *the horse that bore the consul's insignia* was interpreted to betoken the retreat of *the Roman army and its consul*.


too will be found well to agree with those that Gibbon and other historians make prominent in their pictures, as bearing most importantly on the grand subject of the decline and fall of the Roman empire. Indeed these epochs, and the new agencies for good or evil then successively introduced, did so bear upon it, that, as it seems to me, no philosophic history of the varying fortunes of Imperial Rome during the period they include could omit them. Nor, I may add, does it seem to me that the philosophy of history would require the introduction of any more. Short as are the four figurations, they contain within themselves, I believe, the very spirit of the Roman history, for the next two centuries after St. John:—i. e. up to the memorable epoch of the year 292, when the unity of the empire was practically dissolved.—And let me not forget to observe further, ere closing this introductory Section, that there was then also foreshown to St. John in the *fifth* Seal, though under imagery quite different and peculiar, another and different æra and causal agency, which bore yet more directly and strongly on the overthrow of the empire and religion of Pagan Rome than even any depicted before: it being so the fit introduction of the *sixth* Seal's hieroglyphic, charged with the prefiguration of that overthrow; itself the grand consummation of this first Act of the heavenly Drama.

Thus much premised, proceed we more particularly to consider the sacred figurations. On the first Seal's opening, the voice of the first of the four living creatures, in sign and token of Christ's already assumed part in the providential government of the world,¹ called as with a voice of thunder, Come!² And instant, as if in obedience to the summons, a *horse* and *horseman*, with certain peculiar and

¹ See p. 92 *suprà*.—Christ was not indeed to take his kingdom visibly till the end. But meanwhile "all power was committed to him in heaven and in earth;" and so the providential government of the world, in connexion with the Church, committed to him.


² I have already noticed this as the simple reading in the best text; *ερχου* without the *βλεπε*. Professor M. Stuart, while adopting it, would yet construe the words in the same sense as *ερχου και βλεπε*, i. e. as addressed to St. John. It seems to me more probably to be a call in Christ's Providence on the new agency that was to appear in the Apocalyptic or Roman earth.

THE EMPEROR TRAJAN GOING FORTH TO WAR.




From a coin in the B. Mus

CLAUDIUS DRUSUS' TRIUMPHANT PROGRESS IN WAR, AS DEPICTED AFTER HIS RETURN FROM VICTORY.



From Montfaucon's Antiquit

THE EMPEROR M. AURELIUS GOING FORTH TO WAR.



From a coin in the British Museum.

significant insignia, appeared issuing forth, as I suppose, upon the Roman landscape.

CHAPTER I.

THE FIRST SEAL.

AND what then was to be the characteristic state of the Roman empire, according to the first Seal's prefiguration, in the æra next following (for so, as before said, the Angel's words to St. John fixed the chronology¹) after the time then present of the Apostle's exile in Patmos?—Methinks it might not unnaturally have been expected by Christians, who, like him, were suffering from Domitian's persecution, that it would not be very long before, under the sentence of God's righteous judgment, the great persecuting empire of heathen Rome would be seen declining towards its dissolution. And truly the vices, follies, and oppressions of the emperor then reigning, just as of most that had preceded him,² might suggest an *internal* cause then already in operation, and moreover the recent successful incursions of the frontier barbarians an *external* one, (the facts have been already noticed by me,³) each apparently almost sufficient of itself to produce that result.—But such a result was not indicated to St. John. On the contrary, the first symbol under which the Roman people was represented (as I am presuming) to his view, represented it somewhat strangely under the colour of triumph, prosperity, and health in the body politic.⁴ “I looked, and lo! a *white*

¹ ἂ δὲ γενεσθαι μετα ταυτα.

² Gibbon, i. 128, thus sketches their “age of iron,” from Tiberius to Domitian; Vespasian and his son Titus being alone excepted. “Their unparalleled vices, and the splendid theatre on which they were acted, have saved them from oblivion. The dark unrelenting Tiberius, the furious Caligula, the feeble Claudius, the profligate and cruel Nero, the beastly Vitellius, and the timid inhuman Domitian, are condemned to everlasting infamy.”

³ See my brief historic picture of the state of the empire at the time of St. John's seeing the Apocalypse, given at p. 67 *suprà*; and especially the extract in the Note¹ p. 68, from Tacitus. I must beg the reader very carefully and distinctly to realize to himself this state of things in the Roman world under Domitian, at the outset of our inquiry into the prophecy of what was to follow afterwards.

⁴ This sense of the *white* colour in the 1st Seal is illustrated by the contrast of the *black* in the 3rd.

horse! and he that sat thereon having *a bow*; and *a crown* (στειφανος) was given him; and he went forth *conquering, and to conquer.*"¹ Combining the chief indications here given, it was as if prosperity long unknown would spring up, and continue for some considerable time, within the empire:—a prosperity introduced in some striking manner by wars of victory; and that would be still attended by victory, whenever and wherever wars might arise afterwards,² even to the end of the period prefigured: to which wars there would be a going forth under guidance answering to that of the crowned bow-bearing rider; thereby assuring the general inviolability from foreign foes, and perhaps (for the words might seem to intimate as much) advancing the limits and the greatness of the empire.

I. And, first, did not this answer very notably and distinctively to *the general state and history* of the Roman empire for the 80 or 90 years succeeding John's banishment? that is, from Domitian's death, A. D. 96, throughout the successive reigns of Nerva, Trajan, Hadrian, and the two Antonines, until the accession of Commodus, and triumphant peace made by him with the Germans, A. D. 180; or indeed, yet a year or two farther on, to the completion of his Germanic successes, and coincident primary deterioration of his government in 183 or 184?³ I turn to Gibbon, whose History, by a singular coincidence, in respect of commencing date, as well as of subject, agrees with the Apocalyptic prefigurations: and find him, just as in this first Seal's symbolic sketch, deferring for a while to enter on his great subject of the *decline* of the Roman empire; in order, in the first place, to describe its *glory* and its *happiness* in this precise æra, as being that which immedi-

¹ Και ειδον, και ιδου ιππος λευκος, και ο καθημενος επ' αυτον εχων τοξον και εδοθη αυτω στεφανος και εξηλθε νικων, και ινα νικηση. I give Mr. Tregelles' text generally, as before observed.

² The words "went forth conquering, and that he should conquer," do not imply uninterrupted war and conquests: for, if so, how would the *white* colour of prosperity during any long period have been realized? but only just what I have above stated.—I observe this, because it has been inconsiderately objected by certain critics of the Horæ that the prophecy prefigured an uninterrupted course of war and victory.

³ It seems that those of Commodus' medals that bear the titles Imp. iv, Imp. v, Imp. vi, were struck in the years 180, 182, 183, respectively: also, from history, that these were the only ones in his reign struck in reference to *Germanic* successes; and that the last preceded Commodus' discovery of Lucilla's conspiracy, in 183, which caused the first great deterioration of his government.

ately preceded its declining. In fact, he makes it the bright ground, if I may so say, of his historic picture: whereon to trace out afterwards more effectively in dark colouring, the successive traits of the empire's corruption and decline.

He represents it (and his representations are well confirmed by the original histories remaining to us) as a "golden age" of prosperity, union, civil liberty, and good government;¹ a period "*unstained with civil blood*," (like the *white* of the first Apocalyptic horse, in contrast with the *red* of the second,²) and "undisturbed by revolution;"³ a period remarkable, both at its commencement and at its close, for very wonderful and almost uniform triumphs in war, whereby the glory of the empire was illustrated, and its limits extended;⁴ and of which the middle interval, though not without occasional wars (always successful) on the frontiers, was generally a time of profound and happy peace.⁵ In short, he thus sums up his view of it;—"If a man were called to fix the period in the history of the world, during which the condition of the human race was most happy and prosperous, he would, without hesitation, name that which elapsed from the death of Domitian to the accession of Commodus."⁶

¹ i. 1, 128.

² It is in regard of this contrast that I the rather wish these words to be marked; as furnishing from Gibbon an unintended illustration, not only of the *white* of the first seal, but of the *red* of the second.

³ i. 118. *Partially* this one good distinctive, as Gibbon states, applied also to the darker period antecedent, from Augustus' establishment in the empire to Nerva's: but only quite partially. For there occurred in it the great exception of the mighty civil wars of Galba, Otho, Vitellius, and Vespasian; and also the conspiracies against, and murders of, Caligula, Nero, and Domitian.

⁴ Ib. 8—10, 14.

⁵ Ib. 13.

⁶ Ib. 126. In Dugald Stewart's *Life of Dr. Robertson* (Works i. 38, Ed. 1817) a Letter from Mr. Walpole to Dr. R. is inserted; in which he intimates the idea which he had entertained of writing the history of this æra of Nerva, Trajan, and the Antonines, as "the most remarkable period of the world:" i. e. for *good* government. This was A.D. 1759, before Gibbon's writing his history.

As regards the testimony of *original* historians to the same effect, I shall refer to several more presently, when speaking of the *causal agents* of this national happiness of the Romans during the period spoken of. But I must at once introduce that of the greatest of Roman historians, *Tacitus*: who, having lived and held office in "the iron age" preceding, lived also to enjoy and to record the golden age that followed; his death not occurring (so Lipsius in *Vit. Tac.* supposes, though the exact date is not known,) till the reign of Hadrian. In his *Life of Agricola*, ch. 3, he thus writes. "Nunc demum redit animus: et quanquam, primo statim *beatissimi seculi* ortu, Nerva Cæsar res etiam dissociabiles miscuerit, principatum ac libertatem, augetque quotidie *felicitatem imperii* Nerva Trajanus, &c." So again ch. 44.—And to the same effect another contemporary historian, *Suetonius*, whom I shall have to refer to a little later, *Vit. Domit. c. 23*. See my Note ⁴, p. 143 *infra*.

I said that the wars of the Romans during this period were all but uniformly triumphant; and it may be well briefly to particularize on this point. Not to rest then on Nerva's primary Pannonian triumph, which instantly, as the new æra opened, served to mark the return of victory under it to the Roman banners,¹—I say, not to rest on this, who knows not of the triumphs under Trajan, the Roman Alexander, by which Dacia, Armenia, Mesopotamia, and other provinces, were, in the course of the first twenty years of the period I speak of, added to the Roman empire? As regards the forty-three years which followed, constituting the reigns of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius, though they were years for the most part of honourable and glorious peace,² yet were there passing wars in each reign sufficient to illustrate the continued fulfilment of the predicted destiny that they should conquer:—1st, the Jewish war under Hadrian, confined to a single province, in which the rebellion of that unhappy people was put down with fearful slaughter; then, under Antoninus Pius, those lesser wars on the frontiers, just before alluded to, which served not only to exercise the Roman legions, as Gibbon expresses it, but also to deepen the impression on the minds of the barbarians everywhere of the invincibility of the Roman empire.³—After this, however, and towards the conclusion of the octogenarian period that I speak of, wars arose again, and of so formidable a character as to test to the very ut-

¹ So the contemporary Pliny; who speaks of it as synchronous with Trajan's adoption by Nerva. "Allata erat ex Pannoniâ laurea: id agentibus Diis ut invicti Imperatoris exortum victoriæ insigne decoraret." Paneg. ch. 8.

² How honourable will well appear from Gibbon's statement, i. 13: "The fiercest barbarians frequently submitted their differences to the arbitration of the Emperor: [sc. Hadrian or Antoninus Pius:] and we are informed by a contemporary historian [Appian], that he had seen ambassadors who were refused the honour which they came to solicit, of being admitted into the rank of subjects."—Compare the younger Victor on Antoninus Pius; c. 3. "Adeo trementibus eum atque amantibus cunctis regibus, nationibusque, et populis, ut parentem seu patronum, magis quàm dominum imperatorem, reputarent: omnesque uno ore, in cælestium morem, propitium optantes, de controversiis inter se judicem poscerent."

There is a common class of medals of these emperors, which well illustrate the respect paid them by the barbarians of the frontier. Barbarian kings are represented as receiving a tiara or diadem from them, with the legends, "Rex Parthis datus," "Rex Quadis datus," &c. See Spanheim, pp. 831, 832. (Ed. 1671.)

³ "Per legatos suos plurima bella gessit. Nam et Britannos per Lollium Urbicum legatum vicit . . . et Mauros ad pacem postulandam coegit; et Germanos, et Dacos, et multas gentes, atque Judæos rebellantes, contudit per præsides et legatos." Capitolinus Vit. Antonin. c. 5.

most the truth of the prophecy. From East and West, North and South, it seemed as if the whole barbarian world had been stirred from its very foundations, to overwhelm the envied glory and prosperity of the empire.¹ And on the sudden surprise, once, and again, and a third time, alike on the Euphratean and the Danubian frontier, the Roman frontier army was overthrown.² But so soon as the imperial strength had gathered itself up against the invaders, not only was the invasion on either side, and in every case repelled, but the war carried triumphantly into the invaders' own territory. The Parthian war was successfully ended by the total overthrow of that people, the capture of the chief Armenian and Parthian cities, Artaxata, Seleucia, Ctesiphon; and re-addition to the empire of the great Mesopotamian province, which, originally conquered by Trajan, had, from motives of policy, been voluntarily ceded by Hadrian.³—And even in the most mighty of all those wars, the Marcomannic, victory after victory still attended the Roman standards under the second Antonine; till the German barbarians, driven into their forests, were reduced to submission.⁴—So that the destiny assigned to

¹ "Gentes omnes ab Illyrici limite usque Galliam conspiraverant; ut Mareomanni, Narisci, Hermanduri, Quadi, Suevi, Sarmatae, Latringes, Buri: hi, aliique cum Victovalis Sosibes, Sicobotes, Roxolani, Bastarnae, Alani, Peucini, Costoboci. Imminebat et Parthicum bellum, et Britannicum." Capitolinus Vit. M. Aur. c. 22.

² In the Parthian war Severianus with his army: in the three successive Marcomannic wars, 1st Victorinus, 2ndly Vindex.

³ On the *voluntariness* of the cession by Hadrian we have the testimony of Rufus Festus, Breviarium. "*Sponte propria*, reductis exercitibus, Armeniam, Mesopotamiam, Assyriam concessit," sc. Hadrianus.—So too Montesquieu, Grandeur et Decad. c. 15; and Eckhel vi. 483. See my Vindicke, pp. 90, 91.

In proof of M. Aurelius' recovery of the Mesopotamian provinces, as the result of the Parthian war, Tillemont (ad ann. A. D. 165) refers to Rufus Festus, who reckons him as one of the recoverers of the Roman empire of that disputed territory. The same is implied in Dion C. lxxv. 1, as regards at least the important Mesopotamian districts of Osrhoene and Adiabene. For he speaks of their *revolting* from the Romans in the reign of Severus, some 20 years after M. Aurelius' death; between which epoch and the revolt spoken of there had been no Parthian war.—To the same effect is the statement in the Dramaticum Jamblichi, cited in Photius' Codex, pp. 74, 75. (I borrow this from Mr. Greswell's Harmony of the Gospels, Vol. iv, P. ii, p. 586.) Λεγει δε ο συγγραφευς, says Photius, i. c. when speaking of M. Aurelius' Parthian war, οτι Βολυγαισος υπερ τον Ευφρατην και Τυγριν εφυγεν η δε Παρθυαιων γη Ρωμαιοις υπηκοος κατεση. If this writer was, as supposed, a contemporary of M. Aurelius, and by birth and residence a Mesopotamian, (see Ancient Univ. Hist. xvi. 148.) the greater would be the value of his testimony.—Among the moderns we have, besides Tillemont, Gibbon (i. 335) and Vaillant (Numism. Paris, 1696) expressing the same judgment as to the fact.

⁴ I beg to refer to the full historical sketch of these wars given in my Vindicke Horariae, pp. 95—105.—M. Aurelius' decisive triumph in the Marcomannic war is

the white horse's rider, "and to conquer," continued to be realized by the Romans, even to the end of the period under review. And, as the magnificent *Column of Trajan* still remains at Rome,¹ the just memorial of the triumphs of its commencement, so it has been ordered that there should remain also that of *Antoninus Aurelius*, the magnificent although inferior monument of those of its close.

II. Thus far of the empire's triumphs and prosperity during the next coming æra. But *whose the influential agency* that would cause it and them? In other words, who the agents personified by the *rider*? Now to ourselves what is related of *the reigning emperors* throughout this æra,—their absolute authority, for under them "the Roman empire was governed by absolute power under the guidance of virtue and wisdom,"² "the armies being restrained by the firm and gentle hand of four successive emperors,"³ and their power used only to cherish the nation's happiness, advance its prosperity, or guide it to its triumphs,—must at once have suggested *them* as the persons symbolized. As Gibbon says, "The delight was theirs of beholding the general happiness of which they were the authors."⁴ Nor were the visible symbols wanting in the vision, to

noticed by Gibbon, i. 381, and Schlegel in his *Philosophy of History*, ii. 36. The latter thus states the permanent effectiveness of Aurelius' triumphs over them. "M. Aurelius, by his energetic and successful resistance (i. e. of the Alemannic invasion), was the means of deterring the barbarians for a long time from similar enterprises." In fact for some fifty or sixty years.—On the triumphant nature of the peace concluded with the Marcomanni, immediately after M. Aurelius' death, see *Dion Cass.* lxxii. 2, 3; also my *Vindiciæ*, p. 103.

¹ On the top of this column Trajan's ashes were placed in a golden urn; a triumph having been previously celebrated to *his image*, in place of himself. A thing unparalleled!

² Gibb. i. 127.

³ *Ibid.* By "the four emperors" Gibbon means those after Nerva: Nerva himself, during his short sixteen months' reign, having failed partially in this one point of good government.

⁴ *Ib.*—So the ancient historians of the period. Thus both *Suetonius* and *Tacitus* represent the *earlier* emperors of the series, Nerva and Trajan, as introducers of a golden age: (see my *Notes*, pp. 131, 143:) and similarly, notwithstanding the dangerous wars and plague too that occurred under the reign of Aurelius, *Dion Cassius* (lxxi. 36) represents *his* reign as also of the golden age. So again, *Eutropius*, viii. 1, speaking of Nerva's accession and his successors; "Respublica ad prosperrimum statum rediit, bonis principibus ingenti felicitate commissa:" and of Aurelius, *ib.* 14, "Fortunatam Rempublicam et virtute et mansuetudine reddidit." And so too Victor, as cited p. 144 *infra*.—Even the Christian writer *Lactantius* passes his eulogium on these five Princes. In his *De Mort. Persec.* c. 3, ad fin. he says; "Secutis temporibus (sc. post Domitianum) multi boni principes Romani Imperii clavum regimenque tenuerunt."

foreshow the same to the Evangelist. First the rider's *white horse* might suggest it; *white* having been both in earlier times the chosen colour for horses used by *Roman generals* in their *triumphs*, and still by *Roman emperors*.¹ Then the *crown* given him would seem sufficient absolutely to confirm this impression: the triumph and triumphal crown-wearing having been from the time of Augustus all but withdrawn, as too great an honour, from subordinate generals; and from Domitian's accession appropriated, as his own proper distinctive, to the reigning emperor.²

It so happens, indeed, that as regards this very point an objection has been made, to the effect that the *diadem*, ~~not the στέφανος or crown~~, would have been the badge represented, if Roman emperors had been symbolized: and that, in fact, instead of the presentation of the crown fixing the meaning to individuals in that high office, the want of the diadem positively precludes the idea of their being the persons meant.³ But the objection has been founded evidently on misapprehension. The respectable writer objecting, (and I believe he is not alone in it,) seems to have confounded either between the kingly and imperial offices, or between the practices of the earlier and later Roman emperors. Let me explain.—By the *imperator*, or *emperor*, up to the time of Augustus, was meant, as is well known, simply the victorious Roman general, saluted with that title by his soldiers on the field of battle, and with the triumph and its coveted honours and insignia following. Now, though with Augustus and his successors the most absolute monarchical power attached to their emperorship, yet it was their policy to veil it under the old military or imperial badges. Hence their public insignia (of which

¹ Pliny notes the ancient custom, in his account of Trajan's return to Rome from his foreign victories; Panegy. xxii. "Priores inveni et importari solebant, non dico quadrijugo curru et albetibus equis, &c." So Plutarch of Camillus' triumph after taking Veii. And Dion Cassius, xliii. 14, speaking of Cæsar's returning from the African war, says similarly that the Senate decreed to him *καὶ τὰ ἐπικρία τὰ προεψηφισμένα, ἐπι τε λευκῶν ἵππων, κ.τ.λ.*—So, again, as Suetonius relates, Domitian rode on a *white* horse in his father Vespasian's Jewish triumph. Domit. 2.—Laetantius, M.P. 16, also alludes to the old custom.

² Gibb. i. 102, Note ¹⁰. On the exceptions under the earlier emperors see Note ⁴ p. 136.

³ Cuninghame's Apococalypse, p. 3 (Ed. 4.); and also in his Critical Examination of Faber, p. 155, Note.

the mock robing and crowning of Jesus by the Roman soldiery is an affecting remembrancer)¹ were still the laurel crown and purple robe. The assumption of the diadem, or broad white fillet set with pearls, viewed as it was by the Romans as a badge of oriental despotism, and of the servitude of subject vassals, these emperors carefully shunned. The remembrance long remained with them of the feelings exhibited by the Roman people, on its being offered by Antony to their great ancestor Julius Cæsar;² insomuch that it was considered an act of madness on the part of Caligula, (and the act was quite isolated,) to attempt to assume it.³ Abundant memorials exist to show that, all through the time to which our first Seal refers, the *crown* remained the badge of Roman emperors, the *diadem* of barbarous kings.⁴ In fact not till about the time of Diocletian,⁵ near 200 years after St. John's banishment to Patmos, was the diadem adopted by Roman emperors: the innovation being accompanied with the other insignia attendant on eastern royalty, the personal act of adoration not excepted. The change constituted an epoch in Ro-

¹ Only in *his* case it was *στέφανος ακανθίνος*; a crown not of *laurel*, but of *thorns*.

² How striking is Cicero's description! "Sedebat in rostris collega tuus, amictus togâ purpureâ, in sellâ aureâ, *coronatus*. Ascendis; accedis ad sellam; *diadema* ostendis. Gemitus toto foro. Unde diadema? Non enim abjectum sustuleras, sed attuleras domo; meditatum et cogitatum scelus. Tu *diadema* imponebas cum plangore populi; ille cum plausu rejiciebat." Cicero Orat. 2 in Antonium, c. 34.—Compare 1 Macc. viii. 14.

³ Suetonius, Caligula, ch. 22.

⁴ Illustrations abound both historical and medallie.—Eckhel on the *cultus capitis* of the Augusti, Vol. viii. p. 360, states that in the interval between Augustus and Domitian the only four persons that appear to have been depicted with the *imperial crown*, besides the reigning emperors, were Claudius Drusus, L. Vitellius, Titus, and Domitian himself, previous to his accession. From after Domitian's accession however he says that it was an absolute distinctive. "Deinceps in legem abivisse ut nemo nisi Augustus laureâ præingeretur, numi luculenter docent."

Hærodian (viii. 6) illustrates the continuance of the *imperial* symbol of a *crown*, by an example of the date A.D. 238. When the Aquileians would intimate to their besiegers their acknowledgment of the senatorial emperors Maximus and Balbinus, they did so by exhibiting from the walls their portraits *crowned with laurel*.

On the other hand, as before observed in my Note ² p. 132, Spanheim notices, as common Roman medals of the æra of Trajan and the Antonines, coins in which barbarian kings are represented as receiving a *tiara*, or *diadem*, from the Roman emperor.

Similarly Dion Cassius, lxxvii. 7, tells how Domitian, in 'profession and pretence of his having the disposal of that barbarian kingdom, put the *diadem* on a *Dacian king's* envoy: τῷ Δακίῳ διαδημα ἐπέθηκε, καθάπερ ὡς ἀληθῶς κεκρατηκῶς, καὶ βασιλεῖα τινα τοῖς Δακοῖς δούναι δυναμενος.

⁵ So Gibbon, Vol. ii. p. 165.—See my Essay on this subject in the Appendix at the end of Vol. iii.

THE EMPEROR NERVA WITH THE IMPERIAL CROWN.



Æ

THE EMPEROR VALENS WITH THE ROYAL DIADEM.



Æ

man history ; and one markedly noticed, as will hereafter appear, in the Apocalypse.¹ (I append illustrative engravings.²)—Thus then about Diocletian's time, and thenceforward, *but not till then*, the diadem was the imperial badge ;—for a century or more conjointly with the laurel,³ then I believe exclusively. So that whereas, with reference to such a period as the close of the *fourth* century, it would have been an impropriety, and with reference to the *sixth* an anachronism, to represent the $\sigma\tau\epsilon\phi\alpha\nu\omicron\varsigma$, or laurel crown,⁴ as a badge of empire, on an imperial or royal head,—just as much, and indeed still more, it would have been an anachronism to represent a Roman emperor of the *first two and a half centuries* with a diadem.

Thus the objection has only led us to see the more clearly the exact chronological propriety, as well as the personal distinctiveness, of this particular emblem in the first Seal's hieroglyphic.—And I cannot but add that the very *going forth* of the Apocalyptic rider, and *presentation* of the crown to him, were yet additional points of resemblance in the symbolic picture to the imperial usages at Rome in the time of St. John. For *an emperor's going forth* to war was an occasion perpetually taken by the senate to express their good wishes, and their auguries of success, often in those cases falsified : and, in token thereof, medals were struck ; depicting the emperor galloping forth on horseback, striking down an enemy, and with the legend, *Profectio*, or, *Expediatio Augusti*.⁵ Further, supposing that success had already begun to favour him in the

¹ See my explanation of the Dragon's seven diademed heads, noted Apoc. xii. 3, in my Part iv. Ch. iv.

² In the Plate opposite, the specimens of laureated and diademed emperors given,—the one of *Nerva*, near the end of the *first* century, the other of *Valentinian* of the *fourth*,—are copied from coins in the British Museum.

³ Hence the laureated heads of the Constantinian emperors, for example, often seen on the imperial medals of that period.—But the *proper* badge of royalty was at that time understood to be the *diadem*. Thus, when Constantine's corpse lay in state, we read in Eusebius that it was arrayed in *purple* and with the *diadem*, as the royal insignia ; βασιλικοῖς κοσμοῖς, πορφύρα τε καὶ διαδήματι. De Vit. Const. iv. 66.—See my Paper on the *diadem* in the Appendix to Vol. iii ; the same to which I have already referred.

⁴ In the Apocalypse the *seven-headed dragon* with *diadems*, Apoc. xii. 3, seems used in reference to the opening of the *fourth* century ; the *ten-horned diademed Beast*, Apoc. xiii. 1, with reference to the *sixth*, or *seventh*.

⁵ " Equites Imperatores solebant Romani diverso more pro variis eorum gestis representare. Cum aliquis solito equi gradu incedit *profectio* est Augusti ; accele-

war, they had a mode of expressing the successes accomplished, as well as those that might be anticipated for the future. He was pictured, it might be, with a captive enemy prostrate at his horse's feet;¹ or else perhaps, whether on a triumphal arch, or on terra firma, as *going forth* between trophies and captives: and with Victory in either case crowning, or with crown in hand preceding him. Such e. g. is the device on a medal of the Emperor Claudius, with the exergue "De Britannis" underneath, in memorial of his conquest of Britain;² such, more fully, that on another, which depicts a triumphal arch erected to that emperor's father Claudius Drusus, after victories over the Germans:—of which latter an engraving is appended.³ And I think that after viewing it, and considering what has been also further observed respecting the *crown* and the *white horse*, the reader will deem me justified in expressing the persuasion I did in the Introduction to this Chapter;⁴ to the effect that a person conversant, like St. John, with the Roman usages of the age, could scarcely but have had suggested to his mind, *à priori*, by these emblems of the first Seal, the idea of a Roman emperor speeding forth to victory.—It is observable that medallic memorials still remain of the five several emperors in question, depicting them, more or less fully, under guise of these self-same semi-Apocalyptic devices:—the two chief conquerors Trajan and M. Aurelius *riding forth*, as in the *Profectio Augusti*; and all the five either *crowned*, or with *the crown*

rato passu ejus *expeditio*; captivum prosternens *virtus* Imperatoris; denique lento gradu *adventus* ejus in urbem." Rasche, ii. i. 724. See also Rasche on the words *Profectio Augusti*, vol. iv. pp. 175—188; and Spanheim, 705, 834.

¹ So Rasche of one of the later emperor *Caracalla's* coins, which he describes ii. i. 716; "Eques Imperator, dextram elevans, à Victoriâ volitante coronatur: ante pedes equi captivus:" &c.

² Given by Gessner, Vol. ii. Tab.^cxli: also by Ackerman, in his work on Roman medals, i. 105. The horseman in it is speeding forth between trophies on a triumphal arch. It is described too by Vaillant (Ed. 3) p. 58, and Eckhel vi. 240.

³ It is given by Gessner, ii. xlii; by Montfaucon; and by Bellori, in his *Veteres Arcus Augustorum*; (Rome, 1824;) and is supposed, as he intimates, to be the same with that still standing, though dismantled of its statuary, near the gate of S. Sebastian, or old Appian Gate. The words, "De Germanis," appear inscribed on the peristyle of the arc; and on the coin, round the head of Cl. Drusus, there is the inscription, "Nero Claudius Drusus Germanicus Imper." Compare Vaillant *ibid.* and Eckhel vi. 176.

I should observe that in the plate opposite, the Victory has been added by me, by way of illustration, from another triumphal arch, adjoining this in Montfaucon's Plate, vol. iv. p. 108. (Ed. London, 1721.) ⁴ p. 121 *suprà*.

held out to them, by Victory.¹ And in their cases, we know, the medals spoke truth; not, as in some other cases, mere false flattery.

One objection however may still present itself, one difficulty seem to stand in the way of this our imperial application of the prophetic symbol;—I mean the fact of the rider having a *bow* in hand. For the weapon represented in the hands of Roman emperors, on medals and other exant monuments of antiquity, is generally the *javelin*; sometimes the *sword*; never, so far as I know, the *bow*. And hence indeed Vitringa,—though not unconscious of the general fitness of the emblem of a *crowned rider on a white horse, going forth conquering and to conquer*, to depict the æra of prosperity and triumph under the five Roman emperors whose reigns followed next after the date of the Apocalyptic visions,²—yet argues that the bow was an *Asiatic* and *barbarian* weapon and badge; and purposely inserted in the hieroglyphic, to divert the thoughts of the observer from the Roman empire and emperors.³ In which view he has been followed by other commentators.

But is this correct? Was the *bow* a badge of Asiatic and other barbarians only? Was there not one particular province and people, among *the provincials of the Roman empire*, of whom it was also distinctive? distinctive not equally alone, but almost even more than of any barbarian people whatsoever? If the reader will consult the records of antiquity, he will find, if I mistake not, that such was indeed the case with *the island and islanders of Crete*. Alike their *colonial origin, mythological traditionary legends, military history, and manufactures*, attest this peculiar connexion of the *Cretans* and the *bow*.—As to their *origin*, it appears from ancient authors that Crete was originally peopled, in part at least,⁴ from that part of Palestine situ-

¹ See Gessner, Vaillant, Eckhel, &c. I have given notices of some of these coins in my *Vindicie*, pp. 86, 94, 98. Splendid medals exist of Trajan crowned triumphing.

² "Sub bonis et laudatis principibus à Nervà usque ad Commodum facies Romani Imperii satis fuit æquabilis, et emblemate . . . albi equi eum sessore victorioso figurari potuisset." p. 310.

³ "Emblema . . . desumptum esse ex moribus gentium Asianarum, quæ arcu in bellis utebantur, quod Romani moris non erat." p. 323. "Addo Spiritum certo consilio huic Imperatori dedisse *arcum*, non *gladium*, ut cogitationem nostram à Romanis Imperatoribus abduceret ad Christum." p. 325.

⁴ The Univ. Hist. viii. 219 (on *Crete*), while allowing Bochart's correctness in

ate on the Mediterranean coast, which was by the Arabs called *Keritha*, and by the Syrians *Creth*; its inhabitants bearing the similar Hebraic appellation *Crethim*, or, as the Seventy have translated it, Κρητες:¹—respecting which *Crethim*, Bochart adds, that they were *noted archers*, some of them employed by David as his life-guard.²—It is Sir Isaac Newton's supposition that Crete was thus peopled from Palestine about 1045 B.C., when many of the Phœnicians and Syrians fled from King David into Asia Minor, *Crete*, Greece, Libya. Others date the migration earlier.³ But, whatever the epoch, this is certain, that in Crete itself the archery habits of the Syrian *Crethim* colonists, as well as their name, remained. The earliest *traditional legends* of the Cretan islanders ascribe a similar pre-eminence in the art to those of their forefathers that were in the island native-born. It is told us by Diodorus Siculus that Apollo (the *Cretan Apollo*) was affirmed in these legends to have been the first inventor of the bow, and how he taught the natives archery; whence their superior skill in the art before and above all other men.⁴ Memorial Cretan medals of which tradition are still extant, struck in the Roman imperial times; some bearing the device of *Apollo and his bow*, some of *Diana and her bow*,⁵ with the inscription Κοινων Κρητων.⁶—Descending from the times of legendary fable

stating that some of the Philistines mingled with the Phœnicians that attended Cadmus into Crete and Greece, yet observes, not without good historic authority, that a *Pelasgian* colony had arrived in Crete before him.—But it was the Phœnician *Crethim* that gave their name to the island.

¹ So 1 Sam. xxx. 14, Ezek. xxv. 16, Zeph. ii. 5.

² See 2 Sam. viii. 18, xv. 18, xx. 23, 1 Kings i. 38, 1 Chron. xviii. 17: in all of which places the word, though in our translation rendered *Cherethites*, is in the original *Crethim*; and this word by the Chaldee Paraphrast interpreted *archers*.—In the above I have nearly copied the observations of Macknight, in his Preface to the Epistle to Titus, § 3.

³ The reader will probably be aware that Sir I. Newton's Chronology dates the early settlement of Greece some 300 or 400 years later than the more received Chronology of Usher and Playfair.

⁴ Diodorus, Lib. v. c. 74: Απολλωνα δε αναγορευουσι, ευρετην του τοξου γενομενον, διδασαι τους εγχωριους τα περι την τοξειαν αφ' ης αιτιας μαλιστα παρα τοις Κρησιν εζηλωσθαι την τοξικην.

⁵ See my Engravings. The medal with the huntress Diana is a Cretan coin of Trajan's time. Says Ovid, Fasti, iii. 81, of her worship by the Cretans,

Pallada Cecropidae, Minoia Creta Dianam.

⁶ These *κοινα* of different nations, after the establishment among them of the Roman dominion, were chiefly for the purpose of common games, and common sacred rites. So the Marmor Lyttiorum Cretæ apud Gruterum, p. 1094. 5; 'Ιερου αγωνος

THE CRETAN APOLLO AND DIANA WITH THEIR BOWS.



From a coin in the Vienna Imperial Collection.



From a coin in the British Museum.

A CRETAN BOW MAKER.



From a coin in the British Museum.

to those of real history, we find the connexion of the bow and the Cretan islanders constantly marked thenceforward for ages, in the *military annals* of the neighbouring states. Among Homer's heroes it was the Cretan Merion that bore away the palm in archery.¹ By Pindar the appellation *bowmen* was attached as a distinctive appellation to the Cretan islanders.² And Pausanias states that in those earlier historic times the Cretans *alone of all the Greeks* were archers: impugning the correctness of a piece of sculpture, which represented Diitrephes as pierced by *arrows*; his slayers being *other* Greeks, not Cretans.³ With reference to later times, Thucydides relates how in the Peloponnesian war archers were fetched by the belligerent parties from Crete:⁴—as regards those of Macedonian supremacy we are reminded of the same fact by Plutarch:⁵—and with reference to those of Roman greatness, from the Carthaginian wars down to those of Cæsar, when Crete had been made a Roman Province,⁶ and afterwards as late even as the reign of Claudius Gothicus in the 3rd century, by Polybius,⁷ Livy,⁸ Lucan,⁹ Hirtius,¹⁰ and Trebellius Pollio.¹¹ It was suggested by astronomers, in explanation of the fact of their long-continued eminence in the art, that Crete lay under the zodiacal sign of *the Archer, Sagittarius*.¹²—Moreover, the Cretan *manufacture of bows*, (not to

πενταετηρικού του Κοινου των Κρητων. See Eckhel's Chapter on the Κοινα, Vol. iv. pp. 428—431.

¹ Il. v. 880.

² He calls the Cretans τοξοφοροι, κατ' εξοχην, Pynth. Od. v. 54.

³ Τοσούτων μεν παρεστη μοι θαυμα ες την εικονα του Διτρεφους, οτι οιστοις επεβεβλητο· Ἕλλησιν, οτι μη Κρησιν, ουκ επιχωριον ον τοξενειν. De Atticis.

⁴ Lib. vi. 43.—So too his contemporary *Aristophanes*, in the *Rane*, 1356;

Αλλ' ω Κρητες, Ιδης τεκνα,
Τα τοξα λαβοντες επαμμνατε.

So also Xenophon Anab. i. 2. 9, speaking of Clearchus bringing *τοξοτας Κρητας διακοσιους*.

⁶ Crete was made a Roman Province by Q. Metellus, hence surnamed *Creticus*, B. C. 66.—To those of my readers who have visited Rome, the name of this *Metellus Creticus* will have been made familiar by the majestic sepulchral tower raised to his daughter Cecilia Metella, still standing two miles outside of the gate of S. Sebastian; and the deeply touching lines upon it in Child Harold.

⁷ Polyb. Lib. v.

⁸ Livy, Lib. xxxvii. 41, xxxviii. 21.

⁹ Lib. iii. 185.

¹⁰ Bell. Alexandr. 1.

¹¹ Vit. Claud. c. 16; "ex sagittariis Creticis sexaginta."

¹² So Manilius, Lib. iv. (Given in Meursius' Work on Crete, p. 178. Ed. Amstelod. 1675.)

Gnosia Centauro tellus circumdata ponto
Paret, et in geminum Minois filius astrum

say of *arrows* also,¹) was celebrated. No European bow was noted like theirs. The name *Cretan* in fact came to be attached as an appellative to bows;² and it was a *national device* impressed on their medals. I append one as a specimen; and subjoin the observations on the device, as a *Cretan distinctive*, of a Roman poet and German medallist.³

Under all which circumstances can I be wrong in stating that the bow was pre-eminently a *Cretan* weapon and badge; or in inferring that, when a bow was pictured emblematically before St. John in a European warrior's hands, the intention would be to signify that the warrior was of *Cretan origin*?—In fact it so happens that, over and above all the other accumulated evidence just adduced, we have extant a Greek epigram, or epitaph, consisting of a set of emblems, the *bow* inclusive, with an express explanation to this effect. A *magpie* sculptured on the tomb-stone was to mark the *loquacity* of the person whose epitaph it was; the *cup* her *proneness to drink*; the *wool* her *diligence in work*; the *bow*,—what did the *bow* mark? It is explained that this was to signify that she was a *Cretan*.⁴—I must confess that, considering the important bearing of this

Ipse venit geminus: celeres huic Creta sagittas
Asserit, intentosque imitatur sideris arcus.

¹ So Plutarch, in his Life of Pyrrhus, *Κρητικῶ βελεῖ πηληγεις*; and Manilius in the verses just cited, “celeris huic Creta sagittas asserit.”

² So in the passage above cited from Diodorus Siculus; which after *μαλιστα παρα τοις Κρησιν εξηλωσθαι την τοξικην*, adds, *Και το τοξον Κρητικον ονομασθηναι*. For I think of the correctness of Bochart's and Wesseling's correction of *Κρητικον* for *Σκυθητικον* little doubt can be entertained. See Wesseling's Note. So too, says Wesseling, Pollux (i. 149) speaks of the *τοξον Κρητικον*.

³ Eckhel, ii. 309, after describing a medal of Cydonia, in Crete, in the reverse of which a man is represented as manufacturing a *bow* before a fire, says; “In this there seems to me an allusion to the celebrated skill of the Cretans in preparing bows:” and he quotes Claudian's lines,

“Quis labor humanus tantum ratione sagaci
Proficit? excipiunt trucibus Gortynia capris
Carnua: subjectis eadem lentescere cogunt
Ignibus; intendunt taurino viscere nervos.”

Others however explain the figure as *Cydon*, founder of Cydonia, *stringing* his bow.

⁴ I refer to the epigram on *Bitthis*, by Antipater, a Greek poet of Sidon, who flourished about a century before Christ; given in Brunck's *Anthologia Græca*, (Argentor. 1776,) Tom. ii. p. 31.

Ταν μεν αι πολυμυθον, αι λαλον, ω ξενη κισσα
Φαιε ταν δε μεθας συντροφον ήδε κυλιξ.
ΤΑΝ ΚΡΗΣΣΑΝ ΔΕ ΤΑ ΤΟΞΑ· τα δ' ειρια ταν φιλοεργον'
Ανδεμα δ' αυ μιτρας ταν πολιοκροταφον'
Τοιανδε σταλουργος οδ' εκρυφε Βιτιτιδα τυμβος,
Τιμελου αχραντον νυμφιδιαν αλοχον. ...

point on the commencement, and consequently on the whole scheme of Apocalyptic interpretation, it has seemed to me a matter for thankfulness that so illustrative an epigram should have been preserved to us.

But what the application of all this, the reader may be thinking, to the point in hand? or how the sense that we have inferred to attach to the emblem of a bow to connect itself with the hieroglyphic of the first Seal, and its imperial horseman riding on to triumph? I now proceed to show this.—It is well known then that, down to the accession of Otho, the reigning Cæsars, from Julius to Galba inclusive, were of old Roman families. Agreeably with the Roman *jus imaginum*,¹ they exhibited in each of their halls the busts of a long line of Roman nobles, their ancestors,—whether of the *Julian* gens, the *Claudian*, or the *Sulpician*.² And as for *Otho*, *Vitellius*, *Vespasian*, and Vespasian's two sons *Titus* and *Domitian*, if not all of Roman, yet they were of *Italian* extraction; and indeed Otho of an Italian family still more ancient and noble than all the rest; for he was descended from the Etruscan kings.³—But after Domitian, there was a notable change on this head in the character of the imperial succession. It is said to have been pre-intimated in a dream, a little before his death, to Domitian. He dreamt, says Suetonius, that a *neck of gold* appeared to grow branching off from his own neck behind:⁴

¹ See Dr. Smith's Dictionary (Art. Nobiles), or Adams, on the *Jus imaginum*.

² The *Julian* line of emperors was extended by successive adoptions down to *Claudius* of the *Claudian* gens, who adopted Nero. Galba was of the *Sulpician* gens. See Tacitus Hist. i. 15.—Suetonius on Galba, c. 3, says: "*Imagines et elogia universi generis [Sulpicii] exsequi longum est: familiæ [Galbæ] breviter attingam.*" A subject illustrated in Tacitus' account of the funeral of Tiberius' son Drusus, Annal. iv. 9.

³ So Suetonius Vit. Othon. i; "*Majores Othonis orti sunt oppido Ferentino, familiâ vetere et honoratâ, atque ex principibus Etruriæ.*"—Respecting *Vitellius* the same historian says (Vit. Vitell. ch. 1) that it was a disputed point whether he was of noble or of base ancestry. But it was Italian. So Eckhel, i. 105, speaking of Samnium, observes: "*Certè gens Vitellia, ex quâ prognatus erat Vitellius Augustus, ex Sabinis Romam antiquitus profecta est: eum subinde quidam Vitelliorum, belli Samnitici tempore, præsidio Româ in Apuliam misso, deinceps subsiderent Nuceriæ, et longo post intervallo repeterent urbem, ut refert Suetonius.*"—Of *Vespasian's* ancestry Suetonius speaks as connected with the neighbourhood of *Reate* "*in Sabinis*;" the gens *Flavia* being however "*obscura quidem, et sine ullis majorum imaginibus.*"

⁴ "*Ipsum Domitianum ferunt somniasse gibbam sibi pone cervicem auream enatam; pro certoque habuisse beatiorum post se latiorumque portendi statum Reip. Sicut sane brevi evenit, abstinentiâ et moderatione insequentium Principum.*" Suetonius in Domit. § 23.—"Domitian dreamed, the night before he was slain, that

that which so *branched off* implying a new line of emperors; and the *gold* their character as introducers of a golden age. Another historian, Aurelius Victor, expressly sets forth the novel character of this line as a fact very remarkable, in respect of its being one of princes of *foreign extraction*: “Hitherto men of *Roman* or *Italian origin* ruled the empire; from after this time *foreigners in extraction*.”¹ In which statement he is followed, indeed copied, by the younger Victor:² and they both note at the same time the increased happiness that accrued to the empire from the innovation.—And what then the foreign country, or province, to which the five emperors might be ascribed, as to lineage and family, that followed next after Domitian, and introduced and kept up this golden age of the empire? Prior to which question another must indeed first be answered; Can they all be classed together under *one and the same* head and family? The answer to which latter question is, that they may be so classed together; because, in a manner quite unparalleled in the subsequent history of the Roman emperors, they were all connected, as in the line of one and the same family, by successive adoptions. Trajan was adopted by Nerva, Hadrian by Trajan,³ Anto-

a golden head was growing out of the nape of his neck; and indeed the succession that followed him for many years made golden times.” So the great Lord Bacon translates, and comments on Suetonius, in his Essay on Prophecies.

¹ “Hactenus Romæ seu per Italiam orti imperium rexere; hinc advenæ. Nescio quoque an (Qu. annon?), ut in Prisco Tarquinio, longè meliores. At mihi quidem audienti multa legentique planè compertum urbem Romam *externorum* virtute, atque *insitivis* artibus, præcipuè crevisse. Quid enim Nervâ,” &c. Aurel. Victor, Vita Domit. ad fin.

It should be clearly understood that in the expression, “Romæ aut per Italiam orti,” Victor refers not to the *birthplace* of the individuals spoken of, but to their *ancestral origin*. As regards *birthplace*, two out of the twelve Cæsars that preceded Nerva were born out of Italy: viz. *Claudius* at Lyons, as Suetonius tells us; and *C. Caligula* in the camp near Treves. At least such is Victor’s own view of Caligula’s birthplace, (“natus in exercitu,”) as well as that of Tacitus, Annal. i. 41; whence, he adds, his name *Caligula*.

² “Hactenus Romæ seu per Italiam orti imperium rexere; hinc advenæ. Unde compertum est urbem Romam *externorum* virtute crevisse. Quid enim Nervâ prudentius aut moderatius? Quid Trajano divinius? Quid præstantius Adriano?”

³ After Hadrian’s accession two reports prevailed, as we learn from Dion Cassius, Spartian, and other historians, about this emperor’s adoption by Trajan: *one* that Trajan really adopted him very shortly before his death; the *other* that the adoption was falsely asserted by Trajan’s wife Plotina, and in forged letters of adoption, as by Trajan’s order, sent by her to the Senate. In my *Vindicia*, pp. 111—113, I have fully discussed the existing historical evidence on the question, and given reasons for my own decided leaning to the former. One thing however is certain; viz. that both the Roman Senate and people recognised the adoption as valid, and in consequence accepted Hadrian as emperor.—The other three adoptions were unquestioned.

ninus by Hadrian, Aurelius by Antoninus:—each, as their medals and other extant memorials of antiquity illustrate to us, taking the name of his predecessor in virtue of the adoption.¹ Thus, according to the well-defined Roman law of adoption,² all were reckoned as of *Nerva's* family; he being the head of the line.—And what *Nerva's* own national origin and extraction? In Dion Cassius we find what is evidently an allusion to him, as an *Italiot*; ³ which word will by a reader versed in the Greek language be well understood to mean a *colonist of Greek extraction*, settled in Italy.⁴ His exact Greek provincial origin, however, he does not mention. But Aurelius Victor supplies the omission.

In Bonanni's Numism. Pontif. Tom. i. p. 207, is given the Inscription on the famous equestrian bronze statue of M. Aurelius in the Capitol at Rome; which similarly notes his relationship of son, grandson, great-grandson, and great-great-grandson, to the four preceding emperors respectively.—Also two others to the same effect will be found in Canina's Foro Romano, pp. 192, 193. Similar in effect to which is another, found on an ancient stone at Milan, to L. Verus, the *adopted brother of M. Aurelius*; given by Montfaucon in his Supplement; Antiq. of Italy, p. 18.

Once more Clinton, Fasti Romani, ad A.D. 165, gives from Gruter the Inscription following, found on a marble near Verona, and connected with some votive statue to M. Aurelius by the Benacenses, or inhabitants by the Lake of Garda, which thus records the relationship:

Imp. Cæsari Aug. Antonini Pii fil.
Divi Hadriani Nep. Divi Trajani Parthici Pronep.
Divi Nervæ Abnep.
M. Aurelio Antonino Aug. Armeniaco
Pont. Max. Trib. Pot. xviii, Imp. ii, Cos. iii,
Benacenses.

¹ Alike in histories, medals, and marbles, we find Trajan called *Nerva Trajan*, Hadrian called *Trajan Hadrian*, Antoninus Pius called *Ælius Hadrian Antoninus*, and M. Aurelius called *M. Aurelius Antoninus*. So Tacitus Agric. 3; Capitolinus Vit. Anton. Philos. 1, 5, 7; Vaillant, pp. 126, 141, 165, 171, 176; &c. See the citations in my *Vindiciæ*, p. 115.

² "The effect of *adoption* was to create the legal relation of father and son, just as if the adopted son were born of the blood of the adoptive father in lawful marriage. The adopted child was entitled to the *name* and *saera privata* of the adopting parent." Smith's Dict. of Antiquities in voc. Adoption.—This is well illustrated in the address of Galba to Piso, when adopting him, given in Tacitus, Hist. i. 15.

³ He says, lxxviii. 4, that Trajan was the first emperor that was *αλλοιθνης*, or altogether foreign; being of purely Spanish parentage, always settled in Spain, besides that he was himself born out of Italy: also how Nerva did not overlook his merits, because he was thus *Spanish*, and neither an *Italian* nor an *Italiot*, *ὅτι Ἰβηρὸς Τραιανος, ἀλλ' οὐκ Ἰταλὸς οὐδ' Ἰταλιωτῆς*: i. e. not *Italian*, as all the former emperors except *Nerva*; nor *Italiot*, as Nerva himself. The allusion is plain. Compare Aurelius Victor before quoted.

⁴ So Ammonius distinguishes between *Ἰταλός* and *Ἰταλιωτῆς*, *Σικελός* and *Σικελιωτῆς*. *Ἰταλοὶ καὶ Ἰταλιῶται διαφέρουσι. Ἰταλοὶ μὲν γὰρ οἱ ἀρχηθέν χωρὰν οἰκονῦντες Ἰταλιῶται δὲ ὅποσοι τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐπωκῆσαν μετὰ ταῦτα. Το αὐτο καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν Σικελιωτῶν.* He is quoted to this effect by Reimar on the passage in Dion Cassius. So too the Scholiast on Thucydides v. 5; Duker ibid. iv. 58, 64; and also Matthiæ in his Greek Grammar, § 103, on *Nomina Gentilia*. Reimar illustrates by a quotation from Lucian; who, speaking of Pythagoras, says; *Ἰταλιωτῆς ἔοικε τις εἶναι, τῶν ἀμφὶ Κρωτῶνα καὶ Ταραντα καὶ τὴν ταυτῆ Ἑλλάδα.*

He tells us,¹ (and most of our best-known modern historians of the earlier emperors of Rome repeat the statement,²) that Nerva was, in respect of family extraction, a *Cretan*.³

Yes! the meaning of the bow in the rider's hand is now indeed manifest. And how admirable, beyond what the most learned of human artists or scholars would have devised, appears the point and the comprehensiveness of this device of the Divine Spirit! Had a *javelin* or a *sword* been in the hand of the rider, so as Vitringa would have had it, in case of his representing Roman emperors, the weapon carried would have added precisely nothing either to the meaning or the distinctness of the hieroglyphic: the *crown* sufficing to designate emperors; and the javelin and the sword, although appropriate, not being distinctive of them. But by the addition of the *bow* (the *bow* held in hand, observe, before the *crown* was given him) there was prefigured the very *provincialism* of the family to which (first of any families not of Italian origin) the empire within a year from after the visions in Patmos was destined to be committed: and under which, in a measure quite unprecedented, the symbolic horse was to assume and to retain the *white* colour; the Roman nation to flourish in prosperity; and in its wars, both at first and whenever afterwards occurring, to realize the predicted destiny of conquering and to conquer.⁴

¹ The passage from *Victor Aurelius* quoted p. 144 Note ¹ *suprà*, goes on, "Quid enim Nervà *Cretensi* prudentius?"

² So, for example, *Tillemont*, ad ann. 96: "Nerva etoit originaire de Crete par ses ancetres, mais né a Narni dans l'Ombrie. C'est le premier empereur qui ne fut pas Romain ou Italien d'origine." And so too, after him, *Crevier*.

Again the *Ancient Univ. Hist.* Vol. xv. p. 104: "Nerva was a native of Narni in Umbria; but his family came originally from *the island of Crete*: so that he was neither by birth a Roman, nor descended from an Italian family."

And the *Encyclopædia Metropolitana*, Art. *Nerva Augustus*: "The *Flavian* family left the throne of Augustus to the descendant of a *Cretan colonist*."

On an interesting *medallic* illustration and corroboration of this fact, see my Appendix to this Volume, No. 4.

³ Nerva's great-grandfather would seem to have been the first of his ancestry that was dignified by Roman honours; he having been consul U. C. 718, some 35 years before the Christian æra. See *Tillemont* *ibid.* But this settlement of the family in Italy would not prevent the memorial being kept up of its early *Cretan* origin. Compare the parallel case of the Emperor Hadrian. He had in like manner a great-grandfather, ennobled, first of the family, as senator at Rome. Yet in a memoir of himself he tells of his ancestral origin as *Spanish*. See *Spartian's Hadrian*, c. 1.

⁴ St. John, as *Irenæus* tells us, (B. iii. ad init.) "lived to the times of Trajan;"

CHAPTER II.

THE SECOND SEAL.

THE second Seal is opened; and behold, on the second living creature's voice like thunder, the *white* horse has past from view, that symbol of the Roman nation in joyous prosperity and triumph: and another, a *red* horse, passes over the scene before the eyes of the Evangelist; depicting it¹ under the different colour of war and bloodshed.² But what the kind of bloodshed? The explanatory words that were added defined it to be that of *civil* war:—"There went forth another horse, *red*;³ and to him who sate thereon it was given to take peace [*την ειρηνην*, the peace left by the former seal]⁴ from the [Roman] earth, and that *they should kill one another*."—And whose the *causal agency* in the matter? It was indicated to be those whose fitting and distinctive badge was the *sword-bearing*: "And there was given unto him [the rider] *a great sword*."⁵

and so was himself a living witness of the commencing fulfilment of the Apocalyptic prophecy. In like manner the similarly beloved and favoured Daniel lived to see the destruction of Babylon, and Cyrus' supremacy and decree for the Jews' restoration; and in those events the commencing fulfilment of the prophecies of the future revealed to him.

¹ It has been objected by Mr. Faber that the horse being *αλλος ιππος*, *another* horse, it ought to designate another and different nation or empire, from that symbolized by the horse of the 1st Seal. But in Gen. xli. 3, 19, we read of seven fat kine first appearing in vision, and then afterwards seven *other* lean kine. Yet the latter, we know, depicted the cattle not of another land than Egypt, but of the same land, only in a new and different state. Compare too 1 Sam. x. 6.

² Πυρρος, *fiery*; or, as it is often explained, *bloody*. So Hermas (B. i. Vision iv. chap. iii.) "The *fiery and bloody* colour;" and Epiphanius on the sardine stone in the Apocalyptic vision, Πυρωπος τη ειδει και αιματοειδης.

The epithet might be explained either actively or passively. In Hesiod's description of Mars, Αιματι φοινικοις ωσπε ζωνος εναριζων, (Scut. Herc. 194,) it has an active force, significative of the *blood-shedder*. Elsewhere it is used passively, or neutrally, of the persons whose blood has been shed. So I conceive here, after the analogy of the other Seals. Thus Christian confessors who witnessed unto blood were called *rubri*. Maitland's Catacombs, p. 83.

³ The special colour of the horse sacred to Mars: "*russeum* [equum] Marti consecraverunt." Tertull. de Spectac. c. 9.

⁴ When peace (*ειρηνη*) is meant in the abstract, or without speciality of reference, it is usually without the article. So e. g. Matt. x. 34, "Think not that I came βαλειν ειρηνην, to send peace, &c.;" and in many other passages, which the reader will find on turning to a Greek Concordance.

⁵ Και οτε ηνοιξε την σφραγιδα την δευτεραν, ηκουσα του δευτερου ζωνος λεγοντος, Ερχου. Και εξηλθεν αλλος ιππος, πυρρος και τη καθημενη επ'

We ask, then, was there any strongly marked new æra of change, accordant with this ~~figuration~~, in the history of the Roman empire, following next after the æra of the first Seal, and through such a causal agency?—These are on this head our two points of inquiry.

1. As to the *former* let us turn, as before, to Gibbon for an answer. And, on consulting his pages, what find we? We find the bright period above-described,—a period including, as we have seen, the triumphant peace made with the Germans after Aurelius' death by his son Commodus, and the first few years of Commodus' reign following, in which he governed well while acting, “as by a kind of tradition,” on his father's principles and arrangements,¹—we find this period, I say, followed in his narrative—by what? Just by the breaking up of the state of national prosperity and peace, (correspondently with our prophetic figuration,) through the evil, not of *foreign* invasion, but of *civil* wars, revolution, and bloodshedding: an evil begun to be prepared immediately after 185, as we shall presently see, by the mal-administration of Commodus; and which outbroke in violence A.D. 193, on the assassination of that emperor.² From which epoch it still continued, with scarce more than two intervals of intermission, some eighty or ninety years onward, even until the accession of Diocletian: having however, in the course of this long period, been joined and aggravated by certain fresh evils, internal and external, at two well-defined intervening epochs; of which aggravations more in my two next ensuing Chapters, as being the subjects of the third and fourth Seals respectively.³

It may be well to glance in rapid view at the detail, for the first fifty or sixty years at least after his death, of these civil wars, and mutual attendant slaughters.—The immedi-

αυτον εδοθη αυτω λαβειν την ειρηνην εκ της γης, και ινα αλληλους σφαξουσι και εδοθη αυτω μαχαιρα μεγαλη.

¹ So Niebuhr, in his Lectures on Roman History, (Schmitz' Ed.) ii. 289.

² The epoch is noted by Montesquieu, as well as Gibbon: also by Schlegel in his Philosophy of History, and Heeren, Denina, and Sismondi; as will appear from subsequent notices in this chapter.

³ The *overrunning* of one element of evil, prefigured in one vision, into the periods of others figuring other fresh evils, is what I intimated at p. 122 Note ¹, as a thing reasonably to be expected; and which indeed in real life perpetually happens. In Ireland in 1847 the *famine* did not cease when the *pestilence* began.

ate sequel then of Commodus' assassination just mentioned, was the elevation of Pertinax to the Imperial throne, and within a month or two after, his murder :¹ then the setting up of Julian as his successor, and the civil wars consequent, prolonged for four years, and ranging from East to West over the extent of the empire, through which the elder Severus fought his way to the throne ; a throne established on the defeat and slaughter successively of the three rival emperors, Julian, Niger, and Albinus.²—Next, after an interval of repose throughout the remainder of Severus' reign, wherein, however, “ although the wounds of *civil war* appeared healed, yet its mortal poison still lurked in the vitals of the constitution,”³ and indeed, by Severus' aggrandizement of the causal agency of the evil, (of which more presently,) a preparation was made for all its subsequent aggravation,—next after this, I say, followed the murder of his one son and successor, Geta, by the other, Caracalla, and soon after (though not till Caracalla had introduced into the empire the principle of the added evil, as we shall see hereafter, of the *third* seal) that of the latter by Macrinus, in the camp of Carrhæ by the Euphrates :⁴ then, and in consequence, the civil war which crushed Macrinus, and raised Elagabalus to the throne :⁵ then Elagabalus' assassination at Rome :⁶ then,—after a second interval of partial, and but partial repose, during the thirteen years of the reign of his successor the second Severus,⁷—the murder of that well-intentioned prince in the camp by the Rhine :⁸ then the civil wars raised against his murderer and successor Maximin, wherein those two emperors of a day, the Gordians, father and son, perished in Africa,⁹ and Maximin himself, and his son, fell by assassination in the siege of Aquileia :¹⁰ then the murder at Rome of the two joint emperors Maximus and Balbinus next set up by the Senate ;¹¹ and, quickly after, that of their associate in the empire, the third and youngest Gordian, on the banks of a river of other and holier associations, the river Chaboras :¹² then the slaughter

¹ Gibbon, i. 165.² Ib. 183—195.³ Ib. 198.⁴ Gibbon, i. 214, 222.⁵ Ib. 231.⁶ Ib. 240.⁷ See p. 154 *infra*.⁸ Gibbon, i. 276.⁹ Ib. 289.¹⁰ Ib. 299.¹¹ Ib. 305.¹² Ib. 309.—It was by the same river Chaboras, or Chabor, that Ezekiel saw some of the most glorious of his visions. Ezek. i. 1, x. 15, &c.

of the next emperor Philip, the last that I shall particularize, together with his son and associate in the empire, in a battle near Verona; which, in the year A.D. 249, as above mentioned, decided the civil war between himself and Decius.¹—Can the history of any empire on record present in any other sexagenarian period such an exemplification of ~~what the Apocalyptic prophecy before us pre-figured~~; viz, peace being taken from the empire, and men in it killing one another?—Much more would the case seem unparalleled, were we, like Sismondi, to trace the evil some twenty or thirty years yet further forward; after it had been conjoined and aggravated by the fresh evil of wars of *foreign invading foes*: a subject which belongs however more properly to our *fourth Seal*. It may suffice here to give in brief his more extended summary. Says he; “With Commodus’ death commenced the third and most calamitous period. . . It lasted ninety-two years, from 192 to 284. During that time thirty-two emperors, and twenty-seven pretenders to the empire, alternately hurled each other from the throne by incessant civil warfare. . . . Ninety-two years of nearly incessant civil warfare taught the world on what a frail foundation the virtue of the Antonines had reared the felicity of the empire.”²

2. Next, what *the causal agency*?—And, in a general way, the Apocalyptic symbol seemed to designate it as *the military*; the rider of the red horse having, it is said, *a great sword given him*. For the sword was a natural, a nearly universal, and in St. John’s time well-recognised and distinctive badge among the Romans, of the military profession:³ while its strange and unnaturally large size in the

¹ Gibbon, i. 386.

² Sismondi’s “Fall of the Roman Empire,” vol. i. 37. (Lardner’s Ed.)

³ So Statius, Domitian’s contemporary and friend, in his *Silvæ*, v. 2. 177, thus addresses the young Crispinus, on his first receiving from the emperor a commission in the army; “Felix cui primum tradit Germanicus ensem.” an expression the same in sense as that in verse 165, “qui aquilas tibi nunc et castra recludit.” See Barthe’s Note on the passage; who speaks of it as agreeable to the Roman custom in those times, “ut nemo sua, sed Principis aut militaris alicujus Præfecti auctoritate, gladium cingat.” I say in those times. For under the emperors the law of military service was quite different from what it had been under the Republic, when every Roman citizen was expected to be a soldier. (See Smith’s Dict. of Antiq. Art. *Exercitus*, p. 507.) Thus Dion Cass. lxxvii. 15, speaks of Parthenius having been so honoured by Domitian *ὡσεὶ καὶ ξιφηφορεῖν*.

Apocalyptic figure¹, indicated further an *undue authority* now given to, and *undue and unnatural use* made of it.² Precisely accordant with which appears the fact, on the very surface of history, as to the origin of the sad events we speak of: the causal agent of the civil insurrections and bloodshed being, as Sismondi and others state,³ from first to last *military men* in power; those whose vocation was war, whose weapon the sword, and who by the sword rose, and by the sword fell.—The manner in which, throughout the favoured period of our *first* Seal, the license of the soldiery was restrained, and its mighty power kept in subordination to the magistrate, and used only in defence of the country and of order, is one of the chief topics of praise attaching to the great emperors of the second century. Then the law was supreme, the sword of the army its enforcer, the civil magistracy sustained in their functions, the Senate's high

Let me also give the following from Pitiscus' Lexicon Antiq. Roman. on the word *gladius*. "Nemini præter militibus *gladio* moribus Romanis licebat *incedere*:" "et his concessum fuisse existimo eos qui milites non essent, tali aliquo cinetos prodire visos, exarmare." In proof of which latter statement he adduces the following passage from Petronius, ch. 42. "Hæc locutus *gladio* cingor latus, mox in publicum prosilio. . . . Notavit me miles: et, *Quid tu*, inquit, *commilito*. *Ex quâ legione es, aut cujus centuriæ?* Cum constantissimè et centurionem et legionem essem ementitus, *Age ergo*, inquit ille; *in exercitu vestro phæcasiati milites ambulant?* Cum deinde vultu atque ipsâ trepidatione mendacium prodidisset, me ponere arma jussit." (Petronius, I may observe, was a writer in the reign of the Emperor Gordian; and consequently of the period of the second Apocalyptic Seal.)—To much the same effect is Eckhel's notice (vi. 310, 311) of the *parazonium*, or sword short enough for keeping in the ζωνη or belt, and frequently depicted as held in the hand on Roman coins. "Certissime possumus hoc aut prædicari virtutem, aut *militare in alios imperium*." He cites Martial on the *parazonium*:

Militiæ decus hoc, et grati nomen honoris:

Arma tribunicium cingere digna latus.

¹ The word *μαχαίρα* here used means properly a *small* sword; such as in fact the Roman sword was, in comparison of that of various other nations. Hence in the figure, of a *great* *μαχαίρα* a something of unnatural or illegitimate size seems indicated.

² So Sophocles in his *Antigone*, v. 127; *Ζεὺς γὰρ μέγα ληγὴς γλωσσῆς κομπῶς ὑπερεχθαίρει* an undue, improper, and largely boastful use of the tongue being indicated by the figurative phrase *a large tongue*.

³ So Sismondi, in the extract partially given by me in the preceding page:—"The third and most calamitous period; that which we have characterized as the period of *upstart soldiers of fortune* who usurped the imperial power. It lasted 92 years, &c."

So too Heeren, speaking of Commodus' assassination; "This was the commencement of that dreadful *military despotism*, which forms the ruling character of all this period." *Manual of History*, p. 434. (Engl. Transl.)—And again *Montesquieu*, (Grand. et Decad. ch. 16,) who thus contrasts this and the preceding æra. "La sagesse de Nerva, la gloire de Trajan, la valeur d'Adrien, la vertu des deux Antonins, se firent respecter des soldats. Mais lorsque de nouveaux monstres prirent leur place, l'*abus du gouvernement militaire* parut dans tout son excès; et les soldats qui avoient vendu l'empire assassinèrent les empereurs: &c."

authority recognised; and, as regards the Imperial dignity itself, the *choice* left with the Senate, the approval only with the armies.¹—But with *Commodus* began the fatal change. It may be first dated from the epoch of his exalting Perennis, commander of the Prætorian Guards, and then Cleander his successor, to despotic authority at Rome and in the state; not without military insurrections, civil strife, and bloodshedding, even then as its accompaniments.² Indeed this seems well to answer to the figure of a great sword being put into the hand of the rider of the second Apocalyptic horse.—Next, as to the immediate effect of the murder of Commodus by the Prefect Lætus,³ and the Prætorians' consequent sale of the empire, as their right, it was not merely, according to the prophecy, "to take peace" on that occasion "from the earth," and cause "men's killing one another," but also to manifest in a way never to be forgotten the supremacy of what Gibbon, writing on the precise subject, in very illustrative language calls "the power of the sword:"⁴ and so to inculcate on both themselves and their fellow-soldiers on the frontiers, the lesson of improving that supremacy to their own advantage.—And then, after the civil wars between the several rival armies, which by almost necessary consequence thereupon followed, and the establishment of the chief of the successful one, *S. Severus*, on the throne, what the policy of that emperor, during the remaining 13 or 14 undisturbed years of his reign? It was directed,—not, as in the age of the Antonines, to the curbing of the license of the military, and restoring the Senate and the civil magistracy to their proper station, authority, and independence; but to the riveting upon the empire, and strengthening, and perpetuating of the system of pure military despotism. The licentious Prætorians that overawed Rome were quadrupled.⁵ The

¹ "The emperor was elected by *the authority* of the Senate, and the consent of the soldiers." Gibbon i. 118. "These words," he adds in a Note, "seem to have been the constitutional language:" referring to Tacit. Ann. xiii. 4.—See too Montesquieu in the Note preceding.

² I must beg to refer the reader to my sketch of Commodus' reign, after Perennis' elevation, in this point of view, in my *Vindiciæ*, pp. 123—130.

³ Conjectively with Marcia and Electus.

⁴ Gibb. i. 167. This is on the opening of his Chapter about the Prætorians' public sale of the empire, after the assassination of Commodus.

⁵ In a Letter still extant he himself complains of their license. Gibb. i. 199.

prime ministry of state, with authority over the whole civil as well as military administration, was attached by him systematically and *de jure*, as it had been by Commodus *de facto*, to the Prætorian Præfecture: an office which thenceforward consequently, as it has been remarked by Montesquieu and Denina, came yet more to resemble that of a Turkish Grand Visier;¹ and in which, for seven out of those fourteen years, Plautian made Rome tremble.² The Senate he despised and degraded, nor would allow of any such "intermediate power between himself and his army."³ And true in death, as in life, to the system, he bequeathed his maxim of ruling by the sword, as the one grand principle of government, to his son Caracalla; "Enrich the soldiery; despise the people:"⁴—a maxim well remembered and acted on by Caracalla; and which soon issued, as might have been anticipated, in a succession of revolutions, civil wars, and imperial murders, worse even than before.⁵ Says Gibbon; "The dissolute tyranny of Commodus, the civil wars occasioned by his death, and the new maxims too of policy introduced by the house of Severus, *all* contributed to increase the dangerous power of the army."⁶ So that, in fine, the civil wars, murders, and insurrections *before* Severus' accession, must be viewed as connected in one with those *after his death*, by his use of

¹ Montesquieu, *ibid.* ch. 16 and 17; Denina *Rivoluzioni d'Italia*, Book iii. c. 3.—Denina's primary date, like my own, is from the increase of the power of the Prætorian Præfect *de facto* by Commodus, A.D. 185. "Allora," he says, "la Præfectura Prætoriana cominciò à comprendere, come di propria ragione, tutta l'amministrazione dell'impero, così civile che militare, come il *gran Visirato* appresso gli imperatori Ottomani." Severus attached this power to them *de jure*.—Gibbon dwells much on the increase of their power by Sept. Severus, who augmented the numbers of the Prætorians from 16,000 to 50,000. Vol. i. p. 200. Also Vol. iii. 42; "From the reign of Severus to that of Diocletian the guards and the palace, the laws and the finances, the armies and the provinces were entrusted to their (the Prætorian Præfects') care; and, like the Viziers of the East, they held with one hand the seal, with the other the standard of the empire."

² See the sketch given of Plautian's administration in Dion Cassius, lxxv. 14—16, lxxvi. 2; or its abstract in my *Vindiciæ*, pp. 135, 136. I must indeed particularly beg the reader, who would fully satisfy himself on this part of the history, to refer to one or the other,—the original or the abstract. See also Gibbon i. 200.

³ Gibbon, i. 201.

⁴ *Τους στρατιωτας πλουτιζετε, των αλλων παντων καταφρονηετε.* Dion Cass. lxxvi. 15.

⁵ Montesquieu, *Grand. et Decad.* c. 16. He thus contrasts the nature and the results of Adrian's and Severus' policy respecting the soldiery. "Des deux grands empereurs, Adrien et Severe, l'un établit la discipline militaire, et l'autre la relâche. Les effets répondirent aux causes. Les regnes qui suivirent celui d'Adrien furent heureux et tranquilles: après Severe on vit regner toutes les horreurs." ⁶ i. 254.

the intervening thirteen or fourteen years for the aggrandizement of that which was the *causal agency* of both: in other words, (reverting to the Apocalyptic figure,) by his enlargement of the sword in the hand of the mystic rider of the red horse, in order to his more effectually carrying out the destiny assigned him, "to take peace from the earth, and that men should kill one another."—As to the younger Severus' ineffective efforts at reform, they did but aggravate the evil they were intended to cure. The army murdered him.¹—And then what next? Says Montesquieu of the state of things immediately following; "What in that age was called the Roman empire was a kind of irregular republic, not unlike the aristocracy of Algiers, where the militia, possessed of the sovereignty, creates and deposes a magistrate styled a Dey. . . . What was the emperor, except the minister of a violent government, elected for the private benefit of the soldiers? . . . The army exercised the supreme magistracy."² And Sismondi; "The sovereignty had passed into the hands of the legions."³

In a state of things like this it was to be expected, of course, that it would be for the most part the *commander* of one or another army that would be put forward as its candidate for the imperial office; and, if successful, constitute the representative and impersonation, for the time being, of the military dominancy. Such in fact was the case very generally in the Roman civil wars of the century between Commodus and Diocletian. Instead of their arising out of strife between members of previously reigning royal families, on questions of disputed succession, so as most of the civil wars noted in the histories of modern Europe,⁴ it is the generals of Roman armies that figure most prominently on the arena of strife; whether as the nominees of the Prætorians, or of some other army.—And perhaps this very class of persons may be judged to have been specially indicated in the Apocalyptic figuration: considering the facts both of the sword-bearer there exhibited being depicted as

¹ See Gibbon i. 249: also Dion Cass. lxxx. 2, 4.

² Grand. et Decad. e. 16, 17.

³ p. i. 37.

⁴ So e. g. in the case of the long-continued wars of the rival roses in England.

on horseback, and moreover the presentation of the sword as made to him apparently *in public*. For, when thus solemnly acted out before the Roman world, the presentation of a sword, (which might otherwise have been simply a general designation of the military profession,) implied that there was to be the *official bearing* of it: and this bearing of it signified, not the mere general military duty of wielding it against the foe, but the right of *judicially using* it; (the *jus gestandi*, as the Roman law expressed it, implying and signifying in such case the *jus exercendi*:¹) and this against *military* criminals, as well as *citizens*.—For, it is to be observed, there was long a distinction² between the *sword-badge*, thus worn by the one functionary now spoken of, and the *axe* carried by lictors before another. The latter symbolized power over the lives of Roman *citizens* only, the former over the lives of Roman *soldiers*;³ whether distinctively, or conjointly with the civil judicial power also. The emperors themselves, of course, by their *imperatoria potestas*, as first established under Augustus, and perpetuated under succeeding emperors, had in its fullest sense the *power of the sword*, including all capital jurisdiction, both military and civil:⁴ and, in token of it, they were wont to wear about them the badge I speak of, a *small sword*; whether borne in hand, in front, or at the side.⁵ They esteemed the military part of the authority it symbolized as one of their highest imperial prerogatives. And so jealous were they of it, that for Rome itself and Italy⁶ they delegated the power to but one individual, viz. the

¹ So the old rule is exprest in Justinian's later Digest of Roman Law, Lib. i. Tit. 18. 6.

² In the 4th century the legal phrase *jus gladii* had become a less distinctivo one; being then applied sometimes to supreme jurisdiction, with power of life and death, merely over *citizens*. The *sword-badge* however continued to be still *military*.

³ See Note ⁴ p. 156 for illustration.

⁴ See Gibbon i. 102, with the context.

⁵ In Montfaucon, iv. 11, Augustus is sketched with one. So Suetonius of Galba, c. 11; "Iter ingressus est paludatus, ac dependente à cervicibus pugione ante pectus:" and of Vitellius, c. 15, "Solutum à latere pugionem consuli primum, deinde illo recusante magistratibus, ac mox senatoribus singulis porrigens, nullo recipiente, quasi in æde Concordiæ positurus abscessit." This was on his abjuring the imperial office; and is noted, with an explanatory remark, by Tacitus also, Hist. iii. 68; "Adsistenti consuli exsolutum à latere pugionem, *velut jus necis vitæque civium*, reddebat."

⁶ So Dion Cass. liii. 13 says of Augustus; τα ονοματα το τε του στρατηγου και το του υπατου εν τη Ιταλια ετηρησε. And as the Prætorian Prefect was the acting *delegate* of this his important power in Rome, so I presume for all Italy also; there being within Italy no other delegate.

commander or Præfect of their own Prætorian guard, in the fortified camp just outside the city walls: ¹ and moreover in the provinces intrusted it not to the *Senatorian Proconsuls*, but only to their own *Military Lieutenants*; (those to whose care were assigned the provinces least settled, and which consequently required and maintained a large military force resident;) functionaries appointable and removable at the emperor's sole pleasure. ² In either case it was the delivery of the *sword-badge* into their hand that marked the delegation of this *power of the sword*. Thus while the Senatorian Proconsul, when entering on his provincial government, had but the badge of *lictors* attendant, with the *rod and axe* intertwined as of old in their fasces, ³ it was the custom for the *Imperial Lieutenant*, on appointment to his province, publicly to *receive and assume the military sword*, as well as cloak, outside the pomærium of Rome; (where also on the termination of his office he laid them down: ⁴) and for the home general, or *Prætorian Prefect*, on his ap-

¹ This Prætorian Guard, as first instituted by Augustus, consisted of some 10,000 men; but it had been increased in Vitellius' time to 16,000. Tiberius fixed it in a fortified camp, to overawe the city, just outside the walls, near the Porta Nomentana; of which camp remains are still seen on the broad prolonged summit of the Viminal Hill. See Gibbon i. 168. A sketch of the *Prætorian Camp*, as designed by Ligorio from the ruins remaining in the 16th century, is given in Montfaucon, iv. 83.

² Like the Legati of the ancient Proconsuls of the Republic.

³ Και ανθυπατους καλεισθαι, . . . ρα βδουχοις τε σφας χρησηται . . . εκλευσε. Dion Cass. ib. 13. So too Gibbon, after him, i. 103.—In Acts xiii. 7, xviii. 12, we have mention of the Proconsuls of Cyprus and Achaia.

⁴ After speaking of the senatorially appointed ανθυπατοι, as in the Note preceding, Dion Cassius proceeds to notice the αντιστρατηγους, or *Proprætors*, appointed by the emperor. And he speaks of the latter as την τε στρατιωτικην στολην φορουντας, (that is, the Roman general's *sagum*, or *military cloak*, of red, or scarlet,) και ξιφος, οις γε και στρατιωτας δικαιοσαι εξεστιν, εχοντας; whereas the former were neither ξιφος παραζωννυμενους, nor στρατιωτικη εσθητη χρωμενους. adding, in explanation, Αλλω γαρ ουδενι, ουτε ανθυπατω, ουτε αντιστρατηγη, ουτε επιτροπω, ξιφηφορειν διδοται, ω μη και στρατιωτην τινα αποκτειναι εξειναι νενομισται. Each αντιστρατηγος had also, he says, six ραβδουχοι. He further states that these badges of the Imperial Lieutenants' office, της αρχης επισημα, were only to be assumed by them, on appointment, outside of the pomærium of Rome; and to be instantly laid down on the cessation of office.

This power of the sword over *soldiers*, as well as *people*, given to the Imperial Lieutenants, appears to have been very much the same with that given to the Proconsuls in their several provinces under the old Republic. Thus Niebuhr, speaking of the settlement of the first Roman Province, Sicily, observes thus in his Lectures, i. 140: "After the peace which terminated the first Punic war, Sicily was constituted as a Roman Province. This was a new system; and Sicily was the first country to which it was applied. A *Province*, in the Roman sense of the word, was a country in which a Roman general, either during the time of his *magistratus curulis*, or (in case of his year of office having elapsed) during the time for which his *imperium* was prolonged, exercised over his *soldiers*, as well as over the *inhabitants of the country*, the same power as in times of war, by virtue of the *lex de imperio*."

pointment to office, to be similarly invested with the *sword* by the emperor within the city walls. The memorable words used by Trajan on one such occasion, "Use this sword *for* me, if I rule well; if not, *against* me;"¹ will be remembered by the classical scholar as one illustration of the custom. And the scriptural reader will not forget another and different illustration of it in St. Paul; when thus writing to the Romans, even like an eye-witness to eye-witnesses, about a magistracy and magistrate of high authority there, whether the emperor himself, or his prefect; "He *beareth not the sword* in vain."²

Thus then, and considering further that alike the *Prætorian Prefects* at Rome, and the *Imperial Lieutenants* commanding the legions in the provinces, were wont to appear *on horseback* in their high offices,³ it seems to me likely that these might suggest themselves to the mind of the Evangelist as the chief agency through which, in the second æra prefigured, the Roman military sword, itself a small one,⁴ would become, as it were, of exaggerated size and illegitimate use; so as to take peace from the Roman earth, and redden the body politic with the blood of civil

¹ "Cum insigne potestatis, uti mos erat, pugionem darct." So Victor in his Life of Trajan: also Plin. Paneg. 67; and Dion Cassius lxxviii. 16.

On the passage from Pliny Bernegger has the note following: "Præfecti prætorio, præter alia, insigne erat gladius, vel ensis, aut pugio (ξίφος), quo donari atque accingi solebat à principe; quem nonnunquam et ipsi gerebant imperatores. Siquidem soli principes et præfecti prætorio Romæ usum gladii habebant. Reliqui magistratus togati erant. Eo autem merum imperium, et jus vite ac necis civium, ipsis tribuebatur: ejus nota et signum gladius. Hinc . . . *gladium ponere* est præfecturâ prætorii se abdicare: ut Tigellinus apud Plutarch, in Galbâ." (Compare Suetonius and Tacitus cited before by me, Note⁵ p. 155.)—In this Note however Bernegger seems to me to have overlooked the original and more proper power indicated by the sword-bearing, as Dion explains it, viz. the power of life and death over the *soldiery*; noting only that over the *citizens*, which soon came to be included also.—The old jurisdiction of the Prætor in criminal cases of life and death was not indeed, I believe, ever formally abrogated; but it was gradually superseded by the superior dignity of the Imperial courts.

² Rom. xiii. 4; *οὐ γὰρ εἰκὴ τὴν μάχαιραν φορεῖ*. In which passage we ought to mark the *μάχαιρα*, the same word for *the sword* as here, the *φορεῖ*, and the transition from the *plural*, when speaking of *αρχόντες*, governors, to the *singular*, in speaking of the sword-bearing magistrate in Rome.—Under this sword, shortly after, St. Paul suffered martyrdom. It would seem that there were at that time *two* Præfects; appointed by Nero, *pro illâ vice*, in place of Burrhus. See Clement's Ep. c. 5, and Jacobson's note on it. On St. Paul's *first arrival* at Rome (Acts xxviii. 16) there was only one *στρατοπεδάρχης*.

³ See Note⁴ p. 126 *suprà*.—By a regulation of Alex. Severus two horses were presented by the Emperor to the Proprætors and Proconsuls under the Imperial regime. (So Æl. Lampridius Vit. Alex. Severus, ch. 42.) But not so as thereby to set aside the public gift of the *equus honorarius* alluded to p. 126.

⁴ See the Note¹ p. 151 *suprà*.

carnage. And certainly it was to *these*, the chief commanders of the Roman military, that the civil wars, insurrections, and bloodshed were often owing. It was in the persons of the *Prætorian Præfects* under Commodus, as we lately saw,¹ that the military power was first seen exalted to absolute supremacy, with insurrections, civil strife, and bloodshed immediately resulting, such as told ominously of greater evils that were to come; and in the murders both of Commodus, and of Pertinax, (consequent on which latter was the Prætorians' sale of the empire to the highest bidder,) the Præfect Lætus had a part.² It was the three chiefest of the *Imperial Lieutenants* in the provinces, Severus, Niger, and Albinus,³ that led in the civil wars following. After which, alike in the wars and murders consequent on the first Severus' death, and in those too after the murder of the second Severus, each took their share in the deeds of blood.⁴—Hence, I say, it seems to me very possible that there may have been a special reference in the Apocalyptic symbol to *these* representatives of the military autocracy, established from the time of Commodus. But the specific reference to them is not essential. The symbolic sword-bearing rider may be regarded, if we prefer it, simply and comprehensively, as the impersonation of the military body, whose badge was the sword; inclusive alike of soldiery and commanders, whether of the provincial armies or the Prætorians.⁵ The historical application is in either case the same.

¹ See p. 152 *suprà*.

² Dion Cassius expressly states the prominent part acted by *Lætus* in both cases.

³ Their provinces respectively were Pannonia, Syria, Britain;—all imperial provinces.

⁴ *Macrinus*, the assassin and successor of Caracalla, was a Prætorian Præfect. (It is on this occasion that Gibbon writes, "The decisive weight of the Prætorian guards elevated the hope of their *Præfects*; . . . who began to assert their *legal* claim to fill the vacancy of the Imperial throne." i. 224.) Again, Elagabalus (*Macrinus*' successor) was murdered in a sedition of the *Prætorian bands*; who were also afterwards the murderers of Maximus and Balbinus. Moreover their Præfect *Philip*, acting on the army generally, effected the conspiracy against the younger Gordian, in which that emperor perished.—On the other hand *Maximin*, the murderer of Alexander Severus, was one that held the first military command in a provincial army: and *Decius*, who revolted against Philip, was an Imperial Lieutenant; though as an extraordinary functionary, and on an extraordinary mission to the Mæsian army.—After which, in the times of the so-called thirty tyrants, the exemplifications are superabundant.

⁵ The Prætorians' subsequent history was this. Both in regard of number and powers they were greatly reduced by *Diocletian*; and by *Constantine* the whole body suppressed, their camp destroyed, and their Præfects deprived of military authority, and confined to civil functions. So Aurelius Victor, referred to by Gibbon, ii. 161, 235.

In conclusion let me beg to impress upon the reader that the æra and the subject which I suppose here prefigured was no æra or subject of small importance in the Roman history, pressed into the Apocalyptic expositor's service for the occasion, and exaggerated for his purpose. The æra and the evil has been most strongly marked, as we have seen, by historians of the highest eminence;¹ indeed as strongly as the prosperous æra of Trajan and the Antonines which immediately preceded it. The evil introduced under Commodus into the body politic was one that acted out its part on a mighty scale, both as to duration and as to injurious effect, on the Roman people. And it both prepared the way for, and indeed almost necessitated the sequence of, other social and political evils; which soon joined with it, as we shall hereafter see, (agreeably with the 3rd and 4th Seals' prefigurations,) in undermining the empire's strength, and accelerating its decline. The "increase of the dangerous power of the army," begun by "the dissolute tyranny of Commodus," and augmented alike by "the civil wars occasioned by his death," and "the policy" afterwards following of "the house of Severus," constituted, as Gibbon expresses it, "an internal change which undermined the foundations of the empire:"²—and again; "The licentious fury of the Prætorian bands [i. e. against Pertinax] was the first symptom and cause of the decline of the Roman empire."³—And I cannot but think it remarkable that, as Tacitus, the greatest contemporary historian of the commencement of the 1st Seal's æra, has left his strong testimony respecting the astonishing change to national happiness which was introduced with the new age under Nerva and Trajan,⁴—so Dion Cassius, the most eminent contemporary historian of the commencement of my 2nd Seal's æra, has left his similar testimony to the evil change introduced under Commodus. He speaks of his reign as one of change from a *golden* age to one of *iron*:⁵ paints in strong colouring the military despotism and license then

¹ See the testimonies of Sismondi, Heeren, Montesquieu, Denina, &c., cited at pp. 151, 153, &c. *suprà*. The subject is noted in much the same way too by Schlegel in his *Philosophy of History*, ii. 34.

² i. 254: a passage cited before in part, p. 153 *suprà*.

³ i. 168.

⁴ See p. 131 *suprà*, Note ⁶.

⁵ lxxi. 36: ἀπο χρυσης βασιλειας εἰς σιδηραν.

commencing, as the grand evil of the times :¹ and in telling of a conflagration in Rome, just before Commodus's assassination, of mysterious origin and terrible fury,²—which, falling on the magnificent *Temple of Peace* by the Via Sacra, left it a ruin,³ and thence, crossing to the Palatine, ravaged the *Imperial Palace* and its archives, inextinguishable by all the arts and efforts of man,⁴—he adds that it was regarded as ominous of the overthrow of peace that was to follow ;⁵ and that “ the evil would not be confined to the city, but would extend to the whole Roman world.”⁶

CHAPTER III.

THE THIRD SEAL.

“ AND when he opened the third seal⁷ I heard the third living creature say, Come! And I beheld, and lo a *black* horse! and he that sat on him had in his hand a *pair of balances* :⁸ and I heard as it were a voice in the midst of

¹ See e. g. his observations lxxx. 4.

² Herodian, i. 14, says that it was caused either by lightning or the eruption of some volcanic subterranean flame. Ουτε γαρ ομβρου προῦπαρξαντος, ουτε νεφωσ θροισθεντων, σεισμου δε ολιγου προγενομενου γης, ειτε σκλητου νυκτωρ κατενεχθεντος, ειτε και πυρος ποθεν εκ του σεισμου διαρρυνεντος, παν το της Ειρηνης τεμενος κατεφλεχθη, μεγαστον και καλλιστον γενομενον των εν τη πολει εργαων.

³ The temple had been built by Vespasian to receive his Jewish spoils.—The celebrated physician Galen had a shop adjoining, and tells of its destruction. Δουιν μεν εξ αυτης [sc. πραγματειας] των πρωτων βιβλιων εκδοθεντων, εγκαταλειφθεντων δε εν τη κατα την ιεραν οδον αποθηκη μετα των αλλων, ιηνκα το της Ειρηνης τεμενος ολον εκαυθη, και κατα το παλατιον αι μεγαλαι βιβλιοθηκαι. Tom. xiii. p. 362.

⁴ Ουδε γαρ κατασβεσθησαι ανθρωπινη χειρι ηδυνηθη, says Dion, lxxii. 24, καιτοι παμπολλων μεν ιδιωτων, παμπολλων δε στρατιωτων υδροφορουντων, και αυτου του Κομμοδου επελθοντος εκ του προαστειου, και επισπερχοντος.

⁵ This and other omens, says he, επιφθεγγομενα εδεν ειρηναιον. lxxii. 24.

⁶ Ibid.—So too Herodian. Μεγιστον τε δεινον και τον παροντα καιρον ελυπησε, και προς το μελλον οιωνισματι και φανλη συμβολη χωρμενους παντας εταραξεν. And again; Συνεβαλλοντο τε τινες εκ των κατειληφωτων, πολεμων σημειον ειναι την του νεω της Ειρηνης απωλειαν. Τα γυν ακολουθησοντα . . . εκ της αποβασεως την προουπαρχουσαν φημην επιστωσατο.—The ruins of this Temple of Peace are still seen, looking across the Via Sacra towards the Palatine.

⁷ Καί ὅτε ηνοιξε την σφραγιδα την τριτην ηκουσα του τριτου ζωου λεγοντος, Ερχου. Και ειδον και ιδου ιππος μελας, και ο καθημενος επ' αυτον εχων ζυγον εν τη χειρι αυτου. Και ηκουσα ως φωνην εν μεσφ των τεσσαρων ζωων λεγουσαν, Χοινηξ σιτου δηναριου, και τρεις χοινηκες κριθων δηναριου και το ελαιον και τον οινον μη αδικησης.

⁸ So, and I doubt not correctly, in our authorized English translation; the word in the original being ζυγος.—However, Woodhouse and others after him would translate it, agreeably with its other signification, a *yoke*: observing, 1st, that it is always so used in the New Testament; 2ndly, that, where it is meant to signify a *pair of*

the living creatures, saying, A chœnix of wheat for a denarius, and three chœnixes of barley for a denarius; and see that thou hurt not [or, rather, *that thou wrong not in regard to*]¹ the oil and the wine."

The intent of the figuration in this Seal is less obvious than in the two former, and will require some considerable thought and attention; though the *change of the horse's colour to black* can scarce be mistaken as indicating generally the change to a state of aggravated *distress and mourning*.² Let us

balances, there is generally added some other word in the context to suggest that meaning as intended.

Now surely, as regards the *latter* remark, one might have thought that the accompaniment of the word *chœnix* would have been precisely all that the Dean needed, to determine him in favour of the meaning of *balances* in the passage before us. As regards the *former*, if other words had been used in the New Testament in the sense of *balances*, to the exclusion of *ζυγος*, the argument would have had weight in proportion to the frequency of those instances. But the truth is, there is no mention of *balances* in one single passage in the New Testament, unless it be in this. So that the value of the argument is just nothing.

As conclusions of no little importance have been built in part on the critical propriety of substituting the word *yoke* for *balances* in the translation of this clause, it may be useful to enter a little more fully into the Lexicographical question.

There are five words in Greek that signify a *balance*; *τρύανη*, *ταλαντον*, *σταθμος*, *σταθμιον*, and *ζυγος*. Of these none being used, as before observed, in the New Testament, (except it be in this passage,) it becomes us next to inquire what is their use in the Septuagint. And the answer is that *τρύανη* is never used at all in it; that *ταλαντον* and *σταθμιον*, though used, are only used in the sense of a *weight* (the latter answering to the Hebrew זָרָק a stone); that the use of *σταθμος* also is confined all but constantly to the same sense of a *weight*; it being the usual rendering of the Hebrew זָרָק , and having the meaning of a *balance* *once* only, viz. in Isaiah xl. 12, where a second word, beside the usual one, was needed in that sense. The usual, I may say the constant, word in the Septuagint for *balance* is *ζυγος*; being so used some nine or ten times in it:—among others in the above-noted passage from Isaiah, *τις εισησε τα ορη σταθμω, και τας ναπας ζυγω*; in Prov. xi. 1, *Ζυγοι δολιοι, σταθμιον δικαιοι*; in Ezek. xlv. 10, *Ζυγος δικαιοι, μετρον δικαιοι, χοιριξ δικαιοι*: where, as here, the *χοιριξ* is in association with it; also in Lev. xix. 36, Hos. xii. 7, &c. &c. Hence, if the idea of *balances* was intended to be expressed in the passage before us, *ζυγος* would be of all others the fittest word.

Thus a *balance* being a version of *ζυγος* equally authorized with that of a *yoke* by its use in the sacred as well as the classic writers, the associated notice of a *measure* in the hieroglyphic, just as in that example above quoted from Ezekiel, might of itself induce a preference of the former rendering. Besides which (and I would beg the reader's attention to the fact), whereas in Roman usage,—to which usage, as we have already seen, the apocalyptic symbols are strikingly conformed,—the *balance-holding* was, as will be afterwards shown, a very common symbol, that of a *yoke-holding* was, if I am not mistaken, altogether unknown.—Nor indeed is it so used in Scripture. In Jeremiah xxvii. 2, and xxviii. 10, we have an example of the prophet bearing *upon his neck* bonds and yokes, in type, *passively*, of the approaching oppression and captivity of Judah; but nowhere do we find the holding of a yoke *in the hand* as a type, *actively*, of oppressing.

¹ So Mede, *ne sis injustus*: also Junius, as Brightman states, and Daubuz, and others. I shall give reasons afterwards in support of this rendering.

² In proof of this emblematic use of the colour such phrases as *atra cura, ater*

therefore, Ist, consider the usually received, but, as will appear, incorrect solution; then, IIndly, apply ourselves to seek one more correct and satisfactory.

I. A *famine* of the chief articles of food (whether literally taken or metaphorically) has been supposed by nearly all interpreters to be implied in the other details of the prophetic passage, as the cause of the distress indicated: their opinion being grounded on these two suppositions;—1st, that the *chœnix* spoken of was the common Attic chœnix; 2ndly, that the specified *prices* for such a measure of wheat and of barley were famine prices.

Nor, as to the former of these suppositions, do I contest its reasonableness. For although,—not to dwell on the fact that the word chœnix is sometimes used to designate *measure in the general*,¹ which generic sense however, from the specifications of price given, is here of course quite out of the question,—though, I say, it is moreover undoubted that there were used in the Roman empire chœnixes of various specific values,² viz. (as learned men

luctus, atrum funus, &c., will naturally occur to the classic reader. On Plotina's death, Dion tells us, lxix. 10, that Hadrian mourned for her, *ἐπι ἡμερας εννεα μελανει μωνησας*. On M. Aurelius' death, the senate, says the younger Victor, "in curiâ, veste *tetrâ* amictus, lachrymans convenit." Further, I find the figure is applied to the *horse* in the following apposite passage from Martial's Epigram on the charioteer Scorpus' death:

Heu facinus! primâ fraudatus Scorpe juventâ
Occidis, et *nigros* tam cito jungis equos.

On which the Commentator Rader observes that *the black horse* is used as the fit associate of mourning, (like the black horses of our mourning coaches,) just as *the white horse* of triumphs and joy.—I need hardly say that a similar sense attaches to the black colour in Scripture. So Malachi iii. 14; "We have walked mournfully;" lit. *in black*: Ezek. xxxi. 15; "I caused Lebanon to mourn for him:" lit. *to be black*.

As regards moreover the change to this *black* colour from the *red* of the former Seal, let me suggest for comparison Horace's notice (Epod. ix. 27) of Antony's similar change of cloak from the military imperial *red* ("honorem *fulgentis saguli*," Sil. xvii. 527, compare my note⁴ p. 156,) to *black*, as the mourning colour, after his defeat;—"Punico lugubre mutavit sagum," i. e. says the Scholiast, "Deposuit *coccineam* chlamydem, et accepit *nigram*."

¹ So Scheidius, in his edition of Lennep's *Etymologicum Græcum*; "figura omnis excavata in quam aliquid infundi vel inseri potest." Similarly the Scholiast on Aristophanes' *Pluto*, 276, calls it *παν περιφερεις*. And in Ezek. xlv. 10 the Septuagint translators have used the word in this generic sense, *Ζυγος δικαιος, και μετρον δικαιον, και χοινηξ δικαια εστω υμιν του μετρον*. "Let there be among you a just balance, and a just measure, (of length?) and a just chœnix."

² Mede notices this variety, though imperfectly and incorrectly. After saying, "Chœnix significat demensum diurnum, *ἡμεροτροφίδα*," he adds, "sed incertâ admodum mensurâ. Variavit enim præ ratione gentium, locorum, et hominum. Chœnix militaris (ut minores chœnixes prætermittam opilionum, villicorum, vinitorum) quatuor fuit sextariorum. Sed veteri Lexicographo Græco-Latino *χοινηξ* est semimodium, id

lay it down¹) of 3, 6, and 8, as well as of 4 cotylæ, or half-pints, respectively, yet was the Attic chœnix of 4 cotylæ,²

est militaris duplum: imo Hellenistic, Ezek. xlv. 10, 11, *χοινιξ* est *bathus*, amplissima Hebræorum mensura." (In Apoc. p. 444.) Thus the measure of the Attic and best known chœnix is not at all particularized by Mede. Then, as to his "old Lexicographer," we have to ask, Who is he? and what the value of his authority for the statement of there having been a *chœnix* equal to *half a modius*? I very much doubt its correctness.—Yet again, on the contradiction between the first clause in the above quotation, and all that follows, it scarce needs that I remark. For if *one* particular and smaller chœnix of wheat (this being in fact the unmentioned Attic) was a sufficient day's measure for a man's consumption, of course each larger chœnix of wheat must have been more than a day's sufficiency. In a Commentator like Mede such inaccuracies are surprising. Hence however the greater need of our looking carefully into the subject, as in the Note following.

¹ So, 1st, an elaborate Essay on the subject in the Memoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions; Tom. viii. pp. 377—401. The immediate subject of the Memoir is an inscription on a Roman standard-weight yet remaining; in part as follows: "Imp. Cæs. Vespas. 6 Cons. . . . Mensuræ Exactæ in Capitolio p. x."—It seems that there was a correspondence between this weight of 10 lb. and that of the congius, filled with rain-water, as a measure of capacity.—In the course of the Memoir the learned Academician observes; "Quatre mesures differentes avoient le nom de *chœnice*: la plus petite, communement appelée *χοινιξ* Attique, (?) avoit trois cotyles Attiques. La seconde en avoit quatre. On en comptoit 6 à la troisieme, et 8 à la quatrieme, qui est celle dont Fannius a parlé."

To much the same effect, 2ndly, writes Wurm De Pond. et Mensur. It is defined, he states, as a measure equivalent to 3 cotylæ both by Pollux in his Onomasticon, iv. 3, in Table 7 of what are called the Fragments of Galen, and Table 10 published among the same Fragments from the Cosmetics of some one named Cleopatra.—It is made equal to 4 cotylæ in Table 5 among the same Fragments; which thus compares it with the *modius* and *sextarius*; *ὁ μοδιος ὁ Αἰγυπτίος καὶ ὁ Ἰταλικὸς ἐχει χοινικὰς ἢ, ἢ δὲ χοινιξ ἕξτας β*: (a Table this which, together with the four preceding, I conceive to be Galen's own; as they form a complete connected set; and stand at the head of the Fragments bearing his name in the inscription, *Γαληνοῦ τοῦ σοφωτάτου μετρῶν καὶ σταθμῶν διδασκαλία*) also by a Parisian MS, says Professor Wurm, cited in Paneton's Metrolog. and by other authorities.—Once more, its value is stated at 4 sextarii, or 8 cotylæ, in Table 8 of Galen's Fragments, thus; *Ὁ χοῦς ἐχει λίτρας δέκα ἢ χοινιξ ἐχει λίτρας ἕξ ὁ ξίστηρ ἐχει λίτραν ἅ ἡμισυ* also by the author generally called Rhemnius Fannius; (but who should rather be named Priscian, as Professor Wernsdorf shows in the Prolegom. to his 5th Volume of the Poetæ Latini Minores;)-in the verses following:

At cotyle cyathos bis ternos una receptat :

Bis quine hunc faciunt drachmæ, si appendere velles :

At cotylas recipit geminas sextarius unus ;

Qui quater assumptus Græco fit nomine chœnix :

Adde duos χοῦς fit, vulgo qui est congius idem.

Such is the reading of the passage given by almost all the Codices; and recognised, as expressing Priscian's view of the chœnix, by most modern writers on the Ancient Weights and Measures; e.g. Wurm, Eisenschmid, Hussey, the French Academician, the Writer on the Chœnix in Smith's Dictionary of Antiquities, &c. Moreover in Isidore's Origines, (a writer of the 7th century,) we seem to have evidence of the reading being the one received by him: as he there (xvi. 25) almost quotes the passage; "Sextarius duarum librarum est (?); qui bis assumptus bilibris nominatur; assumptus quater fit Græco nomine chœnix."—I learn however from Mr. T. K. Arnold that in one Codex, followed by Endlicher, (and Facciolati too, in voc. *chœnix*, notes this,) there is the reading, "*Qui quater assumptis*," in the last line but one; and *duas*, instead of *duos*, in the last line. Correcting the *qui* in which to *quies*, and understanding *chœnices* as the noun to *duas*, Endlicher makes Priscian define a *chœnix* as the *third of a χοῦς*, or *congius*; i. e. as equal to *two sextarii*. But the weight of MS authority is against this.

² The reason of my saying so is because the Attic chœnix is the same doubtless

or one quart, so much the most common that, without direct countervailing evidence, we seem bound to take it as the one intended.¹

But then, admitting the *Attic* chœnix to be the one meant in the prefiguration, how far would the second supposition of the expositors referred to be borne out, viz. that the prices of a chœnix of wheat and barley named as from the throne were famine prices, such as to make all faces gather blackness? Of course the average prices near about the time of Domitian and St. John's exile in Patmos (not those of quite other times) must be the standard of reference. And, judging by what the elder Pliny reports of prices not very long before,² we shall find that though the

that Herodotus speaks of, vii. 187, as the daily ration of wheat to each of Xerxes' soldiers. Now we learn both from Polybius vi. 39, and Cato De Re Rusticâ c. 56, that the usual demensum, or *monthly* allowance of corn to both the common soldier and the working slave was 4 modii; whence consequently about the 8th part of a modius, i. e. 2 sextarii, or 4 cotylæ, was the *ἡμεροτροφις*, (as Athenæus calls it,) or *daily* ration.—This is the value given to the *Attic* chœnix by Dr. Arnold, in Thucyd. iv. 16, among others. In which passage also one *chœnix*, and that of *barley*, is mentioned as the *ἡμεροτροφις* asked for each servant of the Spartans at Sphacteria, though two *chœnices* (with some meat in either case) were asked for the Spartans themselves.*

¹ Besides the above-mentioned values it is used in one passage by the Greek Septuagint Translators, agreeably with Mede's statement, as a term answering to the tenth part of the Jewish *chomer*; that is, as equivalent to the much larger measure of an English bushel. Το δέκατον του γομορ χουιξ: where the Hebrew for *χουιξ* is כִּבֵּ a bath, and which is said in the same verse to be equivalent to an ephah. Now the *chomer* חֲמִשָּׁה with the כ, or *γομορ*, is equal to ten bushels; and consequently the *chœnix* here used to one bushel.—Palladius [Octobr. tit. 14] mentions a *Syrian* chœnix. "Tribus cadis unam floris mensuram, quam Syri *chœnicam* vocant, adijciet." He does not state its capacity. But as the *cadus* was a measure of twelve congii, and the *congius* nearly an English gallon, the *Syrian* chœnica may have been of considerable size; and very possibly the same as that of the Septuagint.

Since however such a chœnix of wheat at a denarius would indicate superabundant plenty, the horse's black colour puts it here out of the question. The same too, let me add, holds, though less markedly, of the chœnix of 8 cotylæ.

² The following is the statement in Pliny (Lib. xviii. Cap. 10). "Pretium huic, annonâ mediâ, in modios farinæ xl. asses: similagini castrate octonis assibus am-

* The following Table of Greek and Roman, as compared with English measures, may be convenient to the reader. As regards these (and indeed yet more as regards the ancient prices of corn) entire accuracy must not be expected. But what is here stated will be sufficiently accurate for our purpose.

<i>Greek and Roman.</i>	<i>English.</i>
Sextarius (Gk. ξετης) = 2 cotylæ =	Pint.
2 Sextarii = Attic Chœnix =	Quart.
8 Chœnices = Modius =	Peck.
4 Modii =	Bushel.
6 Modii = Medimnus	
32 Modii =	Quarter.

In *weight*, the chœnix of wheat = 2lb.; the congius, or χςς, of rain-water = 10lb.

price of *wheat* here named might be a *scarcity*-price, it could hardly be called one of *famine*.¹ Then, moreover, what of the very singularly added specification of the price

plus; *siligini castratæ duplrm.*—On which Arbuthnot thus comments. “Pliny tells us that the bread made of a modius of coarse flour cost 40 asses; of that which was entirely purged from the bran, or very fine flour, 48: and what was made of the flour of the *siligo*, or the finest of all, was double of the first. If we proceed according to our English manner, it will make the peck of the cheapest or household bread, 2s. 6d. $2\frac{1}{4}q.$, that of the wheaten bread 3s. 0d. $2\frac{3}{4}q.$, and the finest 5s. 1d. $0\frac{1}{2}q.$ ” . . . Now “the assize of wheaten bread in London is pretty near as 3 to 5; that is, when wheat is 15d. the peck, the peck loaf is sold for 25d. And, as the price of the middle sort of bread, which answers to our wheaten, according to Pliny, was 3s. 0d. $2\frac{1}{4}q.$, this, reckoned according to the forementioned proportion, will make wheat per quarter at 63s. 6d., as the common or middle price.” So Dr. Arbuthnot (*Ancient Coins* p. 122); making the price in Pliny’s time 2s. for a modius or peck.

I may observe that the proportion existing in his day between the prices of *bread* and *corn* still continues. Thus while I write, (A.D. 1838, or 1839,) among the Prices Current I find wheat at 74s. a quarter; and bread at 9d. the quarter or 4lb. loaf. Now, as a *peck* of *wheat* weighs on an average about $18\frac{1}{2}lb.$ (Arbuthnot, p. 89,) the weight of 32 pecks, or a *quarter*, is $18\frac{1}{2} \times 32lb.$, or 592lb. Of which the present price being 74s., it is 74d. for one twelfth of 592lb., i. e. for 49lb. Again, as the average price of *bread* is 9d. each 4lb., that of 49lb. is about 110d. Hence the proportion between the prices of the same weight of *wheat* and of *bread* appears to be as 74 to 110d.; i. e. as 37 to 55, or 3 to 5 nearly.—I notice this in order to obviate a possible objection to Arbuthnot’s calculation. The proportion seems to be one in the nature of things.

The calculation of prices from Pliny’s statement may with advantage be made directly in terms of *the denarius*; the denarius being, as it is observed by Arbuthnot, universally, in classic writings, the equivalent to ten asses. Thus, if we take Pliny’s 48 asses, or about 5 denarii, as the average price of a modius of *bread*, we shall have $5 \times \frac{3}{4} = 3$ denarii, as the average price of a modius of *wheat*.

It is to be regretted that commentators on the passage before us should have given *collectanea* on the subject of the prices of corn from different countries, and different ages, mostly quite foreign to the case and time before them; the object being to make out a standard of average price of wheat among the ancients much below the true price in St. John’s time. Thus Danbuz, for example, gives a quotation from the poet Martial, as an authority on the point; “*Amphora vigessis; modius datur ære quaterno:*” and he reasons as if the poet (who lived under Domitian), really intended to state four asses a modius, as the then *market-price* of wheat! “It is mentioned,” as Arbuthnot observes on the passage (p. 125), “in *poetical extravagance!*” —Again, to take the case of living expositors, Mr. Burgh (p. 155) speaks of “History telling us that in the time of plenty from 16 to 20 measures (*chœnixes*) of corn were given for the sum of a denarius.” Perhaps so in the Carthaginian wars, 300 years before Domitian, when money was of far higher value than under the emperors. But what had that to do with the price in Domitian’s time? Hume speaks of 6s. 8d. a quarter of wheat, and 3s. 4d. of barley, being in our Henry the 6th’s time the price of plenty. What would Mr. B. think, if any one were to require that as the standard-price of plenty now?—So again Dr. Wordsworth, p. 182; making the price in *Cicero’s* time the standard.

Of authentic remaining notices of the prices of wheat in Roman pre-Apocalyptic history, we may remark that of *Polybius*, who reports that in the scarce times of the *second Punic war* wheat was at 15 denarii the medimnus, or two-fifths of a modius for a denarius;—of the *Cassian law*, B.C. 73, rating it at one denarius the modius;—of *Cicero*, in his *Verreian Orations*, (iii. 70,) rating it about the same;—and of *Pliny*, A.D. 79, whose testimony I have above given.

¹ So Michaelis iv. 514; “When a *chœnix* of wheat cost a denarius, it may be said that wheat was dear, but not that there was a famine.”—We may compare here what Eusebius says in his *Chronicon* (i. p. 79, Scalig.) of the price of wheat in the

of *barley*, “three chœnixes of barley for a denarius?” Surely this is one such as to put the idea of famine altogether out of the question. For (to state the argument in its simplest form¹) forasmuch as the Attic chœnix was proverbially the *ἡμεροτροφίς*, or day’s sufficient quota for a man, of wheat or barley,² and at the same time a denarius was approximately the daily wages of labour in St. John’s time,³ the price specified would indicate that a labouring man would gain under this Seal nearly a three days’ sufficiency of barley-bread, (above 5 lb. in weight,) by one day’s labour! Did ever man hear of such a famine as this?⁴

Thus, even were no other difficulty to oppose it, yet would the famine hypothesis break down utterly on this one single account. But in fact, besides this, all else in the figuration, except indeed the *black colour* of the horse, is opposed to it. There is 1st the injunction on the rider, “See that thou injure not,” or “that thou act not unjustly about, the *oil* and the *wine*,” those two other next most im-

famine that opprest Greece in the 9th year of the emperor Claudius. *Λιμου κατα την Ἑλλάδα γεγονόςτος μεγάλου, ὁ του σιτου μοδιος ἐξ διδραχμων ἐπραθη*; i. e. that *wheat* was at 12 drachmæ (or denarii) the modius, or a denarius and a half for the Attic chœnix; a price half as much again as the price in the text; and without any remarkable comparative cheapness in the *barley* to act as a counteractive and mitigant.

Cæsar, in his *B. Civ.*, i. 52, speaks of the price of wheat rising at one time in his Spanish campaign to 50 denarii the modius. And this when corn was generally much cheaper than in St. John’s old age.

¹ As *wheat* of the medium quality was about 64s. a quarter in the time of St. John, (see the note from Pliny, p. 164 *suprà*), barley would be at about 32s. At 3 chœnixes for a denarius the price would be about 53s. a quarter.

² See my Note ², p. 163, 164 *suprà*.

³ The inference has been drawn from what is said of a denarius as the day’s wages in the parable of the labourers in the vineyard, *Matt.* xx. 2; which proves that such was the case in the Jewish province, at the time when our Lord spoke the parable. It is indeed somewhat loose to argue thence to the general price of wages in other parts of the empire, and that at a period sixty years later. Yet, as it seems that the pay of common soldiers in Julius Cæsar’s time was a denarius, the same in Tiberius’, (*Tacit. Annal.* i. 17,) and in Domitian’s time was restored to nearly that value, (see *Arbuthnot’s Ancient Coins*, p. 180,) from this, as well as from other data, it may perhaps be not unfairly argued that in the provinces generally the free labourer’s day-wages did, about St. John’s time, not vary very materially from it.

⁴ Compare the quantity and quality allotted to Ezekiel, when meant to typify a time of famine, *Ez.* iv. 9, 10: “Take unto thee wheat and barley and beans and lentiles and millet and fitches, and put them in one vessel, and make thee bread thereof . . . And thy meat which thou shalt eat shall be by weight, twenty shekels a day.” Now a shekel was about half an ounce, according to *Calmet*, *Arbuthnot*, (p. 37,) &c. If so his daily ration of this bread (such as it was) was only ten ounces, or less than one-half of a chœnix:—a chœnix of *wheat* being about two pounds in weight; of *barley* a little less. Even at the shekel’s higher value of 272 grains, assigned by some, as *Arbuthnot* tells us, it would be but half a chœnix.

portant articles of culture and consumption in the Roman world;¹ an injunction of which the spirit (whichever translation of the *μη ἀδικησης* be taken) was directly opposed to the idea of its being the main object in the voice from the throne to enjoin, or to proclaim, a famine.²—2. The circumstance of its being a conjunctive (*και*), not disjunctive (*αλλα*), which connects this latter clause of charge to the rider about the oil and wine with that charge in the former about the wheat and barley,³ constitutes of itself a strong argument in favour of the former being of a similarly kindly purport with the latter.—Moreover, 3rdly, the *balance* in the rider's hand, associated as it is, not with a man's weighing out bits of bread in scanty measure for his own or his family's *eating*, (I pray the reader to mark this,) so as in the oft-misapplied passage from Ezekiel iv. 10, 16,⁴ *but* in association with the *buying* and *selling* of corn,—I say, in this association *the balance*, instead of being an indication of famine, might just as well be an indication of plenty; seeing that at all times corn and bread were sold by weight or measure. In fact in the Roman *baker's* sepulchral monument, outside the Porta Maggiore at Rome, among the various implements of his trade there sculptured, a *pair of balances* is one.⁵—Was this then, altogether, a fit

¹ How important in the *Jewish* world will be seen by turning to the many places in Scripture, where *oil* and *wine* are so mentioned, e. g. Deut. vii. 13, xxviii. 51, Ps. iv. 7, &c. In 2 Chron. ii. 10 we find the correspondent proportions of *oil* and *wine* to those of *wheat* and *barley* promised by Solomon to Hiram's hewers in Lebanon. So too in the Persian king's grant to Ezra, vii. 22.

² It is a little amusing to read Dr. M. Stuart's comment (ii. 155) on this; considering that, like so many others, he makes the Seal to figure *famine*. "*Το ελαιον . . . μη ἀδικησης*" a difficult, if not as yet an inexplicable clause. Eichhorn indeed adopts a very easy method of interpretation; '*Positio merè ornans*:' . . . and remarks that a scarcity of wine and oil would contribute nothing towards creating famine. A strange position! For," argues Dr. St. most justly, "is not *olive oil* one of the most nutritious of substances? And would not *wine* contribute to the comfort of those who were undergoing starvation?" He adds; "What seems strange is that the mass of interpreters *sicco pede eam sententiam prætereunt*; just as though no explanation were needed."—In my opinion, however, a thing quite as strange is that Dr. St. himself should, like others, have past over *the price of barley sicco pede*, and in silence; though as decisive against famine being meant as even what is said of the wine and the oil.

³ Let it be well marked that the whole address of the voice, like as from the throne, is to one and the same person, viz. *the rider*: "A chœnix of wheat for a denarius; and see that *thou μη ἀδικησης*, &c."

⁴ "They shall *eat* bread by weight, and with astonishment." It is most strange that Apocalyptic expositors hitherto should not have noted this total difference of effect between the *eating* by weight, and *buying* or *selling* by weight.

⁵ See the notice of this very interesting monument, in Murray's Hand-Book for

symbol for Famine? Surely a more unfit one could scarce have been devised.¹

II. The idea of *famine* thus decisively set aside, we are forced to seek for some other and quite different solution, such as may better suit the conditions of the case. And, in order to this, and with reference to two very important particulars in those conditions, it needs that we now conclude preliminarily, 1st, as to the right construction of that latter clause in the voice as from the throne, *και το ελαιον και τον οινον μη αδικησης*: whether in the sense of *injure not*, or, *wrong not in regard to*, the oil and wine: 2ndly, in reference to the *balance* depicted as in the hand of the rider, what might have been its most usual meaning as a symbol at the time of the vision.

1. Now, as to the clause *το ελαιον και τον οινον, κ. τ. λ.*, the *admissibility* of the latter translation suggested, as well as the former, results clearly and necessarily, as it seems to me, from these two undisputed and indisputable facts; one, that *αδικω* is a *neutral intransitive verb*, as well as verb *transitive* and *active*;² the other, that in the case of intransitive neutral verbs generally there is frequently appended to them an *accusative of definition*, i. e. one defining the *object* to which the verb relates:³ in which case, let me add, the accusative usually precedes the verb,⁴ so as here.⁵ I subjoin

Rome, p. 311. "The frieze still retains some fragments of bas-reliefs, representing the various operations of baking; from the carrying the corn to the mill to the final weighing and distribution of the bread." It is ascribed to the age of Augustus.

¹ Compare the fitness of a personification such as by Cowper;

He calls for Famine; and the meagre fiend
Blows poisonous mildew from his shrivelled lips,
And taints the golden ear.

² So e. g. Apoc. xxii. 11; *ὁ ἀδικῶν ἀδικησάτω ἐτι*.

³ So Rost in his Grammar, as cited by my critic Mr. Arnold. "Since the accusative . . . serves always to designate the *object* to which an action immediately passes over, it frequently stands also with *intransitive verbs*, and adjectives, containing a general expression; and indicates the *part*, or *more definite object*, to which the expression must be immediately and principally referred. This is called the accusative of nearer definition; and is to be expressed in English by different prepositions, especially by *in*, *as to*, *in respect to*."

⁴ So e. g. in Anacreon;

Τριχας γερων μεν εστι
Τας δε φρενας νεαζει.

Matthiæ notes the fact of this position of the accusative.

⁵ *Και τον οινον και το ελαιον μη αδικησης*. In four out of the five Apocalyptic examples of an accusative of the *thing injured* occurring in connexion with the verb

a few illustrations below.¹ The only possible way of escaping from this my conclusion is by denying to the neutral *αδικεω* the constructive rights of neutral verbs generally: that which no grammarian, I am persuaded, has ever done, and which no biblical critic has any right to do.—The *admissibility* of the second rendering of *αδικησης* thus settled, a decisive reason at once suggests itself for preferring it. In order to any consistent sense with the rendering “injure not,” the articles specified must needs be *articles susceptible of injury*, from some such famine-causing agency as that which the advocates of this translation recognise (incorrectly, as I have shown) in the rider. But what the articles here specified? Not, be it well observed, *vines* and *olives*; on which the destroyer was often let loose by an angry Providence, with his weapons of blight or hail: but the already expressed juice of the grapes and olive-berries, oil and wine, when housed and secured by the owner in his casks and cellars.² To which argument what

αδικεω, in the active sense of *injuring*, the accusative follows the verb; *αδικησαι την γην μη αδικησητε την γην μη αδικησωσι τον χορτον*. vii. 2, 3, ix. 4, 10.

¹ Cases of *accusative neuter*, in the sense of *accusative of definition* as to the matter wronged *in*, occur frequently with *αδικεω*. So e. g. Plutarch; *Ιαπων τα μικρα δειν αδικειν ελεγεν, ενεκεν του τα μεγαλα δικαιοπραγειν*: (ap. Stephan. ad voc.) i. e. “that we should act unjustly in little things, in order to our acting justly in great things:” Eurip. Phœnissæ; *αδικει τα των θεων* “in the things of the gods:” 2 Sam. xix. 19; *μη μνησθης οσα ηδικησεν ο παεις*.—In Philem. 18 we have an example of a *double accusative*, *ει τι σε ηδικησεν* in Xen. Cyrop. iv. 5, one, as I prefer to construe it, of an accusative of definition in the *feminine*; *την δε αγοραν την ουσαν εν τω στρατοπεδω κηρυξατω μεν ηδη, εφη, μη αδικειν μηδενα* “in regard of the market in the camp, that none act injuriously:” in Libanius similarly, Orat. xxxi, *αδικεις μεν τως νομης*: peccas in leges.

Compare a similar use of the verb in the *passive* voice, with the accusative of definition in connexion. Eurip. Andromache, 350,

Ποσας δ' αν εννας θυγατερ' ηδικημενην
Βηλοι' αν ευρειν.

Elsewhere we have the express preposition to govern the accusative. So ib. Medea, 267,

Όταν δ' ες ευνην ηδικημενη κυρη.

I observe with some surprise, as well as satisfaction, that *Heinrichs*, the favourite expository referee of my objecting critic on this point, Mr. T. K. Arnold, prefers to construe the accusative as governed by *κατα* understood, just as I do. After stating the apparent unsuitableness of the charge *not to hurt the wine and oil* to the character of the black horse's rider, he thus proceeds:—“Suspicio itaque *αδικησαι* sumendum esse sensu vulgari, *injuriam afferre*; et *αυτε ελαιον*, &c., *subintelligendum κατα*, ut homini illi . . . acclamatum sit, *Quod attinet ad oleum vinumque*, quorum usus est ad delicias, non *αδικησης*, sc. homines.” On the charge from the throne *Heinrichs* notes its “*brevitas imperatoria*.” Another coincidence between us.

² Thus it is *olives and vines* that are marked out for God's judgments in the Old Testament.

the answer? The only answer that I have seen made is that we are to suppose the oil and wine to be here put *poetically* and *figuratively* for olives and vines.¹ That is, we are to suppose poetry and figure intruded in noting them into the latter clause of a sentence, of which the former, when noting other fruits of the earth, is confessedly literal and prosaic!! For we read not there, in poetical phrase, of *waving corn-fields*; but simply of *wheat* and *barley*; and this in the state evidently of grain threshed out, and ready for measuring out and sale.

2. Further, as regards that other and equally important point of indication in the symbol, the *balance* in the hand of the black horse's rider, let it be well understood by my readers that this symbol, instead of being in itself any way mysterious or difficult of comprehension, was in fact one most common and obvious at the time of St. John's exile in Patmos; and always I believe, in one way or another, as a symbolization of *justice*.²

And now then, our analysis of the several parts of the symbol being completed, proceed we in search of a solution such as may satisfy them all. Whose or what the agency, we have to ask, in the Roman empire that was symbolized by the balance-holding rider? Whose or what the voice admonishing him as from the throne; and wherefore in such terms about the price of corn, and against injustice in the matter of wine and oil? How, though holding the balance of justice, his influence such, in aggravation of the other previous evil, as to deepen the ensanguined red of the Roman aspect into the darker blackness of distress? Finally, what the main intent of the hieroglyphic as a whole; and how designative (as it seems presumable) of some notable cause of further suffering and decline introduced into the

¹ So Mr. Arnold in the British Magazine.

² Multitudes of Roman medals, of almost every emperor and every province of the empire, are extant, bearing the device of a *pair of balances*: and all, I believe, in symbolization of *equity*; (see Rasche on *Bilanz*;) not even excepting those relative to the coinage, and the goddess *Moneta*. For in this case, as Eckhel observes in his *Prolegom.* to Vol. i (p. 3), the balance "*justitiam in servando pondere, ex puritate metalli, significat.*" The subject will be illustrated by medals, and otherwise, in a later part of this Chapter.

I observe in *Papal* medals of the *Annona Pontificia*, or *distribution of corn in largess*, that the *balance* is still one of the symbols made use of. See Bonanni, i. 271.

Roman body politic:—of suffering introduced at a time following that of the establishment of military misrule, with its *concomitants* of civil wars and bloodshedding, so as under the second Seal; and preceding that of the pestilence and mortality which, we shall soon see, attached to the fourth? This, I say, is the question. And though to ourselves for the present it be obscure and enigmatic, from want of that familiarity with Roman symbols and usages which may not improbably have made the figuration at once clear to the Evangelist, as a contemporary, yet, on looking for light into history, and especially into that same philosophic and picturesque history of the Roman empire which has already so admirably illustrated the subjects of our first and second Seals, the clue, if I mistake not, will be found, the solution appear.

On consulting Gibbon then we find him, towards the close of his sketch of the reign of Alexander Severus, referring to the aggravated *oppressiveness of taxation*, consequent on a memorable edict of the preceding emperor Caracalla, (an edict which had to be enforced by the *Provincial Governors*,) as a fresh and wasting evil then introduced into the body politic.—It is after a retrospective glance at that *primary* cause of the empire's decline, which I suppose to have been pictured in the symbolization of the 2nd Seal, (I mean the pure *military despotism* of the soldiery and the sword,) that he takes it up for notice; even as if *another influential cause of the decline of the empire*. And he deems it of importance such as to call for a long digression, on the subject of Roman taxation to which it relates.¹—Let me briefly abstract his statement.

In the original constitution then by the Roman Repub-

¹ i. 254.—I have already at p. 153 quoted the commencement of the passage. "The dissolute tyranny of Commodus, the civil wars occasioned by his death, and the new maxims of policy introduced by the house of Severus, had all contributed to increase the *dangerous power of the army* . . . This internal change, which *undermined the foundations of the empire*, we have endeavoured to explain with some degree of order and perspicuity. The personal characters of the emperors, their victories, laws, follies, and fortunes, can interest us no further than as they are connected with the general history of the Decline and Fall of the monarchy. Our constant attention to that great object will not suffer us to overlook a *most important edict of Antoninus Caracalla*:"—that same of which I have now to speak; and the results of which he proceeds to develop in connexion with the subject of *Roman taxation*.

lic of its conquered provinces, it seems that tributes more or less onerous were imposed on them; which tributes, after the conquests of Greece and Syria, had become so productive as to suffice to pay all expenses of the government, and to allow of the entire exemption of Roman citizens from all taxes. This exemption however continued only until the time of Augustus: who, soon after his establishment in the empire, declared the necessity of their again bearing a share also of the public burthens. Thus thenceforward *the provincials* had their distinctive taxes to pay, *the Roman citizens* (among whom all Italians were now included) *theirs*:—the *latter* consisting of custom-duties and excise, (taxes the more oppressive from the constant and pernicious habit of farming them,) and the tax of one twentieth on legacies and inheritances; the *former* either of tributes of produce in kind, or a money capitation-tax.¹

During the æra of Trajan and the Antonines, says Gibbon, the mildness and precision of the laws, ascertaining the rule and measure of taxation, and protecting the subjects of every rank against arbitrary interpretations, antiquated claims, and the insolent vexations of the farmers of the revenue, alleviated the burthens, though they did not remove them.—But, some thirty or forty years after the death of the last Antonine, and while the rider of the *red horse of civil war* was yet in full career, they received, in so far as the *provincials* were concerned, a sudden aggravation. The emperor Caracalla issued the memorable edict with which his name is associated, by which the ROMAN CTRY was made co-extensive with the empire:—an edict not of liberality, as might at first have been imagined, but simply of avarice; for it was clogged with the condition that the provincials, thus admitted to Roman citizenship, should thenceforth pay both their provincial tributes as before, and also, in addition, the distinctive taxes (taxes

¹ The Scripture reader may be reminded by the mention of this provincial money payment of the question in Mark xii. 14, "Is it lawful to give tribute (*κηνσον*, the yearly *census* or poll tax) to Cæsar? . . . And he said, Bring me a denarius." In the parallel place of St. Matthew (xxii. 17) the same word *κηνσον* is used; in Luke xx. 22 *φορον*. So, again, Matt. xvii. 25; "From whom do the kings of the earth receive custom or *tribute*? *τεσλη η κηνσον*."

now augmented)¹ of the Roman citizen. The edict was compulsory, and the weight of taxation thus forced upon them intolerable. Even Italy itself escaped not from the tyrant's financial oppression, though under another form. "The great body of his subjects," says Gibbon, "was oppressed by the aggravated taxes; and every part of the empire crushed under the weight of Caracalla's iron sceptre."²—Nor did the evil of fiscal oppression, thus and then aggravated, end with him. It was continued onward substantially, as I must observe, an inward canker in the state. Macrinus, whose brief reign for but a year succeeded, enacted a partial mitigation of it. But under Macrinus' successor, Elagabalus, the oppression became as intolerable nearly as under Caracalla.—Then did the protesting voice of the law of equity, which had long been almost silenced, speak out again under the next reigning emperor, A. Severus; the only one for many years in those wretched times, whose character it was to do justice and love mercy. And he indeed did seek to mitigate the evil; above all by inculcating the spirit and the law of equity upon the administrators of the provincial government, and of the revenue, throughout the Roman world. But to reduce the tribute to any large amount, such as the case demanded, and such as some have supposed,³ was what I feel well assured he neither did, nor could do. The grand sources of the expenses of government were lasting in their nature. The soldiery, the real masters of the empire, must at any cost be satisfied. "Am not I he," was his own language to the mutinying troops at Antioch, "who bestow on you the corn, the clothing, and the money of the provinces?"⁴ "His administration was an unavailing struggle against the corruption of the age:"⁵ and for what he did, or showed that he wished to do, he paid the penalty of his life.⁶—After his

¹ "Instead of a *twentieth* Caracalla now exacted a *tenth* of all legacies and inheritances." Gibb. i. 267.

² i. 219, 267.

³ I refer especially to Salmasius and Gibbon. I doubt not to prove their opinion on the matter quite erroneous. See my Paper on this subject, No. 5, in the Appendix to the present Volume; or my *Vindiciæ Horariæ* on the 3rd Seal.

⁴ Gibb. i. 252.

⁵ *Ib.* i. 251.

⁶ "His prudence was vain; his courage fatal." "The troops blushed at the ignominious patience with which during 13 years they had supported the discipline im-

murder the evil soon became oppressive as before. Through the reigns of Maximin and his successors, we trace it still running on, (in meet sequence of the military tyranny that necessitated it,) with disastrous influence on the body politic. In speaking of the empire's internal state under Philip A.D. 248, some 13 or 14 years only after the death of Alexander Severus, the following is Gibbon's descriptive sketch :—" Its form was still the same, [i. e. as under Hadrian or Augustus ;] but the animating health and vigour was fled. *The industry of the people was discouraged and exhausted by a long series of oppression.*"¹ And again, with reference to the calamitous times that followed soon after Philip's death, (of which more under the next Seal,) that " the long and general famine, (which at that time befell the empire,) was the inevitable consequence of *rapine and oppression*, which extirpated the produce of the present, and the hope of future harvests."²—Nor did the evil stop then and there ; but still continued onward to Gallienus' death ; and even afterwards, under the next succeeding emperors, though styled restorers of the Roman empire, Claudius, Aurelian, Probus. Until in fine Diocletian, conjunctively with his new imperial scheme,³ more fully developed and enforced this fiscal system ; (its branch of provincial contributions in kind prominently inclusive ;) therewith perpetuating the oppression and consequent desolation of the provinces.⁴

Such is in brief the account handed down to us of the nature and aggravation of the evil under Caracalla ; of A. Severus' vain attempts at applying an effective or permanent remedy ; and of its perpetuation, as a *further cause of decline* in the empire. It is my conviction that we have here the very evil, and witness of the law of equity to its vain attempts at arresting it, figured in the vision under consideration.—Let us then now, as under the previous Seal, compare the history with the prophecy ; in respect, 1st, of

posed on them ;" and determined "to elect for their prince one (Maximin), who would assert the glory, and distribute among his companions the treasures of the empire." *ib. i.* 249, 275.—Compare what I have said of this emperor, with reference to the subject of the 2nd Seal, at p. 154 *suprà*.

¹ *i.* 314.

² *i.* 455.

³ See Lactantius M. P. 7.

⁴ I must again beg to refer my readers to my Paper, No. 5, in the Appendix, on the subject here cursorily sketched.

the fiscal evil itself, as causing the dark colour of distress, at the time prophetically indicated, on the emblematic horse; 2ndly, of its *administrators*, as signified by *the horse's rider*, and words address to him from the throne.

1. Now, as regards our first point of inquiry, the historic epoch well accords of course with the chronological position of the hieroglyphic before us; following closely, as it did, on the æra of the introduction of the *military despotism* depicted under the second Seal, and preceding that of the *mortality* under Valerian and Gallienus, the subject, as will soon appear I doubt not, of the fourth.

Further, another point of agreement will be obvious in the identity of the *articles of produce* on which the Roman taxation fell with those noted in the vision. For the former, like the latter, comprehended both *corn-produce*, including *wheat* and *barley*, and also, from such of the provinces as best produced them, *wine* and *oil*.¹—And let me add that in the system of *largesses*, as about this time acted out on a large scale at Rome, they were all, or nearly all, included; and so the evil aggravated that we speak of. At first it was otherwise. For a long time *corn* only was distributed to the citizens.² The largess of *oil* given on one occasion by Julius Cæsar was an extraordinary donative, and not repeated. Again, when Augustus was petitioned to supply them with *wine*, he declined.³ In the reign of Septimius

¹ For example, from Egypt *wheat* was largely required. *Barley*, as well as *wheat*, was included in the required tributes from Sicily. Of this Cicero speaks more than once in his Orations against Verres. So ii. iii. 31, &c. Also *wine* and *oil*. So ib. 7; "L. Octavio et C. Cottæ, consulibus, senatus permisit ut *vini* et *olei* decumas, et frugum minutarum, quas ante te quæstores in Sicilia vendere consueverant, Romæ venderent." Columella, in his Treatise De Re Rusticâ, (written about A.D. 42, in the reign of Claudius,) speaks of *wine* as exacted from the Cyclades, Gaul, and Portugal.—See too Synesius and Cassiodorus in Burmann de Veetigal, p. 50.

By Augustus there was drawn up a *Canon frumentarius*, stating the quantity of corn that each province was to pay. It is noticed, with reference to the times and acts of Tiberius by Tacitus, Annal. vi. 13; of S. Severus by Spartian, c. 23; of Elagabalus by Lampridius, c. 27.—The corn collected in accordance with it was laid up in public granaries, both at Rome and in the provinces; from whence it was given out by the proper officers to the needy people and the soldiers gratuitously. Others might buy from the stores. See Schwarz Excurs. on Plin. Paneg. 31.

² The laws ordaining this distribution of corn to the poorer citizens, gratuitously, or at a trifling price, were called *Leges frumentariæ*, corn-laws. Among the most famous was the *Lex Semproniana* by the celebrated T. S. Gracchus.

³ He said it was sufficient to have provided aqueducts that furnished them with good water. (Suetonius Vit. August. c. 42.) Similarly it was said by Pescennius

Severus, however, father to Caracalla, a largess of *oil* was again accorded; and, after a short intermission under Elagabalus, the donative renewed and established by Alexander Severus.¹ Not very long after which, *wine* may perhaps also have been granted to them by Aurelian.²—So that at the time to which I refer the voice in the vision, not only were all the four items of taxation mentioned in the vision regularly in requisition from the *vectigales*, or produce-paying provinces, but three out of the four had received aggravation from the system of largess above-mentioned; as did, soon after, the fourth also.³ “We shall be too often summoned,” says Gibbon, “to explain the land-tax, the capitation, and the heavy contributions of *corn, wine, oil, and meat*, which were exacted from the provinces for the use of the court, the army, and the capital.”⁴ The explanations that he here alludes to were to be given with reference, more particularly, to the times and the financial system of Diocletian. But, as before observed, there is good evidence of this oppressive branch of the Roman fiscal system having been in operation throughout nearly the whole of the half century from Caracalla’s decree to Diocletian’s accession.⁵

As to the *state of the Roman people* as affected by the evil spoken of, and its accordance with the *black* colour of

Niger, about two centuries afterwards, to his mutinying troops in Egypt, “*Nilum habetis, et vinum quæritis?*” Spartian, Vit. Nig. c. 7.

¹ “*Oleum quod Severus populo dederat, quodque Heliogabalus iminuerat, turpissimis hominibus prefecturam annonæ tribuendo, integrum restituit.*” Lamprid. Vit. A. Sev. c. 22.

² “*Statuerat vinum gratuitum populo Romano dare; ut, quemadmodum oleum et panis, et porcina gratuita præberentur, sic etiam vinum daretur.*” Vopisc. c. 47. Whether he fulfilled his intention does not seem certain. See Note ⁴ p. 197 *infra*.

³ The aggravation thus caused was large. The extent of imports into Rome alone “for the use of the court, the army, and the capital,” of this *fiscal* corn and oil under the emperors, is illustrated by certain specifications that we find in the younger Victor and Spartian. The *former*, in his Life of Augustus, says that from Egypt alone “*urbi [Romæ] annua ducenties centena millia frumenti inferebantur:*” i. e. twenty million of modii, or between 600,000 and 700,000 quarters: a quantity increased by Tiberius. (Tac. Ann. vi. 13.) The *latter*, c. 23, thus writes: “*Moriens (S. Severus) septem annorum canonem, ita ut quotidiana 75 millia modiorum (sc. frumenti) expendi possent reliquit: olei vero tantum, ut per quinquennium non solum urbis usibus, sed et totius Italiæ quæ oleo egeret, sufficeret.*” The *annual* distribution of the government corn at Rome only would thus be about 850,000 quarters. The public [annual] allowance for Alexandria, as fixed by Diocletian, is stated in the Paschal Chronicle, (referred to by Gibbon ii. 136,) at 400,000 quarters.—Other great cities also partook of the bounty. And then there were the great frontier armies too to be supplied. ⁴ Gibb. i. 268. ⁵ See my Paper, No. 5, in the Appendix.

the horse in our hieroglyphic,—the sign of distress and impoverishment in the body politic,—it has been already observed on, and is equally evident. Indeed, in the graphic descriptions of Gibbon, the very trope of the *black* colour of this third horse is adopted, (just as of the *white* and *red* of the two Seals preceding,¹) to illustrate the effect of the evil, with reference both to its earlier and its later operation. He speaks of “the *dark* prospect of distress and calamities bequeathed,” through Caracalla’s prodigality, “to his successors:”² and how this fiscal evil, as “a noxious weed, sprang up again with the most luxurious growth; and in the succeeding age *darkened the Roman world* with its *deadly shade*.”³

2. Nor I think, as designative of the *agents* in these oppressions, (those whom I suppose *the rider of the black horse* to have impersonated,) in other words the *provincial Presidents, Proconsuls, or Procurators*,⁴ to whom, as to the *Prætors* and *Quæstors* of the old Republic before them, was now intrusted in each province the collection of the produce and the revenue, will the Apocalyptic twofold indication here given be found less characteristic:—I mean the indication, first, of *the words addrest to the black horse’s rider* from the throne; secondly, of *the balance* held by him in hand.

As to the *former*, (which will occupy us some little time in unfolding,) it was obvious respecting persons in offices like those of the Provincial Proconsuls, that, as opportunities abounded for exaction,—more especially in respect of payments in kind, or of purchases in kind,⁵ when extra

¹ See p. 131 *suprà*.

² Gibbon i. 227.

³ i. 268.—The words “sprang up *again*” arose out of Gibbon’s erroneous impression that Alexander Severus succeeded in effecting a very material temporary reduction in the produce-taxation: that same error to which I alluded Note ³ p. 173, and which is examined in my Paper in the Appendix. The metaphor *darkened* is of course as applicable to Caracalla’s time as to Diocletian’s.

⁴ See for a more particular notice of these public officers Note ³ p. 186.—Sigonius de Provinc. ii. 5, arranges the duties of the Provincial Præsides or Proconsuls, generally speaking, under three chief heads:—that concerning the *jus*, or judicial matters; that concerning the *res frumentaria*, or corn; and that concerning the *military* of the province.

⁵ Middleton, in his Life of Cicero, Sect. ii, (Vol. i. p. 105, Ed. 1810,) speaking of Sicily, and the times of the Roman Republic, observes that the tenth of the corn in all the conquered towns of Sicily belonged to the Romans; which was always gathered in kind, and sent to Rome: also that, as this was insufficient for the

supplies, as was often the case, were required by the sovereign government at Rome,—so, unless rigorously checked, abuse of those opportunities was likely to follow. In early times this forced itself on the notice of the Roman senate and people; and precautionary laws were enacted by them, laws adopted and added to subsequently by the emperors. They were styled laws *de repetundis*, or against extortion and injustice on the part of the provincial governors;¹ and in their general *charges against injustice* well corresponded, it will be observed, with the tone and spirit of the monition to the rider in the text.—Besides which, and with the same object of preventing injustice, particular precautionary provisions were sometimes, in other laws, made against it; especially *by naming the price* at which the governor was to rate and purchase. I may cite as a specimen the Casian frumentarian law. And really the expressions in it are so remarkably similar to the words pronounced in the Apocalyptic vision,—so illustrative of their preceptive and admonitory character, and of the object and meaning in that character of the charge they contain as to the price of corn,²—as to seem like an actual comment of explanation

public use, the Prætors had an appointment also of money from the treasury, to *purchase* such further stores as were necessary for the current year.—And Burmann De Vectigal. pp. 41, 42, speaks of the same right and custom of purchasing, as prevalent too in imperial times, and with reference to the provinces generally.

Money payments were, however, sometimes taken by the Provincial Governor, in lieu of payments in kind: “a method,” says Gibbon, (iii. 86,) “susceptible of the utmost latitude, and of the utmost strictness: and which, in a corrupt and absolute monarchy, must introduce a perpetual contest between the power of oppression and the arts of fraud.”

¹ In the times of the Republic there were enacted the following laws *de repetundis*; U.C. 604 *Lex Calpurnia*; by which trials for extortion were made one of the four *Quæstiones perpetuæ*: i. e. one of the six Judicial Prætors, annually chosen, was through the year to devote himself to the trial of those causes.

— 627 *Lex Junia*; by which, besides the *litis æstimatio*, and damages, the officer convicted was to suffer banishment.

— 653 *Lex Servilia*, ordaining severer penalties than before against extortion; but permitting that the defendant should have a second hearing.

— 683 *Lex Aeilia*; by which the defendant's right of a second hearing was abrogated.

— 694 *Lex Julia*, by Julius Cæsar; of which there were above 100 heads, some very severe.

I copy from Adams' Roman Antiquities. A fuller account of these laws is given by Ernesti; prefixed to the *Clavis* in his edition of Cicero.

² It should be observed that the genitive of price, as we have it in the text, (*χοινιξ σιτου δηναριου*) is applicable both to buying and selling. It is used of *buying*, Acts vii. 16, *ωνησατο τιμης αργυριου* of *selling*, Matt. xxvi. 9, “This ointment *ηδυνατο παθηναι πολλου*” and is generally a term of *value*.

on them. It having been enacted, at the instance of Cassius, that 800,000 modii of wheat should be bought for the citizens of Rome by the provincial authorities, the price to be paid for it (about the fair market-price at the time evidently) was by the legislating supreme government enjoined upon those authorities, in phrase brief and simple, like that in the text; "A modius of wheat for a denarius!"¹—Such was at that time the admonitory direction of the *supreme law and government* at Rome to the provincial authorities; such the naming of the price of corn, and the object of its naming. Nor was the case different afterwards with any of the really justice-loving emperors:² whether urging the thing with successful effect, like Trajan and the Antonines; or, like A. Severus, less successfully.—And *whence* such monitory laws? Surely, forasmuch as both these, and the general laws against extortion, were conceived in the spirit of equity, they might well be considered as emanating not only from the *subordinate earthly powers* ordained by God, but from Him the habitation of whose throne is justice and judgment,³ and who has solemnly declared himself in his written law against all defrauding, oppression, and wrong:⁴ even the same that in the Apocalyptic visions sate enthroned in the midst of the living creatures,⁵ *God Himself*. For, as Hooker beautifully says,

¹ "Ex Senatûs Consulto, et ex Lege Terentiâ et Cassiâ frumentariâ . . . pretium constitutum. . . frumento imperato, in modios singulos, H. S. iiii;" i.e. at a denarius a modius. Cicero in Frument. Verrinâ c. 70.

² "*Definito pretio*" occurs frequently in the Roman *imperial* laws. So Burmann De Vectigal. (p. 41, 42) says that the emperors were wont "à subjectis gentibus *pretio dato* emere," when more corn was wanted than the tribute in kind supplied: "et eo casu coactos fuisse Provinciales, pretio à fisco accepto, frumentum vendere; quod onus dicitur *στροφή*, *coemptio*."—He adds, with reference to the *price* enjoined by just or unjust emperors; "Quemadmodum vero avari et impotentes Imperatores hoc frumentum nullò vel perexiguo pretio Provincialibus extorquebant, sic boni et justî Principes pretium congruens solvi jubebant." And he instances the case of *Trajan*; "Unde eam laudem Trajano, Plin. Paneg. c. 29; 'Enuit [qu. *sinit* ?] fiscus quidquid videtur emere: inde copiæ, inde annona: *de quâ inter licentem vendentemque conveniat*.'" A passage which I shall have again to allude to p. 180.

Of later imperial laws this is the language: "Frumentum pretium non justum statuere non potest ordo cujusque civitatis." Justinian Corpus Jur. Civ. Index in voc. *Frumentum*.

³ Ps. lxxxix. 14.

⁴ "Thou shalt not steal." Thou shalt not defraud. "A just weight and a just balance are from the Lord." Again, Deut. xxv. 13; "Thou shalt not have in thy bag divers weights;" (Hebr. a stone and a stone;) one, heavy, to buy with,—another, light, to sell with: but only "one stone," or one true weight.

⁵ Compare Numb. vii. 89; "When Moses was gone into the tabernacle of the congregation, then he heard the voice of one speaking to him from off the mercy-seat that was upon the ark of the testimony, from between the two cherubim."

“Of *law* there can be no less acknowledged than that her seat is in the bosom of God:”¹ a truth which even heathen Romans saw, and acknowledged.²

The *price* of wheat named in the Cassian law varied indeed greatly, as will be seen, from the one here mentioned; the former being a denarius for a *modius*; the latter a denarius for a *chœnix*, or *eighth part of a modius*: that is, if we follow the most natural hypothesis about the chœnix, and suppose the common *Attic* chœnix to be the one intended. But it is to be remembered that as time went on, and the republic passed into an empire, and the empire became settled and mature, great changes took place in the price of corn throughout the Roman empire: under which circumstances changes proportionate, of course, occurred in the amount of price equitably dictated to the provincial governors, in the laws of equitable emperors, at which to estimate, to buy, and indeed also to sell.³ Of the average price at a period not very long before the Apocalyptic vision we have already seen authentic record in the elder Pliny, who died A.D. 79, two years only before Domitian’s accession; stating it as then about *three denarii* the *modius*, or three times greater than in the age of Cassius.⁴ This price would seem to have continued pretty much the average through the prosperous times of the second cen-

¹ Eccl. Pol. B. i. ad fin.

² “Lex est recta et a numine Deorum tracta ratio, imperans honesta, prohibens contraria.” So *Cicero* de Leg. Again, *ibid.* ii. 4; “Lex vera atque princeps. . . ad rectè faciendum impellens, et à delicto avocans, . . . orta simul est cum mente divinâ.” And he calls the law of nature and equity *lex divina, jus divinum*. De Offic. iii. 5, &c. Middleton, in his *Life of Cicero*, iii. 386, enlarges well on this. So again *Seneca*, *Epist.* 94, on *law*: “Legem brevem esse oportet, quo facilius ab imperitis teneatur: velut emissa divinitus vox sit.” In which passage *Seneca*’s “velut emissa divinitus vox,” is really almost like a translation of the Apocalyptic phrase, “a voice as it were from the midst of the living creatures.”—Similarly in old *Homer* θεμιστες, as *Daubuz* observes, signifies both the oracles of God, and the laws of a king.

Dr. Arnold, *Hist. of Rome*, Vol. ii. 19, on a subject not dissimilar from that on which I am speaking, thus remarks. If “false to its divine origin and purpose” then “the voice of law is no longer the voice of God.”

³ See p. 175 Note¹.—*Schwarz*, in his Note on *Plin. Paneg.* 29, thus praises *Trajan* for not allowing his Procurators to *force* a sale on the Provincials at the Procurators’ own price, as had been frequent before. “Eo major laus erat *Trajan*i, quo imperante fisci procuratores non obtrudebant provincialibus invitis frumentum certo pretio emendum; sed sinebant quemque quidquid sibi e re esse videretur emere, eo quidem pretio de quo inter licentem ac vendentem convenat.”—Compare Note² p. 179: also, on the inclusion of *selling*, as well as *buying*, in the Apocalyptic monition from the throne, Note² p. 178.

⁴ See the abstract from *Pliny* in Note² p. 164 *suprà*.

tury: after which it declined; till it stood at just half Pliny's price under the Constantinian emperors, in the first half of the fourth century.¹ And, on the reasonable hypothesis of the decline having progressed nearly about one third at the opening of the second quarter of the third century, the date of the reign of Alexander Severus, the average price at that time might have been about two denarii and a half for the modius of wheat, or near *one third of a denarius* for the *Attic chœnix*.—But how then? The price is still altogether at variance with that enunciated in the Apocalyptic vision; “A chœnix of wheat (not for *one third of*, but) for a *whole denarius*.” Hence in truth at first sight a great difficulty. Indeed for a long time it seemed to me insurmountable, on the hypothesis of the Attic chœnix: and I fell back, in consequence, on the supposition of the larger and less common chœnix of 8 cotylæ being meant, as its best solution.² But I had overlooked one most important element for consideration in the question, which at once sets all right; viz. the *intrinsic value of the denarius* at the time supposed to be depicted in the vision. For so it is, as I now find, that though the denarius for centuries previous, under both Republic and Emperors, had been always scrupulously coined of pure silver, yet from the commencement of the third century it began to be gradually more and more adulterated:—to the value of *one-half* in the reign of the first Severus; and in the reign of the second Severus to the value of just *two-thirds*.³

¹ The *Emperor Julian*, about the *middle of the fourth century*, states in his *Misopogon* that the price of wheat was 5, 10, or 15 modii for an aureus, according as it was a time of plenty or scarcity. Now the aureus (Gibbon iii. 89) equalled at that time near about 11s. “Whence,” says Gibbon, (iv. 146,) “and from some collateral examples, I conclude that under Constantine's successors the moderate price was about 32s. the English quarter;” i. e. just half the price of Pliny. Prices probably attained their maximum in the Roman empire about the end of the first century.

² I then supposed the chœnix of 8 cotylæ to have been the one most generally used at Rome; being led to this impression by the French Academician's speaking of it as a measure “naturalisée à Rome.” But, on reverting to the Memoir, I see that he only so speaks of it in common with the other chœnixes; and both the more ancient testimonies of Herodotus, Thucydides, Theocritus, and also, under the emperors, those of Athenæus and Galen, so testify to the general diffusion and notoriety of the *Attic chœnix* throughout the Roman world, that, as stated before, I have felt bound to accept it as the chœnix here meant.

³ In proof I subjoin extracts to this effect from Professor Wurm's Book on the Ancient Weights and Measures; and also from Eckhel.

1. *Wurm*, p. 30. “Ex accuratiori examini subjectis compluribus denariis Darceet invenit *florente Republicâ* eorum argenti puritatem adscendisse ad 0. 993, (positâ

So that, as under that last-mentioned prince the denarius had but one-third the silver, and consequently but one-third the value, of the older and standard denarius, the Apocalyptic charge, "A chœnix of wheat for a denarius," proves to have been the literally true expression of about its average price at that particular æra.¹ Surely the coincidence must be deemed very remarkable.—As to the price of *barley* specified in the voice from the throne, it is considerably lower than its usual proportion to that of wheat: it being but *a third*; not, as more commonly, *a half*.² But

integritate absolutâ=1,) donec paulatim ad 0.965 deprimeretur. In Augusti quodam denario Bouterone reperit argenti puritatem=0.9826. Sub primis imperatoribus imminuta parumper puritas sic satis sibi constitit ad Severum usque. Posteriores enim imperatores monetam mirum in modum corrumpere ausi, quo lucraretur ærarium; unde puritas denariorum Septimio Severo imperante recedit ad 0.494, sive ad $\frac{1}{2}$.—Caracalla novum monetæ genus excudit, modulo majori, argento deteriori; quanquam cum successoribus nummos quoque ex veteri instituto ferire periret.—Sub *Alexandro Severo* nummi quidem pondere antiquis pares; sed *nonnisi tertiam iis argenti partem inesse* expertus est Savotus.—Nummorum Gallieni puritatem Letronne ait fuisse 0.339, sive circiter $\frac{1}{3}$; Bimardus adeo=0.200, sive $\frac{1}{5}$. A Claudio Gothico usque ad Diocletianum Romæ exulat argentum; ut nonnisi rarissimi sint nummi argentei, iique valde impuri. Cum Diocletiano redit moneta argentea."

2. *Eckhel*, Vol. i. Prolegom. p. xxvii. "Alexander Severus veteris formæ argenteos sic corrumpit, ut etsi pondere à veteribus non differrent, tamen *nonnisi tertiam argenti portionem in iis inesse* expertus est Savotus." At p. xxxvii he says that this adulteration affected the coinage in the Provinces, as well as at Rome. "Adde monetam argenteam inde à Severo non Romæ modo, *sed etiam in provinciis*, si qua adhuc in his signata fuit, vilioris metalli admixtione pessimè corruptam."

Niebuhr also remarks on this, in his History of Rome (Ed. Schmitz), Vol. ii. p. 358, with reference to a later part of the 3rd century: and *Ducange* notes from Pollio the *brass* denarii of the emperor Aurelian; of which "sex millia solidum conficiebant."

It is by this adulteration, and great depreciation of the value of the denarius, that the high prices of produce given in the Stratonicean inscription are alone to be explained:—e. g. "Milipisti KM unum * centum; Panici KM * quinquaginta." The inscription is an imperial decree, stating the maximum of prices in terms of the denarius; and is given in full by Col. Leake, in his Tour in Asia Minor, p. 331. It was probably of the time of Diocletian. And Lactantius, in his M. P. 7, both well illustrates, and is well illustrated by it. "Diocletianus, cum variis iniquitatibus immensam faceret caritatem, legem pretiis rerum venalium statuere conatus est: &c."—But this is with reference to a time 60 years after Alex. Severus.

¹ At that one æra almost distinctively and alone. For under the first Severus the current denarius would have been probably more than the average price; under Gallienus less. See the extract from Wurm in the Note preceding; stating the adulteration under the former emperor to have been to the value of but one half, under Gallienus of four-fifths.

² Such was the proportion after the ending of the famine in Samaria. (2 Kings vii. 1, 16.) The same is noted by Cicero as the proportion in Sicily at the time of Verres' Prætorship (Lib. iii. in Verrem); "Quaternis H. S. tritici modium, binis hordei." It is nearly the proportion also in our own country: at least according to statistical tables of prices for the last forty-seven years, i. e. from 1790 to 1837; the exact average proportion being as 87 to 160.

Daubuz broaches a curious theory, to the effect that the comparative cheapness of barley noted in the vision, as compared with that of wheat, was a sign of scarcity. His argument is quite unintelligible to me, and is indeed refuted by fact. From the above-mentioned tables it will appear that the lower or higher ratio of the price of

there does not seem to be here anything in our hypothesis inconsistent with historic probability : Alexander Severus' large and celebrated procurations of corn in considerable measure accounting for it ; since these were doubtless most by far of wheat.¹

Let me observe, ere passing from this subject, that the Apocalyptic specification of the *denarius* as the standard money-price, in the voice from the throne, may perhaps have been common at Rome, as language borrowed from the Cassian law : a price involving the specification also of that small wheat-measure the *chenix*,¹ rather than the *modius*. But chiefly, I conceive, this is specified to indicate how low the taxation would descend, and consequently its universal oppressiveness. And let it be understood that the idea that measures thus small might have been specified, as well as larger, in the Roman laws of that period, is not the mere conjecture of the expositor, with a view to suit the language of the prophetic figuration before us. There is still extant direct historical evidence that such was the case, in regard both of measures and weights ; and as an object of very careful and serious legislation, with a view specially to that which we have explained as the intent of the voice from the throne, viz. the protection of the tributaries of the empire from unjust exactions on the part of the exactors of tribute. So in a law of Valentinian, which orders *small* standard measures, as well as the larger *modius*, and corresponding weights also, to be placed in every city ; in order that every tributary might see whether more was exacted than his due, and punishment follow surely on the fiscal exactor.² Moreover,

barley to that of wheat, has no connexion either with the fact of plenty or scarcity.—In some of the years included in the tables, I may observe, the comparative price of barley was much lower than as 1 to 2 ; e g. in 1816, it was as 1 to above 2½.—Fleetwood, in his *Chronicon Pretiosum*, gives examples of price from our earlier British history ; in some of which the proportion is as low as 1 to 3, the same as in our text.

¹ It is said that Alexander Severus replaced all the corn which Heliogabalus had wasted. See too his appeal to the mutinying soldiers, on the subject of his procurations for them. The word here used by the historian, in relation thereto, is indeed *annonam* ; (“acceptam à provincialibus annonam ;” Lamprid. 53;) a word including *barley*. But, as the procuration was for the citizens of Rome and the army,—and by the former barley-bread was despised, and with the latter to be fed on barley, “*hordeopasci*,” was a military punishment,—we may safely conclude that the procurations were, in by far the largest proportion, of *wheat*. This would of course raise the price of wheat somewhat disproportionately.

Doubtless it was the despised barley-bread on which Christ often fed. John vi. 9, &c.

² “*Modios aeneos vel lapideos, cum sextariis, atque ponderibus, per mansiones singulasque civitates jussimus collocari ; ut unus quisque tributarius, sub oculis con-*

somewhat remarkably, an ancient weight of 2 lb., just equivalent to the *chaenix* measure of wheat,¹ has been lately made the subject of critical examination at Rome: ²—one stamped, it seems, as a government-weight under direction of ~~one of the~~ *αγορανομοι*³ of ~~Alexander Severus~~; and issued doubtless with the same equitable object in view as Valentinian's, as well as for the general use of buyers and sellers in the market.⁴

Thus is the specified *price* and *measure*, as well as all else, found to suit our view of the rider in the third Seal; though with special reference, in so far as regards the Apocalyptic voice as from the throne, to the reclamation of the law of equity under A. Severus. And indeed I cannot but think that to St. John those words enjoining the price of *wheat* and *barley* must almost of themselves have suggested Imperial Provincial Governors, as the parties address under figure of the rider; just as the monitory words of the Cassian law might in earlier times have suggested the Provincial Administrators of the old Republic:—more especially as there was added that other monition, in the same spirit of equity, about the *wine* and the *oil*; precisely the like to which seems to have been enjoined from time to time on the Provincial Presidents by the juster emperors, in connexion with the imperial exactions of wine and oil, in their Canon Frumentarius.⁵

stitutis rerum omnium modis, sciat quid debeat susceptoribus: ita ut, si quis susceptorum conditorum modiorum, sextariorumque, vel ponderum normam putaverit excedendam, pœnam se sciat competentem esse subiturum." Cod. l. x. Tit. De Susceptoribus. Cited by Secchi p. 22. Compare Note ³ p. 180.

¹ See my abstract from Arbuthnot, and the table of measures, p. 164 *suprà*.

² See the very interesting Dissertation of Father Secchi on this *Διλειτρον*, which is in the Kircherian Museum at Rome; * or my Abstract of it in the Appendix to this Volume. It has stamped on it on one side ΕΤΟΥΣ. Δ. Ι. ΥΠΑΤΕΥΟΝΤΟΣ Τ. ΙΟΥ. ΚΑΛΤΙΟΥ ΣΕΟΥΗΡΟΥ ΙΤΑΛΙΚΟΝ; on the obverse, ΑΓΟΡΑΝΟΜΟΥΝΤΟΣ ΜΕΝΕΣΘΕΩΣ ΧΡΗΣΤΟΥ ΔΙΛΕΙΤΡΟΝ. It weighs, says Secchi, 602 *grammi*, having lost a little weight by friction; the mean weight of the Roman pound being about 326 *grammi*. (N.B. The French *gramme* = 15½ English grains nearly.)

³ Father Secchi judges this Menestheus to have been one of the 14 *curatores urbis*, appointed by Alex. Severus, as Lampridius relates (ch. 33), from men of consular dignity, to assist the *Præfect of the City*, with ædilitial authority in this matter.

⁴ "Leges de jure populi, et fisci, moderatas et infinitas sanxit," says Lampridius in his Life of Alex. Severus, c. 16.—Let me add that on Spartan's Life of S. Severus, c. 23, Casaubon expresses his opinion that the Roman *tesseræ frumentariæ* were tickets that entitled the citizens to a *chaenix* of corn. Hence an additional reason for the *chaenix* and the *διλειτρον*.

⁵ In the Codex Theodosianus, intermixed with stringent laws for the due gathering of the tributes of wine and oil, as well as of corn, we find not merely such cau-


THE ROMAN PROPRETORS' & QUÆSTORS' EMBLEMS.

of a Balance, an Ear of Wheat, and a Corn-measure.



From Spaenheim

THE BALANCE ON AN IMPERIAL COIN OF ALEXANDER SEVERUS.



From a coin in the British Museum.

If however of itself this indication might have been insufficient, the *second* and additional indication of the rider's *holding a balance*, would, I conceive, when conjoined with the former, have sufficed to set all doubt on the point aside. For *the balance*, from being the emblem of justice,¹ came to be an official badge of those that had appointment to the administration of justice;² such as the Prætors at Rome, and the Provincial Governors in the Provinces. Which latter accordingly, under the old Republic, used sometimes to have *a balance* over the *curule chair* of their high office, on coins struck in connexion with their appointment: and, together therewith, sometimes also an *ear of corn*, or it might be *a Roman measure*, with reference to the procurations of corn charged more or less directly upon them; just as in the medals which the reader here sees engraved before him.³—In imperial times indeed the supreme *judicial*

tions about a fair price for the corn as were exemplified by me pp. 178, 179 *suprà*; but generally against all extortion, injustice, and oppression of the people, in the collection of the various tributes.—These monitory laws appear from their language to have arisen generally out of complaints against the imperial officers. A circumstance this which is illustrated by what Spartian (c. 13) says of the emperor Hadrian's energetic proceedings against unjust and oppressive Provincial Governors in his reign. "Adrianus, circumiens provincias, Procuratores et Præsides pro factis supplicio affectit ita severè, ut accusatores per se crederetur immittere." Also by Capitolinus, c. 6, of Antoninus Pius; "Contra procuratores suos conquerentes libenter audivit."

It will be observed that there is this distinction in the Apocalyptic monition, with reference to the *wheat and barley* on the one hand, and the *wine and oil* on the other, that a *price* is named for the *former* only. I presume that this may have been because, besides the provincial *tributes* of corn, a vast quantity had frequently to be *bought* for the imperial service. But the wants of wine and oil were for the most part abundantly supplied by the tributes; and no *buying* of them consequently requisite.

¹ See Note ² p. 170 *suprà*.

² So the Oneirocritic cited in Daubuz: *Εαν τις ιδῆ κατ' οὐρανὸν ζυγόν, . . . ταυτα εἰς προσώπων νοεῖτω κριτὸν*. "If one see in vision a *balance*, it indicates a *judge*." Compare Job xxxi. 6; "Let him weigh me in *balances of justice*." Marg. i. e. as a *judge*.—In his Dialogue *Περὶ Δικαίου*, Plato draws out the comparison.

³ The three medals alluded to, and which are the first three in the Plate, are copied from Spanheim *De Usu Num. Diss. vi. p. 545*. After speaking of the *sella curulis*, which the reader sees in the first of my engraved medals, as often marking the *consulare fastigium*, he goes on as follows. "Eadem *sellæ curules* in denariis Gentium Romanarum ad designandos alios curules magistratus, Prætores, Ædiles, Præfectos Urbis: quibus etiam varia symbola vulgo adjuncta, puta *lances, spicæ, thyrsos*; idque, ut observo, ad discrimen eorum magistratum quibus *sellæ curulis* jus competeat. Hinc *lances* videas eum *sellâ curuli* in denario Gentis Liciniæ; adpositè ad *Prætoris* aut *Legati Pro Prætoris* officium indicandum, cui *juris dicendi* partes incumbabant. Ædiles autem curules, quos eum *annonæ* tum ludorum procuracionem habuisse nemo nescit, et quos proinde Curatores Urbis, *annonæ*, ludorumque solennium vocat alieubi Tullius, frequenter etiam *sella curulis*, modo cum *spicis* à lateribus, modo cum thyrso Liberalium symbolo, designat; sicut in denariis Gentis Lollia ac *Valeriae*. Eandem vero *annonæ* eorum inuit etiam *modius frumenti* cum duabus *spicis*, in denario Gentis Liviniæ."

and *financial*, as well as supreme *military* power, centred in the *emperors*: whence the ascription to them of the *balance of justice*; whether in historic writings,¹ or on imperial coins, such as that of Alex. Severus in my plate, with the legend *Æquitas Augusti* around it. But the authority that the *balance* indicated, as well as that indicated by the *sword*, (the latter whether *militarily* or simply *civilly* judicial),² was delegated of course by them to their subordinate provincial and financial governors:³ just as in other times, and another country, it was said by our Henry the Vth to the English Lord Chief Justice,

These medals are noticed by Eckhel also in his 5th Volume, pp. 153, 233, 159, 235.—It seems that the *first* has the name of *Metellus Pius Scipio Imp.* on the other side; P. Crassus Junius having been his Legatus Pro Prætor, at the time when he was contending in Africa with Cæsar, as the head of the Pompeians after the battle of Pharsalia.—The *second* has inscribed on its other side the names of the Quæstors *Piso and Cæpio*; who were appointed by the Senate, some time during the Republic, to buy corn.—The *third* has the name of L. Regulus Prætor. The precise date of the two last is uncertain.

To these three I have added a coin of Alex. Severus' reign, with the symbol of the balance; also a copy, from Secchi, of the *Δλευτρον* issued by him. On which, as well as on the coins, see my Paper on Roman Medals in the Appendix to this Volume.

¹ So Constantine Manasses, with reference to the equity of *Trajan's* administration, *εις κρισεις ἀρεπεστατοι ζυγοι δικαιοσυνης* (in Chron. p. 44): an eulogium, observes Vitringa, (p. 309,) which applies to the administration of Trajan's three successors, as well as to Trajan himself.—With regard to *Hadrian's* similar care to insure equity in his provincial administration, see Spartian's testimony given Note ⁵ p. 184 *suprà*. And so too Capitolinus, c. 6, of *Antoninus Pius*; "Procuratores suos modestè suscipere tributa jussit: excedentes modum rationem factorum suorum reddere præcepit: nec unquam lætatus est lucro quo provincialis oppressus est."

² See p. 155 Note ².

³ See Tac. Ann. xii. 60.—There were *Præfecti Annonæ at Rome*, over the important department of the annona. Augustus himself once undertook the office. But it was the *Provincial Governors*, with whom of course the *Præfecti Annonæ* were in communication, that had to superintend the matter in the Provinces. Of these Provincial Governors the generic title, I believe, was *Præsides Provinciarum*; though the appellation had *properly* a more restricted meaning. It seems that besides the greater Provinces, governed either by the Emperor's *Legati Pro Prætor* or the Senate's *Proconsuls*, there were other smaller or less important Provinces. In the *former* or larger Provinces, besides the *Proprætors* or *Proconsuls*, there were the *Procuratores Cæsaris*, high officers charged specially with the care of the revenue; in connexion however with, and in a measure subordinate to, the superior Governors. In the latter or inferior Provinces the *Procurator* was himself the *Præses* or Governor. So in old inscriptions; "Procurator et Præsides Alpium;" "Procurator et Præsides Provinciæ Sardinie;" &c. (See Salmasius' Note on Spartian's Life of Adrian, c. 13, ad fin., and Burman de Vectigal. p. 146. The latter refers to Lipsius' Excursus on Tacit. Annal. xii. q. v.)—Under these *Præsides* there were of course subordinate officers for the collection of the tributes; "qui per Provincias mittebantur, ut vectigalia tam frumenti quàm pecudum et vini et olei colligerent; et qui vel à speciebus Frumentarii dicebantur, vel generali voce Susceptorum."—In the Provinces governed by higher Officers the *Procurators* had jurisdiction only in fiscal causes, the supreme Governor having the supreme and general jurisdiction. So Salmasius, *ibid.* "Rem fisci curabant, et nullam nisi in fiscalibus causis jurisdictionem habebant." In the other Provinces they had of course the whole jurisdiction in their hands.

“Hold thou still the *balance* and the sword.”¹

Which being so, and the two Apocalyptic indications of the figured *balance* and the *monitory voice as from the throne against injustice* in regard of *corn, wine, and oil*, being thus conjointly characteristic and distinctive of a Roman Provincial Governor, observe with what beautiful propriety they have been combined in the hieroglyphic before us:—the rider’s position on horseback marking of itself his station of authority, the official balance being held by him in hand, and the prices, measure, and charge to equity audibly enunciated to him from the throne.—Nor let me forget to add that a *horse* was presented for his use to the Provincial Governor, on which to go forth publicly to his Province, as well as to the Military Proprætor.² So that in respect of the *black* horse’s rider, as well as of the rider of the *red* horse, the Apocalyptic emblem might be considered as one drawn from the life.

And now, I think, we may draw to a conclusion.—We have seen what were the charges to equity address to the Provincial Governors. And their very badge of the *balance* might seem almost a profession of equity. But they were professions from Caracalla’s time (the earliest included in our vision) with few and brief exceptions almost always falsified; and the injunctions of the law to equity, however solemn, for the most part altogether in vain. “Those,” says Gibbon,³ “who had learning enough to read the orations of Cicero against Verres, might *instruct* themselves in all the various arts of oppression, with regard to the *weight*, the *price*, the *quality*, and the *carriage*;⁴ and the avarice of an *unlettered* governor would supply the ignorance of precept or precedent.” The “*robbers of the provinces*” was both Alex. Severus’ and Aurelian’s too just appellation

¹ Shakespear, Henry IV. (2nd Pt.) Act v. Sc. 2.

² See Note⁴ p. 126; and Lamprid. Vit. Alex. Severi c. 42, already observed on Note³ p. 157 *suprà*.

³ iii. 87.

⁴ It may illustrate the subject of the Seal, as well as Gibbon’s language here quoted, if we observe that in Sicily, when the wheat-procurations were required from the islanders, the market-price being not above one denarius the modius, Verres exacted three denarii from some of them as a money-equivalent for each modius due. Cicero in Frument. Verr.

of them.¹—Moreover, as in the wide-extending branches of *fiscal* administration they acted out this mockery of justice, so too in the *judicial* and *general* administration.²—Hence the solution of the enigma which at first sight seemed scarcely explicable; how, under the influences of one that held the balance of equity as his badge, the aspect of the Roman horse, or people, should yet gather blackness. For it was but in official symbol and profession that he held the balance of equity. The reality of the case with him, as with Ephraim, was that described by the prophet, “The balance of deceit is in his hands; he loveth to oppress.”³—The voice of natural equity indeed never, even from the first, ceased its reclamations. And by Alexander Severus, as we saw, there was in a very remarkable manner a waking up of the voice of *law* in support of it:⁴ even as by one who had studied and loved the golden precept of Christianity, “Do as ye would be done by.”⁵ But it was all in vain. After brief and partial amelioration the evil triumphed as before. Throughout what remained of the third century the laws against extortion and injustice, like many others which meet the eye in history, must be looked on rather as *records of the crime*, then preventives of its commission.

And does it need that I impress upon my readers a sense of the gravity of the evil? With characteristic forethought the great Trajan likened the undue enlargement of the taxation, with exacting procurators to collect it, to the morbid enlargement of the spleen in man’s body, causing atrophy.⁶ And, after Alex. Severus’ vain attempts at

¹ “Fures.” Lamprid. Alex. Sev. 15, 28. “Fures provinciales repetundarum ac peculatûs reos.” Vopiscus Vit. Aurelian. c. 39. (Cicero had previously applied the same word in the same way. Ep. ad Famil. ix. 21.) “Provinciarum prædatores.” Aur. Victor, Vit. Aurelian.

² So Cyprian paints the judicial administration at Carthage, as a mere mockery of justice. “Judex? Sed sententiam vendit, &c.” Epist. 1. ad Donat. p. 22. (Ed. Paris, 1842.)

³ Hosea xii. 7.—The old Apocalyptic Expositor *Tichonius*, in his 6th Homily on the Revelations, expresses very much the same view of the rider’s falsification of this symbol of equity. “Stateram habebat in manu suâ;—id est examen æquitatis: quia, dum fingit se justitiam tenere, per simulationem lædit.” And so too *Primasius*.

⁴ So Lampridius of him, ch. 42; “Præsides provinciarum . . . si male [egissent,] in quadruplum reddituri, præter condemnationem aut peculatûs aut repetundarum.”

⁵ Alex. Severus’ admiration of Christian morality is well known; and will be noted by me again under the fifth Seal.

⁶ “Exactiones improbens et detestans, fiscum lienem vocabat, quòd eo crescente artus reliqui tabescunt.” So the younger Victor, Epit. ch. xlii.

effective amelioration, the history of the sequel illustrates too fully the truth of Trajan's comparison. A general internal wasting of the Roman state resulted from it, as I have already stated from Gibbon.¹ The agriculture of the provinces was insensibly ruined: and thus preparation made for famine; which, as we shall see under the next Seal, soon succeeded. In fine, in its not very remote consequences, it involved both the depopulation and desolation of provinces once the most fertile in the empire:² and also personal and family distress, such as to reduce the inhabitants to despair;³ and to banish from the provincials every sentiment of patriotism.⁴

Thus, by any one that considers the end from the begin-

¹ See p. 174 *suprà*.

I see that *Mosheim*, in his *Church History*, i. 1. 1. 2, has a paragraph on the *incommoda* of the Roman empire: and in it makes the evil treated of under this Seal a prominent subject; contrastedly (as here) with the equity of the Roman law, which in vain sought to furnish a defence against it. "The Roman government, with respect both to its form and laws, was mild and equitable. But the injustice and avarice of the Provincial Governors . . . together with the rapacity of the publicans, by whom the taxes of the country (*vectigalia*) were farmed, were the cause of innumerable grievances to the people." So again *Niebuhr*; "Soon after the death of *Marens Antoninus* we find the commencement of that boundless extortion of money, and intolerable taxation, which brought distress and misery on the whole world." *Miss Winckworth's Life and Writings of Niebuhr*, Vol. iii. p. 168.

² In *Vopiscus's* *Life of Aurelian*, c. 47, 48, we read of vast fertile tracts in Etruria, along the Aurelian way, even then lying desolate. With reference to a later period, *Gibbon* (iii. 87) states that sixty years after the death of *Constantine*, before ever a barbarian had been seen in Italy, an exemption from taxes was granted for 330,000 acres in the fertile province of *Campania*, that is, for one-eighth part of the whole province, as being by actual survey ascertained to be desert: and he ascribes this to the long impoverishing effect of fiscal oppressions; of the aggravation of which our *Apocalyptic* figuration marks a chief æra.—It is to be observed that Italy had been reduced, about the end of the third century, to a level in respect of taxation with the other provinces. *Aur. Victor* xxxix. 31.

³ In speaking of a humane law of *Constantine*, made early in his reign with a view to remedy the evil, *Gibbon* observes as follows. "The horrid practice of exposing or murdering their new-born infants was become every day more frequent in the provinces, and especially in Italy. It was the effect of distress: and the distress was principally occasioned by the intolerable burden of taxes; and by the vexatious as well as cruel persecutions of the officers of the revenue against their insolvent debtors. The less opulent, or less industrious, instead of rejoicing in an increase of family, deemed it an act of paternal tenderness to release their children from the impending miseries of a life which they themselves were unable to support. The humanity of *Constantine*, moved perhaps by some recent and extraordinary instances of despair, engaged him to address an edict to all the cities of Italy, and afterwards of Africa, directing immediate and sufficient relief to those parents who should produce before the magistrates the children whom their own poverty would not allow them to educate." Vol. ii. 250.

⁴ "Let them come then those barbarians!" So *Michelet*, *Hist. de France*, in a sketch of the feelings of the French peasantry ground down by taxation on the Gothic barbarians' first irruption.

ning, this epoch of Caracalla's decree cannot but be regarded in the same light in which it has been delineated by the historian, as one of the introduction of fresh and grievous morbid principle into the Roman body politic, under the working of which it would indeed gather blackness.—And who then can doubt but that it was a subject deserving of prefiguration? Or who, that it was the very subject prefigured under the Seal before us? For surely, I may say, not a particular is there in the emblematic vision that has not been shown to have had its correspondency in the features, as noticed by me, of this period of Roman history. In truth, brief as is the description of the figuration in the text, the whole subject of this long chapter seems to pass embodied before us, as we once again read it. “When he opened the third Seal, I beheld, and lo! a *black* horse; and he that sat on it having a *pair of balances* in his hand. And I heard a voice, as in the midst of the living creatures, saying; *A chœnix of wheat for a denarius*, and three *chœnixes of barley for a denarius*; and see that thou wrong not in regard to the *oil* and the *wine*!”

CHAPTER IV.

THE FOURTH SEAL.

“AND when he opened the fourth Seal, I heard the voice of the fourth living creature say, Come!¹ And I looked, and behold a *pale*² horse! And his name that sat on it

¹ Και ὅτε ηνοιξε την σφραγιδα την τεταρτην, ηκουσα φωνην του τεταρτου ζωου λεγοντος, Ερχου. Και ειδον, και ιδου ιππος χλωρος, και ὁ καθημενος επανω αυτου, ονομα αυτω ὁ θανατος· και ὁ ἄδης ηκολουθει μετ' αυτου. Και εδοθη αυτω εξουσια επι το τεταρτον της γης, αποκτειναι εν ρομφαια, και εν λιμω, και εν θανατω, και ὑπο των θηριων της γης.

² χλωρος, first, *grassy green*; also *pale*; and then, *livid*. Its application to death in either of the latter senses is obvious and frequent. So “*pallida mors*,” Horace: *χλωρον δεος*, Homer.—In these and such like examples the epithet of the *effect* is, by a metathesis, applied to the *causal agent*. In the symbol of the 4th Seal (like as in the colours of the horses of the three Seals preceding) it is applied, and more appropriately, to the *party affected*. So the emperor Constantius, father to Constantine, was called *Chlorus* from his paleness.

Says Heinrichs ad loc, “Aristot. in Rhet. jungit χλωρον και αναιμον. Est color cadaverum.” And another expositor refers to Hippocrates' 2nd Book on Prognostics,

was Death: and Hades followed after him. And power was given unto him over the fourth part [or four parts]¹ of the earth; to kill with sword, and with famine, and with pestilence,² and by wild beasts of the earth."

There is no research needed here to explain the intent of the prefigurative symbol. The *rider* was not, as before, the representative of *human functionaries* and *rulers*; whose distinctive emblems, though well understood at the time, might now require investigation to unfold them. It is a symbol of meaning as obvious to the reader now, as it could have been then to the seer. For the agent meant is expressly told us. It was the personification of DEATH! To mark that it was the actual King of terrors,—and not, as otherwise it might possibly have been construed, the destroyer merely of political existence,—his badge, so to express it, is said to have been *Hades* following him; the recipient, with his opening jaws, of the victims slain by Death.³ The commission was given him, by the supreme arbiter of life and death, to kill upon the Roman earth with all the four sore judgments of God;—with the sword, and with famine, and with pestilence, and with the wild beasts of the earth. And the horse, symbolizing the Roman empire and people, appeared deadly pale and livid under his influences; a hue symptomatic apparently of approaching dissolution.

An æra of terrible mortality, and to an extent scarce preceded in the annals of human history, was here evidently prefigured. The question for us is, Was there then such an æra in the Roman imperial history; and one following, so as from the sequence of this vision on that of

as enumerating among the symptoms of approaching death, the colour of the facial skin becoming thus *green* and black: το χρωμα του ξυμπαντος προσωπου χλωρον τε και μελαν εον.

¹ Jerome's reading.

² So *θανατος* ought here to be rendered, as most commentators observe. Its use in this sense is borrowed from the Septuagint; which thus, in near thirty places, renders the Hebrew מַדְמָה; a word translated in our English version, and without doubt correctly, *pestilence*. So 2 Sam. xxiv. 13, 15; "Or shall it be three days' pestilence?" where the Septuagint translation is *θανατος*.—Jerome's difference of reading, given parenthetically, will be noticed afterwards.

³ So Isa. v. 14; "Therefore *hades* hath enlarged herself, and opened her mouth without measure; and their glory, and multitude, and pomp shall descend into it."

"*Mihi videtur*," says Vitranga. "Johannem magnam vidisse et aspectu tetram voraginem, ad mortuos veluti deglutiendos paratam, quæ equum proximè secuta fuerit."

the Seal preceding we might expect it to 'do, at no great distance after the time of the second Severus?—The answer is soon given.

An æra in the Roman history, commencing within fourteen or fifteen years after the death of Alexander Severus, is so strongly marked by coincidence in every point with this terrible prefigurative emblem, that interpreters who explain the six first Seals of the history of Pagan Rome, one and all agree, I believe, in referring the fourth Seal to it. By Mede and Daubuz, and after them by Lowman, Bishop Newton, and others, passages have been quoted from ancient authors well descriptive of its multiplied miseries. For my own part, having given *Gibbon's* testimony so much as my authority, in illustration of the former Seals, I wish to give him (though not exclusively) on this also. And, after all, who so graphic an illustrator? Who like him for extracting the spirit of contemporary history, and infusing it, concentrated, into his own paintings?—He speaks then of the period from the celebration of the great secular games by the emperor Philip, A.D. 248, to the death of Gallienus, A.D. 268, as the twenty years of “shame and misfortune, of confusion and calamity.” He speaks of it as a time in which (mark again the correspondence of his figure with the death-like colour of the horse in the Apocalyptic emblem) “*the ruined empire seemed to approach the last and fatal moment of its dissolution.*”¹ He depicts the various agencies of destruction consuming it. *The sword!* “Every instant of time was marked, every province of the Roman world was afflicted, by *barbarous invaders and military tyrants;*”²—the sword from without, and the sword from within.—*Famine!* “Our habits of thinking,” he says, “so fondly connect the order of the universe with the fate of man, that this gloomy period has been *decorated* with inundations, earthquakes, uncommon meteors, preternatural darkness, and a crowd of prodigies, fictitious or exaggerated.” Of none of these fictitious evils, let it be observed, was there any notice in the Apocalyptic vision. “*But a general famine,*” he adds, in correspond-

¹ i. 384, 411. So Eutropius, ix. 9; “desperatis rebus, ac deleto pœne Romano imperio.”

² ib. 384.

ence with that which *had* been predicted, “was a calamity of a more serious kind:” and still expounding our prophecy, though now retrospectively that of the *third* Seal, he observes that it was “the inevitable consequence of *ra-pine* and oppression, which extirpated the produce of the present, and the hope of future harvests.”¹—Yet again the agency of *pestilence* had been prefigured. Accordingly, though little aware in what track he was following, he goes on to notice this also. “Famine,” he says, “is almost always followed by epidemical diseases, the effect of scanty and unwholesome food. But other causes must have contributed to *that furious plague*, which, from the year 250 to the year 265, raged without interruption in every province, every city, and almost every family in the empire.”² During a part of that time, he adds, “5000 persons died daily in Rome; and many towns, that had escaped the hands of the barbarians, were entirely depopulated.” And, could we venture to extend the analogy of Alexandria, where statistical tables were kept, to the other provinces, “we might suspect that war, pestilence, and famine had consumed, in a few years, the *moiety* of the human species.”³

Truly the history must be allowed to agree thus far with the prediction. If the prophetic emblems were terrific, the facts of the history of the period that we suppose them to refer to appear, if possible, yet more so.—It seems to me

¹ *ib.* 455: already cited p. 174 *suprà*.

² *ibid.* Others date it from A.D. 251. So Cedrenus: *Ἐπεκρατεὶ ὁ λοιμὸς ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις* [sc. of Gallus, emperor from 251 to 254,] *κινήθεισ ἀπο Λιθιοπίας μέχρι τῆς ὄψεως, ὡς μηδεμίαν πόλιν μείναι τούτου ἀμοιρῶν· πολλακίς δὲ καὶ δις τῆς πόλεως ἐπῆρχετο· ἐπεκρατεῖ δὲ ἐτη ἰε΄.* Similarly speaks Zonaras. Zosimus says of its ravages; *ὁ λοιμὸς, πόλεσι τε καὶ κωμαῖς ἐπιγενομένος, εἰ τι λειψόμενον ἢ ἀνθρώπων γένος διεφθίρειν.* See Clinton's *Fasti Rom.* ad. ann. 252.

³ *i.* 455, 456. Rather, says Niebuhr, (ii. 345,) *one third*, than *one half*, according to the Tables.

It was during this pestilence (A.D. 253, Clinton) that the Christian Bishop *Cyprian* wrote his treatise “*De Mortalitate*,” of which the very title illustrates the imagery of this fourth Seal: comforting his brother Christians who suffered under it; reminding them that all things, even death, were theirs; that in this world they were strangers; and that death would but take them to their home with Jesus.

In his Letter to the African judge Demetrian (about A.D. 255, Dupin) he speaks of the prevalent calamities as charged by the heathens on Christians. “*Cum dicas plurimos conqueri quòd bella crebrius surgant, quòdque lues, quòd fames sæviant, . . . nobis imputari.*” Then, a little later, he says that their (the Roman heathens’) persistence in their false religion was the real cause of those judgments: “*Non ista accidit quòd Dii vestri à nobis non colantur, sed quòd à vobis non colatur Deus.*”

not undeserving of remark that in the secular or centenary games celebrated by Philip,¹ whence this æra of mortality had its commencing date, solemn sacrifices had been offered, according to custom, to Pluto, or *Hades*, (such was his Greek appellation,) whereby to ensure the preservation of the Roman Empire.² And what the response in God's Providence? "Behold a livid pale horse; and his name that sate thereon was DEATH; and *Hades* followed after him. And power was given him to kill on the Roman earth with sword, and with famine, and with pestilence, and by wild beasts of the earth."

There is just one of the destroying agencies mentioned in the vision that is past over without notice by the historian;—that of *the wild beasts* of the earth. But, though unnoticed by him, it is not unillustrated. For it is a well-known law of nature that where the reign of man fails that of the wild beasts begins; and that they quickly occupy the scenes of waste and depopulation. "I will not drive out the inhabitants from before thee," said God to Israel, "in one year; lest the land become desolate, and the beasts of the field multiply against thee."³ In fact we have it on record, that at an epoch some twenty or thirty years after the death of Gallienus, their multiplication had risen to an extent, in parts of the empire, that made it a crying evil. "Quando cum feris bella," said Arnobius, about the year 296,⁴ "et prœlia cùm leonibus gesta sunt? Non ante nos? Quando perniciēs populis venenatis ab anguibus data est? Non ante nos?"⁵ So does he specify *wild beasts* as one of the plagues with which the land was then afflicted,

¹ It was the 1000th year of Rome.

² See the Pagan historian Zosimus, B. ii. ad init., who says of these secular games, *Συντελει δε προς λοιμων και φθορων και νοσων ακεσεις*. He then gives a long account of their origin, and the ancient mysteriously discovered altar 'Αδου και Περσεφονης, on which the chief sacrifices were offered: tells how, on the raging of wars and diseases, the Sibylline books inculcated these games and sacrifices 'Αδη και Περσεφονη; (as well as to other gods also, specially Apollo and Diana;) and how, according to the oracle, the Roman empire was to be secured in its greatness and power by the celebration of the games; *τουτων απαντων κατα θεσμον επιτελουμενων εφυλαττετο μεν η των Ρωμαιων αρχη*. ³ Exod. xxiii. 29.

⁴ So Clinton fixes the date, about A.D. 296. "Trecenti sunt anni fermè," says Arnobius, c. 13, "ex quo œcipimus esse Christiani:" and in another passage; "Annos ducit urbs Roma quinquaginta et mille, aut non multum ab his minus." Now U. C. 1050 corresponds with A.D. 297.

⁵ Adv. Gentes, Lib. 1. p. 5. (Lugd. Bat. 1651.)



The Roman Emperor Valerian taken captive by Sapor

and of which Christians (as if such evils had never happened before) were upbraided as the guilty cause.

. But this, as I said, was written in 296, twenty or thirty years after the date of Gallienus' death. And the question suggests itself, What was the state of things during the intervening period; and can *it* too be classed under the prefiguration of the 4th Apocalyptic Seal? A question this quite necessary to attend to, as I date my 5th Seal not till the year 303: and the rather, as it has been asserted that the whole interval was one so markedly of restoration, not destruction, as to be in direct contrariety to, not accordance with, the symbolization of the Seal before us.¹—The answer to this question involves of course an historic review of the period intervening; more especially up to the notable epoch of Diocletian's quadripartition of the empire A.D. 292, which I regard as the included terminus of the 4th Seal. It shall be given as briefly as possible. A fuller abstract has been given elsewhere.²

It is to be understood then that after the emperor Valerian's disastrous capture in the 6th year of his reign, A.D. 260, by the Persian king Sapor,³ leaving Gallienus, his son and associate on the throne, sole emperor, Gallienus' wretched character induced insurrections and rebellions so frequent and universal, that the rival assumers of the purple during the next twelve or fourteen years are designated by Pollio and other historians as *the 30 tyrants*. Of these the larger number were mere ephemeral emperors. But three stand out prominently, as having for several years severed three great divisions of the empire from the central empire under Gallienus in Rome and Italy;—viz. *Odenathus* and *Zenobia*, from A.D. 260 to 273, in Syria and the East;⁴ *Aureolus*, from A.D. 260, or 261, to 268, in Illyricum; and *Posthumus* and then *Tetricus*, from 258 to 274, in Gaul, Spain, and Britain. Such was the empire's

¹ Especially by Dr. Keith, in his *Strictures on the Horæ*.

² Viz. in my *Vindicie Horarie*. See its pp. 165—182.

³ This unhappy prince, after being taken by Sapor, king of Persia, died in his captivity. At Nakshi Rostam there still remains a sculpture in the rock commemorative of the event. A sketch is given in Sir R. Porter's *Travels in Persia*, Vol. i. p. 540, from which my Plate is copied.

⁴ So Pollio, the nearest contemporary historian, and Zosimus.

mutilated internal state, (of the barbarian invasions, synchronically, from without I have already spoken,) at the time of Gallienus' death in March, 268; and on the election of Claudius, the first of the five restoring emperors, as his successor.

On his election the cry of the Roman people and senate to him was, Save the empire!¹ Aureolus' own soldiers opened the way to this by assassinating him at Milan.—Then came the news of a terrible Gothic invasion. Claudius wrote thus, on his road, to the Senate:—"320,000 Goths have invaded the Roman territory. . . The whole Republic is fatigued and exhausted. . . The strength of the empire, Gaul and Spain, [with Britain too,] are usurped by Tetricus: . . and the archers of the East serve under the banners of Zenobia."² In a great battle fought near Naissus in Dardania, the legions at first gave way, "oppressed by numbers, and dismayed by misfortunes;" till Claudius' generalship decided the victory in his favour. Still the Gothic war continued, and was diffused for a while over the provinces of Mœsia, Thrace, and Macedon; then at length repelled within the mountain-tracts of Hæmus. There the *pestilence* made havoc among both Goths and Romans, as *the sword* had done before it; and, among its Roman victims, A.D. 270, cut down Claudius himself.³ Had the destroyer DEATH yet resigned his commission to kill with the sword and with pestilence on the Roman earth?—The armies chose *Aurelian* for his successor; the second of the restoring emperors. "A bloody and doubtful conflict" with the Goths, was the first act of his reign: followed by a peace, of which the most memorable and important condition was Aurelian's final *abandonment to the Goths of the great province of Dacia*.⁴ Next came an Allemannic invasion of Italy; one as alarming as that of the Goths before it. Three great battles ensued: in the first of which, fought near Placentia, the Romans suffered so terrible a defeat

¹ Pollio's Claud. c. 4.

² Gibbon, ii. 11. See the original Letter in Pollio's Claudius, c. 7.

³ See Pollio, c. 12, and Zosimus: also Gibb. ib. 12—14, and Niebuhr's Lectures (Ed. Schmitz), ii. 336.

⁴ Gibb. ii. 19, 20.—It was the same great province that Trajan had added to the empire, in the period of my 1st Seal. See p. 132 *suprà*.

that "the immediate dissolution of the empire was apprehended."¹ Then the Sibylline books were consulted at Rome by Aurelian's order. But "all too late," cried a voice in the Senate-house, "for the salvation of the Republic. It is like sick men, who only consult eminent physicians when in absolute despair of recovery."² At the same time those walls of larger circuit were traced out round Rome, which still arrest the stranger's eye by their solemn grandeur: in order to the temporary defence, if so it might be, of the otherwise "defenceless mistress of the world."³ In the two subsequent battles, however, Aurelian conquered. The actual dissolution of the empire was prevented: and Aurelian proceeded to reunite to the empire those vast separated members that Claudius's Letter made allusion to, of Gaul and Spain in the West, Syria in the East. He effected each and either object: but only through the means of two bloody civil wars: (for such the Eastern was, in fact, as well as the Western:) and having done so, and triumphed at Rome for his victories, he set out to repel a Persian invasion A.D. 275, and on the march, near Byzantium, was by one of his generals assassinated.—In the course of Aurelian's sad, though splendid reign, let me ask again, had DEATH ceased to kill with the sword on the Roman earth, or the empire cast aside its hue of threatening dissolution?⁴—But what next? Says Gibbon: "The strength of Aurelian had crushed on every side the enemies of Rome: but, after his death, they seemed to revive with an increase of fury and numbers."⁵ In the year next following we read of hosts of the Alani, that spreading themselves over Pontus, Cappadocia, Cilicia, and Galatia, traced their course by the flames of cities and villages, but who were at length repulsed by the aged emperor *Tacitus*: and then of that emperor's sudden death, (by assassination probably,) and also the assassination of his brother and successor *Florian*: and then of the election

¹ Gibb. ii. 25. Vopiscus, c. 21, says, "Tanta apud Placentiam clades accepta est, ut Romanum pœnè solveretur imperium." ² Vopisc. c. 19. ³ Gibb. ii. 26, 28.

⁴ In an Edict by Aurelian, given in Vopiscus, c. 47, mention is made incidentally of the already begun desolation in Italy. He urges agriculturists to plant vines in certain extensive fertile lands of Etruria, that had been deserted; whence to furnish the Roman populace with wine. ⁵ Ib. ii. 75.

of *Probus*, the *third* of the five restoring emperors; who “set himself,” says Niebuhr, “to rescue the empire from the wretched condition in which he found it.”¹ First came the deliverance of Gaul, opprest by invading armies of Franks, Batavi, Burgundians, and other barbarians; “who, since Aurelian’s death, had ravaged that great province with impunity:”² then a successful inroad into Germany: and a peace, of which one of the conditions, to which Gibbon calls attention, was that the barbarians should supply the Roman army with 16,000 recruits. For, says he, “the infrequency of marriage, and ruin of agriculture, had affected the principles of population; and not only destroyed the strength of the present, but intercepted the hope of future generations.”³ Next came the revolt, and successful marauding expedition round the whole maritime coast of the empire, of a colony of Franks settled by Probus in Pontus: then the revolt and defeat of Saturninus, one of the most distinguished of the Roman generals in Egypt; then the rebellion and defeat of Bonosus and Proculus in Gaul. So at length in the year 281, all enemies seeming to be vanquished, Probus, like Aurelian before him, triumphed at Rome; and, like Aurelian, was immediately after assassinated.—A poet’s idyl, written on *Carus*’ election thereupon to the imperial throne, expresses his ardent hope that this new emperor might be the heaven-sent instrument of putting an end to the then existing æra of affliction and mourning, banish war to its proper abode in Tartarus, and bring back white-robed Peace and Justice.⁴ Had DEATH, in his view, ceased to destroy on the Roman earth even under Probus, or the empire assumed a healthful or joyous hue?—The shorter reign of *Carus* was mark-

¹ Niebuhr ii. 341.² Gibb. ii. 77.³ Ib. 83.⁴ Calpurnius:

. . . . dabit impia vinctas

Post tergum Bellona manus, spoliataque telis
 In sua vesanos torquebit viscera morsus.
 Et modo, quæ toto civilia distulit orbe,
 Secum bella geret. Nullos jam Roma Philippos
 Deflebit; nullos ducet captiva triumphos.
 Omnia Tartareo subigentur carcere bella;
 Immergentque caput tenebris, lucumque tenebunt.
 Candida Pax aderit Jam legibus omne reductis
 Jus aderit, moremque foro, vultumque priorem,
 Reddet; et *adfectum* melior Deus auferet ævum.

Gibbon alludes to this Eclogue, ii. 93.

ed by the repulse of the Sarmatian invaders of Illyricum ; and an invasion of Persia, successful probably, but of which the details are uncertain. What is however certain is, that Carus, in some mysterious manner, there met his death, whether lightning-struck, or by assassination ; and that the Roman army then returned homeward. This was near the end of 283. Then civil strife ensued between three several candidates for the empire. Numerian was murdered by Aper, Aper by Diocletian : which last in a great battle fought in 285, near Margus in Mœsia, defeated and slew Carinus, and secured the empire to himself.

And now began a new and memorable æra in Roman imperial history. Judging the weight of the whole empire too great for any one emperor, Diocletian formed the plan of dividing it. So in 286 he began by its bipartition between himself and Maximian ; and in 292 completed his plan by a quadripartition : Galerius and Constantius being added in the East and West, respectively, as the two Cæsars ; in association with the two senior emperors, or Augusti. Just previous to this quadripartition Maximian had had success in some battles with barbarian invaders of Gaul ; but been unsuccessful in a war with Carausius, the usurper of Britain ; whom, in fact, he and Diocletian were forced to acknowledge. So Eutropius :—“ It was while Carausius was in rebellion in Britain, and Achillæus in Egypt, while the Quinquegentiani were harassing the African Provinces, and Narses [the Persian king] making war on the eastern frontier, that Diocletian made Maximian Herculeus *Augustus*, Constantius and Galerius *Cæsars*.”¹ Nor does Eumenius, in his Panegyric address in the year 297 to Constantius, give a different picture of things as that which in 292 existed in the Western Provinces.² In fact, he compares it with the disgraceful state of the Republic under Gallienus.³ Mamertinus, in his previous Panegyric of 289,

¹ Eutrop. ix. 22. So too Victor, Vit. Dioelet.

² See Eumenius' Paneg. Constantii, c. 12. There exist coins of A.D. 290, with the heads of Carausius, Dioeletian, and Maximian : and the inscriptions, *Carausius et Fratres sui* ;—*Pax Auggg.* Eekhel, viii. 47.

³ “Minus indignum, quamvis triste, fuerat sub Principe Gallieno harum Provinciarum à Romanâ luce discidium. Tunc enim, sive incuriâ rerum, sive quâdam inclinatione fatorum, omnibus fere membris erat truncata Respublica.” c. 10.

had declared the reign of *famine* and *pestilence* to have continued down to Maximian's accession in 286.¹—After this, however, (perhaps we may say from 292,) a real and more effective restoration of the empire began, only in its new form.

So have I brought down my historic sketch, as proposed, from Gallienus' death A.D. 268 to Diocletian's quadripartition of the empire in 292. And now let me once more repeat my question, Had DEATH as yet vacated his seat of power; or given up his commission of killing over the Roman earth with the four several agencies of *sword*, *famine*, *pestilence*, and *wild beasts*?—It is precisely at this closing epoch of the period under review that Arnobius gives us his very illustrative testimony, already in part cited, to the truth of the 4th Apocalyptic Seal. "Men complain, There are now sent us from the gods *pestilence*, *droughts*, *wars*, *scarcities*, *locusts*, hail, and other things noxious to man:" and then he asks,—“But was it not so in ancient times also?” Again; “If every species of corn be now devoured by *locusts*,² or if floods destroy the human race, was it not so before? Were there not wars with *wild beasts*, and battles with *lions*, and destruction from *venomous snakes*, before our time?”³ Very striking seems to me this picture of the empire in 296; with its distinct and particular specification of all the four evils mentioned in this Seal: and very striking its contrast with Tertullian's picture of the empire's cultivation, populousness, and prosperity about a century before, shortly after the ending of the prosperous period of my first Seal.⁴ Indeed could there be a more direct contrast?

¹ “Scimus omnes, antequam vos salutem Reip. redderitis, quanta frugum inopia, quanta funerum copia fuit, fame passim morbisque grassantibus.” c. 15.

² These and such like destroying insects, moreover also venomous snakes, are included in the Apocalyptic word *θηρία*; as much as in the *noisome beasts* of Ezekiel. ¹

³ Hence his argument that “it was not on account of *Christians* that the wretched race of man was oppress and afflicted by these evils.”—Compare this with Cyprian's argument made some 40 years before, and cited by me p. 193 *suprà*. Also Tertullian, Apolog. c. 40, where we find the original of Arnobius' argument. See Note ³ p. 213 *infra*.

⁴ Tertull. De Animâ, c. 30. “Certainly the world is now from day to day brought more under cultivation. Pleasant farms have obliterated ill-famed solitudes: cultivated fields occupy the place of woods; wild beasts have been driven away by cattle; sands are sown, marshes dried. Everywhere there is the inhabited house and population; everywhere the republic, everywhere life.” This was about A.D. 200.

I must now advert to one point of marked apparent *difference* between the prophecy and the history: viz. that in the *prophecy* Death's destroying commission might seem to be expressly limited to *the fourth part* of the Roman earth; ¹ whereas, in the *history* of the period just reviewed, from A. D. 248 to 292, his devastations extended over it all. But let my readers well mark that if the prophecy here differ from the history, it differs from, and is inconsistent with, itself also: seeing that *the whole horse* is depicted with the livid death-like hue, not its *fourth part* only. Besides that the whole tenor of the prophecy seems to mark this Seal's evil as the climax to the evils of the two preceding Seals, to which no such limitation attached.—What then the solution of this difficulty? And can we find one probable in itself, and that shall reconcile the prophecy alike with itself, and with the facts of our historic æra? ² After much consideration, and reconsideration, my mind has turned more and more to that very remarkable reading in Jerome's Latin Vulgate, to which Mede long since called attention, and Daubuz after him, *super quatuor partes terræ*; "over *the four parts* (instead of *the fourth part*) of the earth." The genuineness of this, as Jerome's own version, and not any mistake of a later copyist, is indubitable: ³ and since his faithfulness to the Greek text is as unquestioned as his critical judgment in choosing between various readings in it, ⁴ it follows that he must have had before him some cor-

¹ και εδοθη αυτη εξουσια αποκτειναι επι το τεταρτον της γης.

² My first suggested solution was to the effect that out of Death's four destroying agencies the *fourth part of the earth* might define the scene simply of one of those agencies; viz. that of *the sword*, next specified. I cited in illustration Jer. xv. 2; "Such as are for the *pestilence to pestilence*; and such as are for the *sword to the sword*; such as are for *famine to famine*; and such as are for *captivity to captivity*:" also Ezek. xxxiii. 27; "Surely they that are in the *wastes* shall fall by the *sword*; and him that is in the *open field* will I give to the *beasts* to be devoured; and they that be in the *forts* and *caves* shall die of the *pestilence*." So too Ezek. v. 12.

³ I was enabled to satisfy myself of this on occasion of a visit to Florence: having there inspected in the Laurentian Library what, I believe, is the earliest existing MS. of the Vulgate; (one assigned to the 6th or 7th century;) and found the reading in it, as in the modern copies, "*super quatuor partes terræ*." Moreover I have found it in all alike of the earliest Latin Apocalyptic expositors who used Jerome's version, *Bede, Ansbert, Hoymo*; though on certain other points exhibiting variations in their copies. E. g. in Apoc. xvii. 17 Ansbert reads *et bestia*; the others, *in bestia*.

⁴ "Novum Testamentum Græcæ reddidi auctoritati." So Jerome to Lucinius. To Jerome's critical eminency and faithfulness, and the value of his version, we have the testimony of the best scholars; e. g. Bentley. "This version is exceedingly useful in the textual criticism of the New Testament." Tregelles, *Introd. to Apoc. p. xxvii.*

respondent reading in one or more Greek MSS. of authority, though our extant Greek MSS. do not exhibit it; and which he deliberately preferred, as of all the best. As to what that reading was, I cannot but think that Mede has rightly conjectured it to have been το τετραδιον της γης, instead of το τεταρτον, or τετρατον: for my original objection against this, as a word that would require a plural genitive to follow, I find to be invalid.¹ And, supposing it to have been Jerome's and the true Greek reading, the comparatively unusual form of the expression would perfectly and easily account for copyists substituting for it the more common τεταρτον; or τετρατον, by a mere change of the ΔΙ into Τ.² Admitted, this reading makes the *prophecy* at once consistent with itself. As applied to *history*, what it requires is that the Roman empire, at the time predicted, should have had some kind of *quadripartition*. Will then our historical solution bear this new and trying test? Turn, reader, to p. 195 *suprà*; and read the answer to this question in the fact of the then *three* great divisions of the empire from the central or Italian *fourth*; viz. those of the *West, East, and Illyricum*, under Posthumus, Aureolus, and Zenobia, respectively: ³—just that same quadripartition, in fact, which was soon afterwards adopted and legitimized by Diocletian; ⁴ and which, as I may hereafter observe, was in a measure the original of that other famous Apoca-

The Florentian codex of the Vulgate just referred to by me he calls the *Codex Amicicanus*, and ascribes to the 6th century.

See my notice of Jerome, and his version, in my *History of Apocalyptic Interpretation* in the Appendix to Vol. iv.

¹ I observe in Petrus Siculus, c. 13, την του Ευαγγελιου τετρακτυν. So too τετραδιον βιβλου in Stephens' Thesaurus in voc. if I rightly understand him.

Else the true reading might be supposed, επι τα δ' της γης (μερη understood :) and to have been turned by a copyist into το δ': the Greek numerals and fractionals, as express by letters, being the same. Compare the alphabetic numeral χξς' used in many MSS., Apoc. xiii. 18.

² "Generally speaking a more difficult reading, *cæteris paribus* as to evidence, is to be preferred to one which is altogether easy. Transcribers would naturally change that which is obscure for that which is simple, not *vice versâ*." Tregell. *Introd.* p. xxxi.

³ See Pollio's Claudius, ch. 4.

⁴ Lactantius urges this as a crime against Diocletian: "in quatuor partes orbe divisio." M. P. 7. Says Niebuhr, ii. 335, with reference to the state of things *after the recovery of Illyricum* by Claudius, "The empire was in reality divided into *three great masses*:" viz. the Western Provinces, Italy with Africa and Illyricum, and the East. During Aureolus' tenure of Illyricum in the earlier part of the period of this Seal, and under Diocletian towards its close, it was *four* great masses. Similar were the Apocalyptic divisions, first of *four*, then of *three*; Apoc. xii. 4, viii. 7, &c.

lyptic *tripartite* division, of which we read in the first four Trumpets.

In conclusion, let me add to what I have cited from *Gibbon* the testimonies of three of our most eminent modern historiographers of Roman history, *Sismondi*, *Schlegel*, *Niebuhr*, with reference to the state of the empire at that precise epoch of its legitimized quadripartition that I have brought my historic sketch down to. Says *Sismondi*; “Diocletian put an end to this long period of anarchy. . . But such a succession of invasions and civil wars, and so much suffering, disorder, and crime, had brought the empire into a state of *mortal languor*, from which it never recovered.”¹—Says *Niebuhr*, speaking of the state of things after Diocletian’s accession; “After the cessation of the plague, [“which *began* to decrease in the time of Probus,”] the empire was suffering from general distress: and its condition was very much like that which followed after the cessation of the BLACK DEATH in the middle ages.”²—Says *Schlegel*: “The division of the empire among several sovereigns appeared then [under Diocletian], as afterwards, an unavoidable and necessary evil. In other words, the several parts and members of the vast body of the Roman empire, *which approached nearer and nearer to a dissolution*, began to fall to pieces.”³—How long, we may think, would its utter and total dissolution have been delayed, but for the infusion, not very long after, of *Christianity* into its political system, as a new principle of life?

CHAPTER V.

THE FIFTH SEAL.

Thus, in a series of consecutive homogeneous figurations, —figurations each one of a symbolic horse and horseman, passing forth in vision, as I suppose, over the Roman land-

¹ i. 41.

² ii. 345, 346.

³ Phil. of Hist. ii. 37. Is it not as if all the three historians would illustrate this prophecy?

scape,¹ and repeated in this homogeneous form until the mind of the Evangelist must have become familiarized with them, and till the obvious presumptive solution of the three last, on the same principle of *Roman* reference, must have illustrated and confirmed in his mind that which we have expounded as the most simple and natural interpretation of the first,—in this series, I say, the imminent secular fortunes of the great military empire of Rome had been pre-figured to St. John, as time would in its lapse unfold them:—*first*, and under the rule of a *new line of emperors*, an æra of remarkable and protracted prosperity and triumph; *next*, under the abuse of the *power of the sword*, a commencing æra of as remarkable civil warfare and bloodshed; *then*, as on a scale of suffering suddenly enlarged, an æra of aggravated misery from the added iniquitous administration and fiscal oppressions of them to whom rightfully appertained *the balances* of equity, with a notice of the last vain reclamations of law and justice against them, and consequently marked triumph of official corruption; *lastly*, an æra characterized by the letting loose on the devoted empire of the judgments of *sword, famine, pestilence, and wild beasts*; the evils of the two preceding Seals, themselves still in force, having in fact prepared the way for these four sore judgments of God:—under which, at length, the very vitality of the empire seemed threatened, and its pale and livid hue indicative of approaching dissolution.—But what, meanwhile, of the *Christian church and cause*? About the time of the revelation being communicated to St. John in Patmos, Christ's new and heaven-born religion, as also the church gathered out of the world professing it, had so far spread throughout the empire, and so widely and prominently exhibited its extraordinary pretensions and effects, as necessarily to attract public observation: and that not of the lower orders only, but of the great and the learned also; of philosophers, statesmen, provincial governors, emperors. Under such circumstances, and long spared as it appeared the empire would be, through all the subsequent varying vicissitudes of the first four Seals, would it profit, the Evangelist might think, by this prolongation of the

¹ The scene fixed by the $\gamma\eta$ in verse 4.

day of its visitation: and both rulers and people direct their inquiries into the evidences that Christianity had to show of heavenly origin; and, recognising them, believe and embrace it? That such would not have been the case during the period of the Seals thus far opened, he might almost have inferred from the figurings of the *secular fortunes* of the *empire* shown under them. For, had Christianity been in reality and in the spirit embraced by it, the *red*, the *black*, and the *livid pale* would scarcely have been, one after the other, the distinctive phases of the Roman state. Christianity would have been to it as the panacea of the evils of its social, as well as of its moral system. Under its influence they that bore the sword would have borne it as God's ministers; a terror to evil-doers, and the praise of them that did well: and they, again, to whom the balances appertained would have administered with the balance of justice. "Truth would have sprung out of the earth, and righteousness looked down from heaven." And then, instead of the four sore judgments of God, the land, it might be supposed, would have yielded its increase; and peace and plenteousness flourished within it.—Thus much, I say, as it seems to me, St. John might have inferred as to the non-reception of Christ's holy religion during this period, from the very prefigurations of the second, third, and fourth Seals themselves. But now, on the *fifth Seal's* opening, direct information was to be given him on the subject. For the vision, while primarily depicting a crisis of the church during a new and memorable æra which was to follow after that of the fourth Seal, retrospectively intimated also its condition and treatment in the Roman empire, during the period of all the four Seals preceding.

On this *fifth* symbolic vision we are now to enter.—And in doing so let me first and briefly call attention to the new and different scenery now brought prominently into view, as connected with it. Hitherto, as before observed, the figurings presented to the apostle may be most probably supposed to have past over the landscape of the Roman world, to which they more immediately related. But, when the fifth Seal was opened, another and nearer part of that

significant scenery was called into use, to aid in the development of the subject prefigured. The attention of the observer was directed to something passing in the *altar-court* of the Apocalyptic *temple*; and this locality so intimately associated with the new vision as to constitute in fact an integral and essential part of it. Now as, under the Jewish ritual, it was the *altar-court* of the literal temple that was the scene of what was *visible* and *public* in the *divine worship*, and *there* were seen the ministrations at the altar, the offerings piacular, votive, and eucharistic, the varied lustrations, the presentments of incense by the people worshipping, and their solemn prayer and psalmody, led by the priests and Levites ministering,—so in this temple of vision it might even à priori have been expected that the *altar-court*, and what passed in *it*, would furnish the local scene and indication of whatever had to be prefigured, as characteristic and important, respecting the *visible worship*, from time to time, of *Christ's true and faithful people*: seeing that in the primary Apocalyptic vision shown to St. John the generally intended *Christian* application of the figured *Jewish* temple, and what might pass therein, had already been sufficiently indicated.¹ And just such will prove the fact. We shall find associated hereafter with the local scene spoken of, the figurations of all such matters as chiefly concerned church-worship:—whether that of the church's thanksgivings for signal deliverances and mercies;—that of the saints' presentment to the High Priest of their profession, at a time when such presentment of it was distinctive, of the incense of prayer and praise;—or that of their consistent ministrations, when others might not be faithful in there ministering, at the great altar:²—I say at the great brazen altar of sacrifice; that standing memorial, in the emblematic temple, of Christ's piacular offering; as constituting, to the end of time, the very centre and essence of all true Christian worship.—Thus in the present case, as the scene depicted was the *altar-court*, and

¹ See pp. 71—75 *suprà*; also pp. 97—102.

² All this will be abundantly illustrated as we proceed. See especially my comments on Apoc. viii. 3, xi. 1.

In proof that the great brazen sacrificial altar is always meant by "*the altar*," see my Paper vii. in the Appendix to Vol. ii.

the voice heard a voice *thence* issuing, they might be supposed to indicate, here as elsewhere, something notable and characteristic of the times, in respect of the church's visible worshipping. What then, we ask, was the thing now signified respecting it? What the foreshown characteristic of the worship publicly rendered by Christians to their Lord, in the next notable æra after that of the fourth Seal?—This is the *first* point for consideration.

1. “And when he opened the fifth Seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them that had been slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held. And they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Master holy and true, dost thou not avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?”¹

Thus the scene now depicted in the altar-court was one not of living worshippers, but dead; the voice heard one, not of psalmody or praise, but of suffering. It issued from *beneath the altar*; and came, as the sacred description tells us, from “the souls of them that had been slain for the word of God and the testimony of Jesus:”—shadowy human forms appearing there, we may suppose,² since white robes are afterwards said to have been given them: perhaps like those *elohim* seen ascending out of the earth in olden time by king Saul.³ There was prefigured, evidently, some notable *æra of persecution* against the church, carried out by “them that dwelt on the earth,” i. e. the Roman rulers and people; they having been raised up, apparently, in strength to effect it, from the destroying judgments of

¹ Καὶ ὅτε ἤνοιξε τὴν πέμπτην σφραγίδα εἶδον ὑποκάτω τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἐσφαγμένων διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἣν εἶχον. Καὶ ἐκραζάν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, λέγοντες, Ἔως ποτε, ὁ Δεσποτὴς ὁ ἅγιος καὶ ἀληθινός, οὐ κρινεῖς καὶ ἐκδίκεις τὸ αἷμα ἡμῶν ἐκ τῶν κατοικοῦντων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς; Ἀποκ. v. 9, 10.

² So Vitringa.—There seems a peculiar propriety in this description of the *ψυχαί*, as appearing under the altar: seeing that the *animal soul* (*ψυχή*), or *life*, was, as Dabuz observes, supposed to be in the *blood*; (so Deut. xii. 23, *ὅτι αἷμα ἐστὶν ἡ ψυχή*) and that the blood was poured out at the base of the altar, or upon the altar, in the Jewish sacrifices, according as the victim was given for a sin-offering, or a peace-offering.—The Classics similarly connect the soul and the blood. So Virgil, “Purpuream vomit ille animam;” and Horace, “Non vanæ redeat sanguis imagini.”

In Psalm xvi. 10, Sept. version, *ψυχή* seems to mean the *separate spirit*, “Thou wilt not leave my soul (*ψυχή*) in Hades.” In Levit. xix. 28, xxi. 1, and other places, it seems to be used of a *dead body*, through which defilement was communicated.

³ 1 Sam. xxviii. 13.

the Seal preceding:—a persecution of virulence such that other visible worship, and witnessing for the faith, would be now suppressed; and this would alone remain to Christians, to offer *themselves*, as it were, in sacrifice, in the cause, as well as after the example, of their dying Master; or, as St. Paul expresses it, to *pour out their souls in libation*, at the foot of his altar.¹

And of this the *historical fulfilment* is most striking. Little as was the probability of such an event, during the desolating judgments of the earlier half of the fourth Seal, the Roman empire *was* raised up from its state of imminent dissolution. “Oppressed and *almost destroyed*” as it had been, to use Gibbon’s language, “under the deplorable reigns of Valerian and Gallienus, . . . it was saved by a series of great princes, Claudius, Aurelian, Probus, Diocletian, and his colleagues: who, within a period of about thirty years, triumphed over the foreign and domestic enemies of the state, . . . and deserved the title of *restorers of the Roman world*.”²—It is observable indeed that, although raised up in its *integrity*, (save only that Dacia, the acquisition of Trajan, was abandoned by Aurelian to the Goths,) it was not so, practically speaking,³ in its *unity*;—a *quadripartite division* under two senior emperors, the *Augusti*, and two juniors, the *Cæsars*, having been instituted by Diocletian, (so as already observed by me under the fourth Seal,) as necessary to provide against the difficulties and dangers that now on every side claimed the imperial attention. So that the *dissolution* of the *horse*, the symbol previously of the undivided empire, *had*, in fact, taken place. The empire under its old constitution was no more. “Like Augustus, Diocletian may be considered as the founder of a new empire.”⁴

¹ So Phil. ii. 17, *Εἰ καὶ σπενδομαὶ ἐπὶ τῇ θύσῃ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν*; and 2 Tim. iv. 6, *Ἐγὼ γὰρ ἤδη σπενδομαὶ*, “I am now ready to have my life poured out as in a libation.” Compare too Rom. xii. 1, “Present your bodies a living sacrifice:” also, with regard to the martyrs’ fellowship with Christ’s sufferings, agreeably with the Apocalyptic figuring of their self-immolation as upon the same altar on which the sacrifices typical of Christ were offered, Col. i. 24, 1 Pet. iv. 13, and Matt. xvi. 24, &c.

² Gibb. ii. 1.—So too Montesquieu, ch. 16. “Et, Gallien ayant été tué, Claude, Aurelien, Tacite, et Probus . . . rétablirent l’empire prêt à périr.”

³ I say *practically*; because *in theory* the empire was still viewed as *one*, and Rome still as its common capital.

⁴ Gibb. ii. 114.—The epoch is an extremely important one, and strikingly noticed, if I mistake not, in a later Apocalyptic vision. See my Part iv. Ch. iv. § 1.

—Still the restoration was effective. The empire revived in strength: but only to exhibit, in signal display, the spirit of enmity to Christianity that animated it. During the progress of its restoration, indeed, the Christian churches enjoyed toleration and rest. No sooner, however, had the restoration been completed,—in fact, in the *very same year* that that auspicious consummation was celebrated by Diocletian in his triumph at Rome, (the last triumph that Rome ever saw,)¹ in that same year, A.D. 303, the persecution that we speak of began.

It was early that year, in the royal palace of Nicomedia, that secret and ominous councils began to be held between Diocletian himself and Galerius, the eastern Cæsar previously nominated by him. Maximian, the other Augustus, though absent, was understood to concur with them. The *destruction of Christianity* was the subject. “Perhaps,” says Gibbon, it was “represented to Diocletian that the glorious work of the deliverance of the empire was left imperfect so long as an independent people” (i. e. the Christians) “were permitted to subsist and multiply in the heart of the provinces.”² So then the blow was struck. On the 23rd of February the mission of an armed force to destroy the great church of Nicomedia, and burn the sacred books in it, was the signal for commencing persecution;—a persecution the longest, the most universal, and the fiercest, that ever yet raged against the Christians. History, alike secular and ecclesiastical, agrees in thus representing it: and by a remarkable coincidence, and as if on purpose to call attention to the fulfilment in this persecution of the fifth Seal’s prefigurative vision, a chronological æra, dating from Diocletian’s accession, and, until the introduction of the *Christian æra* in the sixth century, of general use among Christian writers,—I say this æra, though instituted for other and astronomical purposes, has received its title from it,³ and is called the *Æra of Martyrs*. Churches

¹ Gibb. ii. 157.

² Ib. 466.—The bitterness of the Pagan multitude against Christians, and accusation of them as the guilty cause of all the then recent calamities, must also have had its effect. See Cyprian’s and Arnobius’ testimonies cited pp. 193, 200 *suprà*. The subject is referred to again p. 213 *infra*; and with Tertullian’s statement to the same effect superadded.

³ The æra is still used by the Copts and Ethiopians. See Sir H. Nicholas’ Chronol. of History, p. 12. It dates from the persecutor Diocletian’s accession, A.D. 284.

to be demolished, the Holy Scriptures burnt, church property confiscated, the holders of religious assemblies put to death, and Christians generally put out of the protection of the law,—such were the heads of the first edict. Then followed others, imposing penalties of imprisonment, tortures, and death, first against the Christian bishops, presbyters, and other ecclesiastics, then against all Christians, if obstinate in their faith. In this series of cruel edicts, Diocletian declared “his intention of abolishing the Christian name.” The fury of the populace readily, for the most part, seconded the declared intention of the emperor. And thus, with the partial exception of the western provinces, under the rule of the Cæsar Constantius Chlorus, (I say *partial*, for Spain and Britain too furnished many victims,)¹ Christian blood was shed throughout the extent of the Roman world. And, long before the nine or ten years of the persecution expired, such had been its effect that the three other emperors, Diocletian, Maximian, and Galerius, united to raise pillars commemorative of their success; on which pillars inscriptions, not long since and perhaps still extant, recorded their vain boast of *having extirpated Christianity*.³ For church-service the Christians now met in caves and catacombs. Their only way of visibly and publicly witnessing for Christ was by *martyrdom*.

2. “How long, O Lord, dost thou not avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?”—In the words, “How long,” it was *further* implied to the Evangelist, as I before observed, that although this persecution was the first and only one noted in the prefigurative visions thus far exhibited, yet it would not be then a new thing for Christian blood to be shed by them that dwelt on the Roman earth,

¹ St. Alban, of Verulam, is commemorated as amongst the British martyrs of this persecution. Indeed Christianity is spoken of by some writers as almost destroyed at this time in Britain. So Echard, ii. 550. Compare Euseb. V. C. i. 13.

² The following are the inscriptions found on columns at Clunia, a Roman colony in Spain. They are given from Gruter (p. 280) by Lardner, Vol. vii. p. 548.

1 Diocletianus Jovius et Maximian. Herculius Cæs. Augg.
Amplificato per Orientem et Occidentem Imp. Rom.
Et nomine Christianorum deleto,
Qui Remp. evertabant.

2 Diocletian. Cæs. Aug. Galerio in Oriente adopt.
Superstitione Christ. ubique deletâ,
Et cultu Deorum propagato.

including, as the words signified, both rulers and people; but only a continuance, or repetition, of the treatment long previously experienced by them. To verify this is my *next* object. And in doing so I must crave permission from the reader not to hurry over the investigation. A sketch of the persecutions of Christianity in the Roman empire is almost necessary to our entering into the feelings expressed in the words, "How long," by the souls under the altar. And, after dwelling so much at length on the secular fortunes of the Roman empire throughout the two preceding centuries, it seems scarce allowable not to pause awhile on the contemporaneous and parallel history, as connected with it, of the Church of Christ.

Do we wonder that this should be, as we find it, a history, in no little measure, of resistance, persecution, and suffering? The wonder will cease with us when the glorious fact is remembered that Christianity was in its very essence *a war of aggression* on error, idolatry, superstition, and vice, in all their forms and in all their workings:—an aggression *unprecedented in the world's history*; and begun *at a time* when, with growth of ages, they had associated themselves with all the existing political institutions, as well as all the lesser individualities of domestic and social life: and this in *an empire* the mightiest the world ever saw.—During the supremacy of the three preceding empires, the Persian, Babylonian, and Grecian, it was otherwise. Then it was ordered in God's providence that religious truth should be in retirement: on the principle of seclusion, not publicity; and with self-preservation as its object, not aggressive war and victory. Hence it was shut up within the narrow limits of Judea, as the religion of one particular *nation*, not of *mankind* or the *world*; and by all its connected ceremonies, laws, and institutions prohibited almost from extending itself. The times of ignorance in the world at large God then winked at. But on the introduction of Christianity the case was directly the reverse. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature,"—such was the charge to his apostles by Him who had come as the SAVIOUR into this lost world: and in it was declared their commission to go

forth and make war, though not with carnal weapons, on evil and error in its every form; "casting down all imaginations, and every high thought that exalted itself against the knowledge of God." Could it be expected that man's corruption would not rise against the religion that disturbed it? Or that the strong man armed, the Spirit of evil, the Prince of the darkness of this world, when thus assailed in his very citadel, would fail of acting out the bitterness of his enmity?

It was from the *populace* that the persecution of Christian teachers and people began in the Roman empire. This was to be expected. The war was made, not, like other wars, on men in the associated mass in the first instance,—the political body, the state, the empire,—but over men one by one individually; and, in every case, the conquest sought was that not of the mere profession, but of the heart. It was sought there; and, in the case of many, it was won there. For, in spite of its self-denying lessons, and in spite of its outward cross of persecution also, there attended the Christian faith those high credentials of its truth and divinity, and that power and sweetness in its doctrine to convince the reason, calm the troubled conscience, comfort the sorrowing heart, and satisfy its irresistible longings after the knowledge of God and after immortality, (longings that amidst all the speculations and vain boastings of philosophy had been hitherto altogether unsatisfied,) which with the sincere overcame every obstacle; and led them to join in willing union with that new and despised body of men called *Christians*, after the name of their crucified Master, CHRIST JESUS.—In every such case new tastes and principles, and by consequence new habits of life, new associations, and the relinquishment of the old followed. Thus the *family* first felt it. There consequently began the first outcry and opposition. The members of a house were divided, three against two, and two against three. Then it was felt in each little social circle; then, as the numbers increased of converts to Christianity, in the towns and districts surrounding. So from a thousand centres the outcry rose, and waxed louder and louder; "These are they which turn the world upside down."—

The Prince of this world had his ready instruments to fan the gathering odium; the *Jews* scattered over the Roman world, indignant at the thought of the truth and salvation of God being offered to the Gentiles;¹ the *Magicians* who found their false miracles exposed and confounded by true ones; the *Pagan Priests and trades* that found their craft threatened; and, at length, the *Philosophers* too, indignant at their philosophy being held forth as foolishness. *Superstition*, with its dark and unholy terrors, added to the feeling against Christians, and gave it a deeper bigotry. As they had no idol-statues, it vilified them as atheists.² The disasters of the natural world, whensoever occurring,—inundations, earthquakes, dearth, pestilence,—and those of war too, it charged on *them*.³ It was the anger of the gods against the Christians.

From the people the outcry against Christianity rose up to the *Governors*. At first, like Gallio, they treated it with indifference. Then other results followed. The *first imperial* persecution of Christians, that by *Nero*, was one of singular character and origin. It was not an act of state-jealousy against them. They had not as yet sufficient power or eminence to excite his jealousy. Nor was it a persecution ordered against them for their peculiar doctrines. Of these, probably, he knew nothing. But it was a taking advantage of the odium prevalent against the Christian body in Rome, to fix on them the guilt of a then recent incendiary firing of the city: the excessive hatred that they laboured under rendering them the fittest class on whom to avert from himself, the real criminal, that odious charge.⁴—Under *Domitian*, the *second imperial* persecutor, the case was different. The numbers had now so increased in the empire, that his jealousy, being awakened

¹ So Justin Martyr in his Dialog. cum Tryph. p. 234 (Ed. Colon. 1686:) *Ου μονον δε ου μετενοησατε, αλλ' ανδρας εκλεκτους εκλεξαμενοι τοτε απο Ιερουσαλημ εξεπεμψατε εις πασαν την γην, λεγοντες αιρεσιν αθειων χριστιανων πεφανθαι καταλεγοντες τε ταυτα απερ καθ' ημων οι αγνοουντες ημας απαντες λεγουσιν.*

² So in the Account of Polycarp's Martyrdom, § 3; *Αιρε τους αθειους*. Also in Justin M. just cited; and again in Dion Cassius, in the extract given Note 2 on the next page.

³ See again the testimonies of Cyprian and Arnobius pp. 193, 200 *suprà*. To the same effect is the earlier statement in Tertullian's Apolog. c. 40; "Si Tiberis ascendit in mania, . . si terra movit, si fames, si lues, statim *Christianos ad leones* acclamatur."

⁴ So Tacitus, "Quos per flagitia invisos vulgus Christianos appellabat;" adding, as his own judgment on Christianity, the words "exitabilis superstitio." Ann. xv. 44.

by informers against sundry classes as plotting *treason*, (crimen majestatis,) naturally directed itself against Christians among others. Besides the usual charge of atheism, it was said that this aspiring body was seeking a kingdom.¹ So the jealous emperor slew, in the person of his own cousin *Clemens*, the Christian of noblest blood and rank ;² banished the only surviving apostle of the Christian faith to Patmos ; and summoned the nearest surviving relatives of Him whom the Christians called their King. But he found the last-mentioned poor men ; heard that it was a kingdom not of this world ; and dismissed them with contempt.—Thus far St. John himself had beheld the progress of persecution. Soon after, on Nerva's accession, Christians, among other sufferers from Domitian's tyranny, were set free. Against Christians, *as Christians*, no direct law as yet existed.³

About this time however, or soon after, the effect on the public habits and feelings had become so striking, and constituted a social phænomenon so entirely new, and on so vast a scale, as necessarily to arouse both the curiosity and the anxiety of the ruling powers. The governor of Bithynia, the younger Pliny, wrote to the emperor Trajan of the temples being in disrepute, and almost deserted in his province, from the influence of the body of men called Christians : and, at the same time, of the popular fury being such against them, as to charge them with every crime,⁴ and violently to call for their punishment ; though, on examination, their morals seemed to him to be singularly virtuous and innocent.—This was an epoch in the history of the persecution of the Christian Church. In Trajan's

¹ So Justin Martyr ; *Και ἡμεῖς, ακουσαντες βασιλειαν προσδοκοντας ἡμας, ακριτως ανθρωπινον λεγειν ἡμας ὑπιληφατε, ἡμων την μετα Θεου λεγοντων.* Apol. ii. 58.

² Dion Cassius, lxvii. 14, in narrating Clemens' execution by Domitian, and the banishment of his wife Domitilla, in a passage already referred to (pp. 45, 61 *suprà*), thus remarkably describes their crime ; *Επηνεχθη δε αμφοιν εγκλημα αθειστητος ὑφ' ἧς και αλλοι ες τα των Ιουδαιων ηθη εξοκελλοντες πολλοι κατεδικασθησαν και οι μεν απεθανον οι δε των γόνων ουσιων εσπερηθησαν ἢ δε Δομιτιλλα ὑπερωρισθη μονον εις Πανδατεριαν.* Of Clemens' execution, I may observe, Dio uses the word *κατεσφαξε* ; the same that is here applied to the martyrs.

³ Bishop Kaye, however, seems inclined to doubt this ; grounding his doubt on some statements in Tertullian. Tertull. p. 115.

⁴ So Justin Martyr and others tell of charges made against them of Thyestean banquets, &c.

rescript, the law was first declared respecting them. It had long previously been recognised, Cicero tells us, as a principle in the Roman legislation, that no gods were to be worshipped “ nisi publicè adsciti;” i. e. unless admitted and recognised in the public law. On this Mæcenas had strongly counselled Augustus to insist, as a preservative principle to his empire. And upon this Trajan seems now to have formed his rescript. It was true that in the subsequent admission of the *Egyptian* gods and religion into Rome a principle of tolerance had been acted on inconsistent with the former law; and the *Jews’* religion too had become a religion recognised in the empire, and under legal protection, a “*religio licita.*” But the peculiarity of Christianity that I before alluded to seemed to demand other treatment. Both the *Egyptian* religion, and that of the *Jews*, were peculiarly *national*;—religions for the people of those two nations distinctively; and not proselyting, not aggressive, at least to any marked or dangerous extent. But in the phænomenon now before him he beheld a religion, as before said, essentially proselyting, essentially aggressive on the heathenism established in the empire; and in its pretensions challenging and marching on to be universal. His inquiries must have represented the Christians as a numerous and rapidly increasing body of men in the empire, separated in spirit and in habits from the common mass of Roman citizens: a body neither Roman nor barbarian, but a sort of “genus tertium,” as Tertullian tells us the Christians were reproachfully called:¹—being indeed *in* the empire, but not *of* the empire; and constituting an *imperium in imperio*, a *civitas in civitate*; just according to that Apocalyptic figure, which depicted them as a *holy city*, locally associated with the great city of this world, but not blending with it.—The *mysteriousness* of their religious faith made them of course yet more the objects of suspicion; seeing that no visible temple, altars, images, or sacrifices appertained to it, so as to other religions: and, above

¹ Tertullian De Spec.—Bishop Kaye expresses doubt as to Tertullian’s understanding of this reproachful appellation of Christians. Neander (i. 122, Clarke’s Ed.) explains it as meaning they were neither *Roman* nor *Jew*. But it seems to me more agreeable to Roman phraseology, which divided the world into *Romans* and *barbarians*, to explain it as I have done.

all, the singular and unintelligible *closeness* of their *union*; and their *obstinacy*, which was such as it was found no persuasion, no torture, nor even death itself could overcome.¹

In Trajan's rescript, the law was thus far mildly declared, that there should be no *inquisition* for Christians by the public officers; but that, when brought in regular process of law before the governor, and tried by the test of sacrificing to the gods, the recusants should suffer punishment. The rescript, I say, may have been thus far mercifully intended, as a protection of innocent Christians against the violent seeking out and tearing them from their homes by the popular fury. Yet as it constituted Christianity in itself a *religio illicita*, a faith criminal to adhere to, it furnished a ready plea under which Christians might be thenceforward accused and punished, whensoever either the ruler was unjust, or the populace enraged, and the governor (like Festus) willing to do them a pleasure. So in many parts it even now operated. Souls of martyrs were gathered from one place and another under the altar. *Ignatius*, the venerable bishop of Antioch, headed them. In the full triumph of faith he journeyed to Rome, his appointed place of martyrdom. "Have I given myself up," said he, "to death, to fire, to the sword, to wild beasts? The nearer I am to the sword, the nearer to God. When I am among the wild beasts I am with God. In the name of Jesus Christ, and through his help, I am ready to suffer all together with him." Such is reported to us as his language, in a letter written on the journey to the Church at Smyrna.² A little after writing it his journey was accomplished: and in the great amphitheatre at Rome, which still remains in its colossal grandeur as the martyr's memorial, amidst the brutal shouts of assembled myriads, he was thrown to the lions.

¹ This *obstinacy* of Christians is particularly noted in Pliny's letter as criminal. Their peculiar *unitedness* must also have been very obnoxious to Trajan; who had, only a little before Pliny's letter, promulgated a general law against *ἐταιρείαι*, i. e. *associations*, or *clubs*, of whose affiliation and meetings he was jealous. Neander *ib.* 132, 135.

Tertullian, *Apol. c. 2*, comments very justly on Pliny's letter and Trajan's rescript.

² Ch. 4. I here follow the generally received opinion as to the genuineness of this Epistle to the Christians of Smyrna. See, however, my notice at p. 16 *suprà* of the Syriac version of Ignatius' Epistles, in which it does not appear.

Now began the *apologies* of Christians. *Quadratus* and *Aristides* were the first to appeal in behalf of the Christian body to Trajan's successor Hadrian; then afterwards *Justin Martyr* to Antoninus Pius. And both Hadrian, in the spirit of equity, issued his rescript against punishing Christians for anything but political crimes; and the first Antonine yet more decidedly, though not uniformly with success, protected them against violence. But as the reign of the second Antonine progressed¹ the face of things was changed. His proconsuls in various places, and associate in the empire L. Verus, (though not, I cannot but feel persuaded, himself,²) treated Christianity as a direct crime against

¹ See the express Edict issued by him *against* persecution of Christians in the 1st year of his reign, given by Eusebius, H. E. iv. 13, from Melito.

² Melito's Letter to the emperor on occasion of the persecutions suggests this alternative. See the citation from it in Eusebius, H. E. iv. 26. Neander (i. 143) thinks this doubt was expressed by Melito, in order that he might ask his repeal of the edict with a better grace, and due respect to the imperial authority. This seems to me very unlikely; especially considering the full conviction Melito expresses of M. Aurelius arriving at an opinion about the Christian body even yet more philanthropic, as well as philosophic, than that of his two kindly disposed predecessors Hadrian and Antoninus Pius. Σε δε και μαλλον περι τουτων την αυτην εκεινοις εχοντα γνωμην, και πολυ γε φιλανθρωποτεραν και φιλοσοφωτεραν, πεπεισμεθα παντα πρασσειν οσα σου δεομεθα. Eusebius himself, in the Preface to his H. E. v, describes the persecutions of Christians that occurred in certain places in the 17th year of M. Aurelius, as arising, not from any edict of M. Aurelius, but from popular outbreaks of enmity; εξ επιθειας των κατα τας πολεις δημων. And L. Verus, to whom the East was chiefly entrusted, was quite the man to countenance them.

The persecuting edict referred to by Neander, which has the name of *Aurelian* attached to it, cannot of course be relied on as really belonging to *Aurelius*. Gieseler (H. E. i. 76), like myself, disbelieves this.

On the whole, after carefully considering the statements made by Mosheim, Neander, and Waddington, on this subject, and also the original authorities, I cannot but conclude that these authorities do not warrant their ascription of the persecutions of Christians in M. Aurelius' reign to that emperor directly himself.—A view this which his early Edict in favour of Christians, as well as his general character of justice, so universally recognised, strongly confirms; and also Tertullian's testimony in his favour, Apol. c. 5,* and Lactantius' marked omission of him in the list of imperial persecutors. M. P. c. 3.†—I am pleased to find that Mr. Greswell (Harmony, iv. 594) takes the same view with me on this question.

* He challenges the enemies of Christianity to mention any of the good and wise emperors advanced to the throne after Domitian, who had been a debellator of Christians. On the other hand, he adds, we can mention one who was a protector of Christians, viz. M. Aurelius. Now, though this was said by Tertullian with special reference to the Providential intervention in favour of the Roman army in the later affair of the so-called "thundering legion," yet could he so have written, if M. Aurelius had been previously by his edicts a direct persecutor of Christians; yea, "had polluted every year of a long reign with innocent blood," as Dean Waddington expresses it? A statement the more strange on his part, as it occurs just after his describing M. Aurelius as one who "had reached as high a degree of moral excellence as is attainable by the unassisted faculties of man."

† In M. Aurelius' disapprobatory notice of the deaths of Christian martyrs, which

the state; enjoining inquisition against Christians, the application of torture, if they refused sacrificing, and, if still obstinate, death. The wild beasts, the cross, the stake,—these were the cruel forms of death that met the faithful. Many were now gathered under the altar: among others the souls of *Polycarp*, of *Justin Martyr*, and of the faithful confessors of the church at *Lyons*.—Then the *white horse* passed from view.

As the period of the *red horse* succeeded, and when, amidst the civil commotions ensuing, they that shed Christian blood had it given them in a measure to drink blood, the Church enjoyed a temporary respite; which lasted through the reign of *Commodus*, and to the commencement of that of *Septimius Severus*. But, shortly after, a law of the last-named emperor, forbidding conversions to Christianity under heavy penalties, while it indicated the increasing progress of that divine religion in the empire, did also, as Christianity could not but be aggressive and proselyting, revive persecution against it. The brunt of the persecution fell on the churches of *Africa* and *Egypt*. And *Tertullian*, the *Carthaginian* presbyter, rose up as their apologist. He tells, in his *Apology*, of the insults and injuries that the Christians suffered under. “How often,” exclaims he, addressing the *Governors in Proconsular Africa*, “do ye use violence against the Christians; sometimes at the instigation of private malice, sometimes according to the forms of law! How often also do the common people attack us in their rage with stones and flames!” But, as he had previously said, “Truth wonders not at her own condition. She knows that she is a sojourner upon earth; that she must find enemies among strangers; that her origin, her home, her hopes, her dignities, are placed in heaven.”¹ And then again: “Call us, if ye will, by names of reproach, *sarmenticii*, *semaxii*;—names derived from the *stake* to which we are bound, and the *faggots*

¹ *Apol. ch. 1, 37.*

has been cited by *Neander* i. 144 and *Waddington* i. 119, μη κατα ψιλην παραταξιν, ως οι Χριστιανοι, αλλα λελογισμενως, και σεμνως, και ατραγωδως, it seems to me that the words κατα ψιλην παραταξιν might be more exactly rendered, “in the mere spirit of *antagonism*, (sc. to their judges,)” rather than *obstinaey*, as *Neander*, or *ostentation*, as *Waddington*.

with which we are surrounded when burnt to death! These are but our ornaments of victory, our robe of state, our triumphal chariot."¹

Under the *third* Seal, and when again, in God's righteous retribution, the people that had so long instigated the malice and the rapacity of unjust provincial governors against Christians, had their lot darkened by the letting loose of that very rapacity and injustice on themselves,—at that time that self-same voice in the imperial government which called, though all ineffectually, for equity in the general administration, called, but still as ineffectually, for equity specially towards Christians. Alexander Severus confessed his admiration of Christian morality, and of Him too who had been its first and divine teacher.² On a particular occasion he even recognised the Christians as a lawful corporation,³ and protected them at Rome against their enemies. But it was a protection partial only and transient. Martyrs were still slain. The name of *Hippolytus*, bishop of Porto, stands eminent among them.⁴ Moreover, the former laws against Christians remained unrepealed.⁵ And, after his death, his successor Maximin renewed the imperial persecution against them; the rather as against a body which Alexander had favoured. His edict was directed specially against the bishops and leaders of the Church. But in its effects it went further. It animated the heathen priests, magistrates, and multitude against Christians of

¹ Apol. ch. 50. *Sarmentum*, a faggot; *semiazis*, says Bingham, i. 2, 10, "a stake of about six feet long."

² "In larario suo, in quo . . . Christum, Abraham, et Orpheum, et hujuscemodi deos habebat, rem divinam faciebat." Lamprid. Vit. A. Sev. c. 29. Gibbon refers to this, ii. 450.

³ He assigned to the Christian Church at Rome a piece of ground, which they disputed with the corporation of *popinari*; i. e. of restaurateurs, or tavern-keepers. Lamprid. c. 49.

⁴ That the *Portus Romanus* of which he was bishop was *Ostia* near Rome, not *Aden* on the Red Sea, so as many have supposed, seems to me to have been made sufficiently clear before the late discovery of his Work on Heresies, by Prudentius' Ode on his Martyrium (B. P. M. v. 1034); speaking, as he does, of his bones as transferred from *Ostia* to Rome:

Metando eligitur tumulo locus : Ostia linquant;
Roma placet sanctos quæ teneat cineres.

For Cave's idea that this may have been another Hippolytus, also a martyr, and of about the same age, is hardly reasonable. See my Note² p. 26 *suprà*.

⁵ This appears from his minister Ulpian's work, *De Officio Proconsulis*; in which a collection of Rescripts against Christians is noticed by Lactantius, *Instit.* v. 11.

every rank and order. "Smite the shepherds, and the sheep shall be scattered."

The actual martyrdoms unto death had not indeed thus far been very many; i. e. as compared with the multitude of the Christian body. So *Origen* declared near the middle of the third century.¹ There had been enough to show man's bitter enmity against the truth, enough to exhibit the glorious sustaining power of Christian faith. If not more, it was *His* doing who could shut the lions' mouths. Moreover, if the martyrs slain were not so many, the confessors who suffered in other ways for the faith were innumerable. But while *Origen* made this statement respecting the *past*, he added, in a remarkable passage respecting the *future*, that the tranquillity then prevailing was not to be expected to continue: that the irresistible progress of Christianity, and the impression generally prevalent as to the downfall of the established religion necessarily consequent thereon, and together with its downfall untold disasters to the empire,—that this would soon again revive the flames of persecution; and that it would then rage with an intensity, probably, greater than ever:—concluding thus; "But, if God will, let it come: Christ has overcome the world."²

Such was at that time the anticipation of *Origen*; and very soon it had its fulfilment. The period of the *fourth* Seal succeeded to that of the *third*. It was seen by the emperor *Decius* that if the heathen state-religion were to be preserved, the Christian must be crushed; that the two could not long consist together. Thereupon he made his decision. He determined on *crushing Christianity*.—Like those of certain preceding emperors, his edicts commanded inquisition of Christians, torture, death. Then was the consternation great. The bishop of Alexandria, *Dionysius*, expressly records it. For the Church had now lost much of its first love. There were some apostasies; there were many faithless: the *libellatici* and the *acta facientes*.³—professors who at the same time dared not confess, yet dared not apostatize; and bribed the magistrates with money,

¹ Adv. Celsum l. iii. It is cited by Gibbon ii. 427.

² See Neander's Church History, ib. p. 175.

³ Neander, p. 179.

to spare them the conflict.—But now *Death* on the *pale horse*, having received his commission, had entered the empire. The sword of the Goths, one of his appointed instrumental agencies, struck down the persecuting emperor.¹—His successor Valerian, presently after, (A. D. 257,) animated by the same spirit, renewed the persecution. It was against the bishops and presbyters, who led on the Christians to the conflict,—and the Christians' assemblies, which supplied the public means of grace that strengthened them to endure it,—that the imperial edicts were now chiefly levelled. Then it was that the bishop of Carthage, *Cyprian*, confessed among others, and was added to the glorious army of martyrs.—But God again interposed. As Decius by the *Gothic* sword, so Valerian had his reign cut short by the *Persian*.² And Gallienus, his son and successor, trembling under God's sore judgments, though still as before unconverted, sensual, hard-hearted, issued for the first time (A. D. 261) an *edict of toleration to Christianity*.³ Their churches and burial-grounds (*κοιμητήρια*) were now restored to Christians; their worship permitted. Though the popular outbreaks against the disciples were by no means altogether discontinued, Christianity was legalized.⁴

Such, in brief, were the persecutions of Christians in the Roman empire, prior to that by Diocletian. During the progress of what has been called by some the gradual restoration of the empire, commencing soon after Gallienus' edict of toleration, (for the emperor Claudius, the first of the restorers, succeeded him in the year 268,) the toleration continued. Christian churches were now built; Christian worship might be held in public. To use the Apocalyptic figure, the symbolic altar-court of the Christian temple, with its ritual of sacred worship, was now opened to general view. But no sooner was the restoration completed than an æra began, as we have seen, under

¹ Compare Lactantius M. P. c. 4.

² Comp. Lactant. M. P. c. 5.

³ The Edict is given by Eusebius, H. E. vii. 13.

⁴ Neander, p. 191;—the excellent author whom I have chiefly followed in the above sketch of the persecutions of Christianity. Compare Gibbon's celebrated chapter xvi, on the same subject.

the new Seal, which was emphatically, and beyond any other, the *cera of martyrs*. Persecution broke out afresh after its slumbering, like a giant refreshed with sleep. It combined in itself the bitterness of all the former persecutions:—confiscation, imprisonment, torture, death;—a special vengeance against churches and church-assemblies, bishops and presbyters;—with the new feature moreover super-added of war against the *holy Scriptures*; ¹ that source of strength and wisdom to the suffering church, by the destruction of which, it was now rightly judged, Christianity might best be destroyed. “When he had opened the fifth Seal, I saw the souls of them that were slain for *the word of God*,² and for the testimony which they held.” Some there were, yea many, faithless under the terrors of the persecution; many *traditores*, that betrayed their trust, gave up the Holy Scriptures, and helped to prompt the persecutors’ boast of having extirpated Christianity. But the faithful, the faithful even unto death, were many also. The Bible was preserved: (indeed a special provision had been previously made in God’s providence for its preservation:)³ and the Church continued to witness for the word of God, and the gospel of Jesus.

But let us advert to what remains of the vision.

3. “How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?”

During the progress of these persecutions the feeling with the martyrs themselves, (at least the *earlier* martyrs,) which for the most part overpowered all other feelings, was that of joy and gratitude at being permitted the privilege of partaking in Christ’s sufferings; and, after his example,

¹ So Eusebius, H. E. viii. 2. . . . *τας δε γραφας αφανεις πυρι γενεσθαι προστατοντα*. He had previously said, *Τας δε ενθους και ιερας γραφας κατα μεσας αγορας πυρι παραδιδομενας αυτοις επειδομεν οφθαλμοις*. And so Lactantius, M. P. 12; “Qui dies cum illuxisset, repente ad ecclesiam prefectus cum ducibus et tribunis et rationalibus venit; et, revulsis foribus, simulachrum Dei quaeritur: Scripturae reperta incenduntur.”

² I do not mean by this to confine the meaning of the clause to the Christians’ preservation of their Scriptures. I only mean to suggest this point, in addition to the more usual intent of the phrase, with reference to the *preaching* of God’s word.

³ The copies, as well as versions, of the Scriptures had been so much multiplied in the empire, that the most severe inquisition could no longer be attended with fatal consequences. See Mosheim, iii. 1. 1. 5. The learned Origen had availed himself of the previous tranquillity to make his famous Edition of the Old Testament in six versions, called the Hexapla. See Lardner, ii. 327, 473.

offering themselves, like burnt-offerings, (not piacular indeed, but of self-devotion,¹) on the altar of God. Witness the recorded language of Ignatius and of Polycarp, on occasion of their martyrdoms; language alike beautiful, and most illustrative of the Apocalyptic imagery under which their martyr-deaths were here depicted.² Afterwards however, as the clause in the vision just quoted may perhaps suggest to the reader, there were mingled at times with this joyous gratitude other thoughts and feelings. They knew that God would not leave them unavenged; and spoke to each other, and to their persecutors, of a *coming vengeance*. So for example, in the persecution last before Diocletian's, the African martyr *Marianus*. "As if filled," we read, "with the prophetic spirit, he warned his persecutors, and animated his brethren, by proclaiming the approaching avenging of his blood."³

¹ Compare St. Paul's similar figurative language given p. 208 Note 1, *suprà*.

² *Ignatius*, in his Epistle to the Roman Christians, ch. 2,—an Epistle written on his journey to Rome, after his having been seized and bound "like a choice ram for sacrifice,* by the ferocious soldiery,"—begs them, as the greatest favour they could do, not to interpose to prevent his being poured out as a libation to God on his altar; Πλειον μοι μη παρασχησθε του σπονδισθηναι Θεω, ως ετι θυσιαστηριον ετοιμον εστιν: and again, c. 4; Διτανευσατε τον Χριστον υπερ μου, ινα δια των οργανων τουτων θυσια ευρεθω.

As to *Polycarp*, the whole passage in the Acts of his Martyrdom, to which I refer (ch. 14), is so beautiful in itself, and so illustrative of the points specified above, that I cannot but transcribe it. "Having his hands tied behind him, and being bound [to the stake] as a ram [chosen] out of a great flock for an offering, and prepared to be a burnt-sacrifice, acceptable unto God, he looked up to heaven, and said; O Lord God Almighty, the Father of thy well-beloved and blessed Son Jesus Christ, by whom we have received the knowledge of thee,—the God of angels, and powers, and of every creature, and [especially] of the whole race of just men, who live in thy presence,†—I give thee hearty thanks that thou hast vouchsafed to me that at this day, and this hour, I should have a part in the number of thy martyrs, and in the cup of thy Son Christ, unto the resurrection of eternal life, both of soul and body, in the incorruption of the Holy Spirit. Among whom may I be accepted this day before thee as an acceptable sacrifice; as thou, the true God, hast before ordained. . . . For which, and for all things else, I praise thee, I bless thee, I glorify thee, with the eternal and heavenly Jesus Christ, thy beloved Son; to whom, with thee and the Holy Ghost, be glory both now, and to all succeeding ages. Amen."

So again *Cyprian*. "Quasi holocausta hostiæ accepit illos." Ad Fortun. 12.

The figure continued to be used in the Church afterwards. So Prudentius in his *Cathemerinon*, to the Innocents: (B. P. M. v. 1009:)

Vos prima Christi victima,
 Grex immolatorum tener,
 Aram aut ipsam simplices
 Palmâ et coronis luditis.

³ "Ibi et Marianus, prophético spiritu jam repletus, fidenter ac fortiter prædicabat

* *ὡς κριος επισημος*. Acts of Ignatius' martyrdom, c. 7.

† Compare the Apocalyptic figuration of the 24 presbyters, and my comment on it, p. 93 *suprà*.

But it is in fact the *seeming* cry of the martyred saints, —the voice of their blood in the ears of those surviving Christians of the true Apostolic line and character whom I suppose St. John here as elsewhere to have impersonated,¹ —which the analogy of what is said in Scripture of Abel's blood crying from the ground² points out as the main intent of the symbolic language of the clause. And by these, the attendant and surviving ministers of the Christian body, the cry of the blood of their martyred brethren, was construed as in harmony with their own feelings; and as calling for vengeance, speedy and destroying vengeance, on the murderers.³ The which vengeance the Church of the third century did for the most part, like Marianus, expect and look for. Mark, for example, the language of Tertullian and of Cyprian:⁴ language in truth too maledictory;⁵ and hardly in unison with the spirit of Stephen,⁶ or

proximam justī sanguinis ultionem; variasque sæculo plagas, velut de cœli jam culmine, minabatur; luem, captivitatem, famem, &c. Quâ prædicatione non tantum gentilibus insultabat fides martyris, sed etiam fratribus vigorem æmulandæ virtutis præcinebat." Acta St. Jacobi et Mariani, ap. Daubuz, p. 279. His martyrdom is dated about A.D. 259, under Valerian.

¹ See p. 102 suprâ. This will be illustrated at large under the Sealing Vision.

² Gen. iv. 10, compared with Heb. xii. 24.—So Shakespeare, in his Richard the 2nd;

Which blood, like sacrificjng Abel's, cries
E'en from the tongueless caverns of the earth,
To me for justice.

³ Compare Josh. xxiv. 27.

⁴ So *Tertullian*; "But what a spectacle is that which is now near at hand of the coming of the Lord, and the last and eternal day of judgment! What a vastness to that spectacle! How shall I admire, how laugh, how rejoice, how exult, when I behold so many proud monarchs, reported to have been received into heaven, groaning in the lowest abyss of darkness; so many provincial governors, who persecuted the name of the Lord, liquifying in fiercer fires than they ever kindled against the Christians," &c. De Spectac. c. 30.

So too *Cyprian*. First to *Demetrianus*: "We are sure that whatever we suffer will not remain unrevenged; and that the greater the injury of the persecution, the heavier and juster will be the vengeance:" and again; "Since the present judgments suffice not to convert you to God, there remains that of the eternal prison with its everlasting flames of punishment:"—also to his *Christian Brethren* of Thibarīs, Ep. 56 (Ed. Baluz.); "O that day when the Lord shall have begun to reckon up his people; and, recognising the merits of each by the rule of his divine omniscience, to condemn our persecutors to the burning of the penal flame, and to grant to ourselves the reward of our devotedness and faith."

⁵ Augustine, on Matt. v. 44, suggests in apology for the Apocalyptic cry, (which he explains as uttered by the martyrs themselves,) that it might have been a cry against the Roman kingdom of sin, rather than against its living constituents. "Nam ipsa est sincera, et plena justitiæ et misericordiæ, vindicta martyrum; ut evertatur regnum peccati, quo regnante tanta perpassi sunt."

⁶ Acts vii. 60.

EPITAPH IN THE CATACOMBS ON A MARTYR
SLAIN IN DIOCLETIAN'S PERSECUTION.

+

☾

LANNUS XPI·MA
 RTIRHC REQUIESC
 IT·SUB E.P. S DIOCLETIANO
 PASSUS

A MARTYR'S VASE OF BLOOD, IN THE CATACOMBS AT ROME.



of Polycarp.¹ But behold, in contravention of such expectations, it was delayed through one, through two centuries, and more. From year to year, from reign to reign. Christian blood was again and again shed by their enemies, specially in this last and most terrible persecution by Diocletian. Then the voice seemed to them to wax louder and louder: and, with a tone of murmuring and impatience mixt in it, as well as of suffering,—yea, and with almost an impeachment of God's attributes of holiness and truth, for having so long spared the guilty, and left his saints to suffer,—to cry, “How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?”—In the catacombs at Rome, whither the persecuted Christians there resident fled for concealment in those days of trouble, memorials still exist, the most impressive and affecting, both of the *martyrs* then slain, and of their *blood* crying as it were from beneath the ground against them that shed it. I allude to *monumental tablets* long extant there, (such as the Reader sees now pictured before him,) with inscriptions rudely sculptured to their memory: and *vases* of small size often seen beside them, whereinto had been poured, as would seem, what the Christian bystanders could collect of life's ebbing flood at the scene of martyrdom;² inscribed with the single but

¹ “Pray ye,” wrote Polycarp to the Philippian, at the time when Ignatius was passing onward to martyrdom, “for kings and princes and magistrates, even those that persecute and hate you.” § 12.

² The engravings are from *Boldetti*.

In the former the E. P. S. is the abbreviation for “et posteris suis;” showing that the tomb had been legally appropriated to Lannus and his family after him; and also fixing the inscription to the time immediately following his martyrdom.

As regards the inscription in the latter a controversy exists, which will be found noticed in Dr. C. Maitland's Book on the Catacombs; most writers on the subject reading *Sang* . . . for *Sanguis*; some *Sanc* . . for *Saucto*. Dr. M. inclines to the latter; and supposes that the vase was one that the funeral attendants drank out of, at the *agape* or *love-feast*, on the burial. In Aringhi's *Roma Sotteranea*, (vol. i. p. 297,) there is engraved one which has the G more clearly written. And this would tend to confirm the view of those who regard the word inscribed as *Sanguis*. The circumstance however of C being sometimes inaccurately written in old inscriptions, and a little like G, renders it not decisive.—Dr. M. mentions that the Congregation of Relics, held in 1688, after “having carefully examined the matter, decided that the palm-branch and vessel tinged with blood are to be considered most certain signs of martyrdom.” It seems that a chemical examination of a vase, conducted by Leibnitz, and published by Fabretti, proved favourable to the presence of blood, or at least of organic matter, in it. But, says Dr. M., the experiments instituted are far from being satisfactory to the modern practical chemist: though they serve to refute the assertion that the red matter contained in the vessels was merely a mineral impregnation from the surrounding soil. See Dr. Maitland on the Catacombs, pp. 127,

significant word, *Sanguis*, “*Blood!*” Did there not seem to them to be, as it were, a voice, a cry, in that simple memorial word against their murderers?

Now methinks, when such thoughts arose, it should have been considered by the early Christians, much more than was usually the case, that towards nations, even as towards individuals, the divine *long-suffering* is an attribute which must needs magnify itself, as well as the divine justice and holiness. Long had been Jerusalem’s experience of this; and even the heathen Nineveh felt it also. If, after the time when Christianity and the glorious gospel of the Lord Jesus had been fully brought before the consideration of the Roman people,—a time which I have dated as nearly about coincident with that of the giving of the Apocalypse, or close of the first century,—if, I say, after this, a period of prolonged prosperity and peace, such as of the *white horse*, was appointed to the empire, and with it the most favourable opportunity for the calm consideration of the evidences and claims of the holy religion offered them,—what was there in this but what accorded with the usual acting of God’s Providence towards men individually; yea, and which they themselves had each one probably experienced? Or, again, what was there but in accord with his usual forbearance, if, when this period of the white horse had passed unimproved, it was ordered that those of the *red*, the *black*, and the *livid pale* that succeeded, should be periods of attempered suffering and punishment, just such as might best *force* the sufferers to consider the heavenly message:—of punishment, but *not more*;—not of *destruction*?—As to his own persecuted people, the Christians, who in that vast empire were as sheep in the midst of wolves, had He not so overruled the *times* of their bitterest persecutions, (the Decian, for example, and those of Valerian and Diocletian,) as that they should fall on the Church

142—149; to whom I was originally indebted for these drawings.—Gibbon has argued against the evidence for such relics being really those of Christian martyrs, ii. 427. This was to be expected.

It strikes me that it would be satisfactory to compare the supposed remnant of blood with the remains of liquid, some reddish, some yellow, found in funeral urns at Pompeii; and proved by analysis to consist of mingled *water*, *wine*, and *oil*, used no doubt in libation on the ashes of the dead. See Adams’ *Roman Antiq.* Note to p. 420 (Ed. 1834).

when confessedly corrupted,¹ and needing something to stay the increasing corruption? Had He not moreover in some measure blessed those persecutions to their purification and recovery? If so, then, instead of there being any failure in all this of his faithfulness and truth, it was but the very acting out and expression of those attributes towards them. And so indeed some, like David of old, felt it. "I know, O Lord, that thy judgments are right, and that thou of very faithfulness hast afflicted me."

4. But mark the progress of the vision. "And white robes were given unto every one of them: and it was said unto them that they should rest yet for a little season, *until their fellow-servants also, and their brethren, that should be killed as they were, should be fulfilled.*"² Such was the voice heard by St. John, still of course in his representative character: defining the time of the judgment which those martyrs seemed to call for, as thus far approximate,—that there would only intervene before it the period of the rise and slaughter of another and distinct body of martyrs, similarly witnessing for the word of God and the testimony of Jesus. I say *another and distinct body*: for the very singular symbolization, coincidentally, of the presentation of white robes to all and each of those that had appeared in this vision under the altar, constituted a marked sign of separation between its martyrs, and those that were to come; of which sign more under the Head following. For the present let us confine our inquiry to the chronological intimation here given as to the time of the desired consummation; and see how the giving of it was fulfilled in the case of those whom at this point of time in the drama John represented.

It is assuredly very striking and instructing to observe with what earnestness of interest the fathers of the early

¹ The contemporary statements of Cyprian, and retrospective statements of Eusebius. (c. g. H. E. viii. 1.) are express to this effect.

² Και εδοθη αυτοις [εκασιψ] στολη λευκη και ερρεθη αυτοις ινα αναπαυωνται ετι χρονον [μικρον], εως πληρωθωσι και οι συνδουλοι αυτων, και οι αδελφοι αυτων, οι μελλοντες αποκτενεσθαι ως και αυτοι.*

* The dotted bracket indicates a measure of doubtfulness as to the genuineness of the word.

Church, throughout the whole era of Pagan persecution referred to,—as *Justin Martyr* and *Irenæus*, for example, *Tertullian* and *Hippolytus*,—searched into the inspired predictions handed down to them. These were to them no unmeaning, no profitless writings. However they may have been in doubt with regard to many particulars of the future, there was a certain great outline that they found clear in divine prophecy: and both in this, and in the views that it opened to them throughout of God's care and kindness to his Church, they found an admirable stay to their faith, together with counsel, encouragement, comfort. So that there was fulfilled to them, even thus early, what was written, "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear, the words of this prophecy."—It was specially the prefigurative visions in Daniel and the Apocalypse of the *quadripartite symbolic Image* and *four symbolic wild Beasts*, and the predictions in St. Paul and St. John respecting the *Man of Sin* and the *Antichrist*, that fixed their attention. And what their inferences, as to the things then present, and the things future? First, they judged with one consent that Daniel's fourth wild Beast symbolized the Roman empire; as also that the little horn of this wild Beast, or its equivalent the last head of the Apocalyptic Beast, symbolized one and the same antichristian power as St. Paul's Man of Sin, and St. John's Antichrist. Further they judged that the Roman empire, in its then existing state, was the *let* or *hindrance* meant by St. Paul, standing in the way of Antichrist's manifestation; and that its removal would take place on the empire's dissolution into a new form of ten kingdoms: among which, or contemporarily with which, Antichrist, the Man of the Apostasy, would forthwith arise, and reign over the Roman world and empire in this its latest form; Rome itself, and its empire, (so the most learned thought,) having been revived to supremacy under him. Moreover they were agreed that this Antichrist would persecute the Christian Church with a fierceness altogether unparalleled: and thus that there would be a second series of *Roman* persecutions, and a second series of martyrs slain under Roman oppression;—persecutions that would only terminate in Christ's coming and taking venge-

ance, at the end of the world.¹—Once more, as to the *time* of the vengeance on Rome, and its empire,—that great

¹ It may be well to quote, or abstract from, the Christian Fathers referred to in their chronological order.

1. *Justin Martyr*.—In his Dialogue with Trypho, p. 336 (Ed. Colon.), he speaks of Christ's coming again in glory, *ὅταν και ὁ της αποστασιας ανθρωπος, ὁ και εις τον Ὑψιστον εξαλλα λαλων, επι της γης ανομα τολμησῃ εις ἡμας τους Χριστιανους*: thereby identifying Daniel's Little Horn of the fourth Beast, that "spoke great things against the Most High," with St. Paul's Man of Sin, or Man of the Apostasy; also noting his lawless persecution of Christians living at the time, and his succession and destruction by Christ's glorious advent.

2. *Irenæus*.—In his Work on Heresies, B. v. ch. 25, this ancient Father says; "Daniel novissimi regni finem respiciens, (id est novissimos decem reges in quos divideretur regnum, super quos Filius perditionis veniet,) cornua dicit decem nasei Bestiæ, et alterum cornu pusillum." Again, ch. 30, after commenting on the predicted number of the Beast, 666, (as a probable solution of which he mentions the word *Λατεινος*,—probable because of this being the name of the last of the four kingdoms, or Roman, then reigning, "quoniam novissimum regnum hoc habet vocabulum, Latini enim sunt qui nunc regnant,") he goes on to say; "Scientes hunc numerum, sustineant* primum quidem divisionem regni in decem; post deinde, illis regnantibus, et incipientibus augere suum regnum, qui de improvise advenerit, regnum sibi vindicans, et terribit prædictos, habens nomen continens prædictum numerum."

Thus he explains the Latin or Roman empire, then existing, to be the fourth and last of Daniel's great kingdoms; and its division into ten kingdoms to be the event immediately preceding the manifestation of Antichrist: who, whencesoever originating, (and Irenæus had the impression of his being a Jew in origin,) was yet somehow in the result to be a Latin man, and the ruler of the Roman empire in its last form.

3. *Tertullian*.—In his Resur. Carn. ch. 24, commenting on St. Paul's prophecy on 2 Thess. ii. 3, 4, he thus writes; "Nisi veniat abscessio primo,"—hujus utique regni." Then on the clause, "He that letteth shall let until he be taken away," he expounds his sense of this *let*, or *hindrance*, by the question, "Quis nisi Romanus status; cujus abscessio, in decem reges dispersa, Antichristum superducet."—Then, after further comment on the same prophecy, he turns to the Apocalyptic passage now under consideration; his comment on which will be given Note † p. 232 *infra*.

4. *Hippolytus*.—In Hippolytus' Treatise on *Christ and Antichrist*, given in Combefis' Bibliotheca Patrum, (Paris Ed.) there is a full exposition of Daniel's symbolic visions of the quadri-partite Image and the four Wild Beasts; and, like others before him, he explains the first three empires to be the *Babylonian*, *Persian*, and *Macedonian*, (the last-mentioned divided, he says, into four parts on Alexander's death, like the four heads of the leopard in vision,) the *fourth* the *Roman*, then existing and reigning "in its iron legs." And what then, he adds, remains for accomplishment but the division of the iron feet of the Image into its *ten toes*; the growing out of the fourth Beast's head of its *ten horns*. *Τι περιλειπεται ἐρμηνευσαι ἡμιν ὧν ἔωρακεν ὁ Προφήτης, ἀλλ' ἡ τα ἰχνη των ποδων της εικονος* κ. τ. λ. Upon, and from among which 4th Beast's ten horns, he judged that the Little Horn of Antichrist would arise.—Again, ch. 49, he says of the last state of the Roman Beast; "This is the fourth Beast, whose head was wounded and healed again, because of its being destroyed, or dishonoured, and resolved into ten diadems. And Antichrist, being a man of resource, will heal and restore it; so that it shall again revive in strength through the laws established by him." † (The Treatise, in *Latin*, is given in the B. P. M. xxvii. 1. The original Greek of the passage just cited is given in my 3rd Volume, Part iv, ch. iv, § 1, ad fin.)

* That is, *Let them patiently wait*; the verb *sustineo* being used in the same sense here by Irenæus as by Tertullian in a passage which will be given in the subsequent Note † p. 232.

† Hippolytus' contemporary *Origen*, in Genes. p. 6, expounds Nebuchadnezzar's image in Daniel to signify the same four empires of Babylon, Persia, Macedonia, and Rome, as the rest of the fathers. And so again in his Treatise *Contrà Marcionitas*. His fuller prophetic views and expectations scarcely appear in the works of his now extant.

vengeance so graphically described in Apoc. xvi, xviii, when the vials of God's wrath should be poured out thereon, and "in her should be found the blood of prophets and saints, of all that had been slain on the earth," and the saints should be told "to reward her as she had rewarded them, and in the cup which she had filled to fill to her double,"—this time they inferred to be very nigh at hand. For nothing, they reasoned, prevented Antichrist's development but the intervention of the Roman empire in its then existing state,¹ which state they thought would pass away speedily; and that then Antichrist's predicted short-lived reign, and his persecution of but three and a half years would follow, and be succeeded instantly by Christ's second coming and the consummation.²—Not to add that certain

¹ *Tertullian*, in his *Apolog.* ch. 32, writes thus expressly to that effect; "Vim maximam universo orbi imminentem, ipsamque clausulam sæculi acerbitates horrendas comminantem, Romani imperii commeatu * scimus retardari." And again, *Adv. Scap.* ch. 2: "Christianus, imperatorem sciens à Deo suo constitui, necesse est ut ipsum . . . honoret, et salvum velit, cum toto Romano Imperio, quousque seculum stabit: *tamdiu enim stabit.*"

² *Justin Martyr* thus speaks of Antichrist as *at the doors*, and of his 'destined continuance for $3\frac{1}{2}$ times, in his *Dialogue with Trypho*, p. 250: *Του βλασφημα και τολμηρα εις τον Υψιστον μελλοντος λαλειν ηδη επι θυραις οντος, ον καιρον και καιρους και ημισυ καιρον διακαθεξεν Δανιηλ μηνυει.* Which term, he says, the Jews incorrectly calculated on the principle of a prophetic *time* meaning 100 years, and consequently the $3\frac{1}{2}$ times 350 years: he himself regarding them as *literal years*.

Similarly *Tertullian*, *De Fugâ in Persecutione*, ch. 12, writes; "Antichristo jam instante." And again, in his *De Spectac.* ch. 30, "Quale spectaculum in proximo est;" with reference to the destruction of the persecuting powers at Christ's coming. (Cited Note¹ p. 107 *suprà*.) In another place, *Adv. Marcion.* v. 16, he speaks of the Marcionist heretics, then teaching, as if precursors of Antichrist.

Cyprian perpetually dwells on this topic of the nearness of Antichrist and the consummation; and in reference to almost every subject of address. So *Ep. 56, de Exhort. Mart. ad init.* "Scire debetis, et pro certo tenere, pressurâ diem super caput esse cœpisse, et occasum seculi, atque Antichristi tempus, appropinquasse;" and the same in his *Letter to Fortunatus (ad init.)* on the same subject. *Ep. 68*, "Deficiente jam mundo, atque appropinquante Antichristo." Similarly in the *De Unit. Eccl. i*, "Appropinquante jam fine seculi:" *De Mortal. ad init.*, "Regnum Dei cœpit esse in proximo:" and again *Ep. 56*; "Venit Antichristus, sed et supervenit Christus: grassatur et sævit inimicus; sed statim sequitur Dominus, passiones nostras et vulnera vindicaturus." Once more, to the persecuting judge *Demetrianus* he dwells on the existing plagues, miseries, depopulation, &c., as signs of the world's approaching end not to be mistaken.—The end of my last citation, from *Ep. 56*, has been already quoted at p. 224, as illustrative of the voice that seemed to issue in vision from the souls of the martyrs.

Besides the above more eminent Fathers, I must observe that *Judas Syrus*, a contemporary of *Tertullian's*, spoke also of Antichrist's manifestation as near: (so *Euseb. H. E. vi. 7*: moreover that the Christian *pseudo-Sibyl*,† at a time yet earlier, predicted (*B. viii.*) that the third emperor after *Adrian* would be the last Roman

* In the sense of *prolonged existence*. So *Pamelius*.

† *Lardner, vii. 258*, cites *Celsus* (who wrote A.D. 176) speaking of some Christians, whether orthodox or heretical, being *Sibyllists*.

considerations also of the *age of the world*, as if not far from 6000 years, began now to enter into their reasonings; and confirmed them in the idea that the end was near.¹—Thus did the voice of divine prophecy, as their minds apprehended it in those times of fiery trial, correspond most exactly with the voice which fell on St. John's ears in the fifth Seal's vision, as if addressed to the martyred souls under the altar. "It was said to them that they should rest (waiting their avenging and reward)² yet for a little season, until their brethren, which should be killed as they were, should be fulfilled." Indeed this very passage of the

emperor; and the 948th year of Rome, (= the numeral of ΡΩΜΗ,) or A.D. 196, be the fated year of Rome's destruction, and the consummation.

1. Τον μετα τρεις αρξουσι, πανυστατον ημαρ εχοντες.
2. Τρις δε τριακοσιους και τεσσαρακοντα και οκτω Πληρωσεις λυκαβαντας, όταν σοι ευσμορος ηξη Μοιρα βιαζομενη· τεον ουνομα πληρωσασα.

¹ So *Irenæus*, v. 28; "Si dies Domini quasi mille anni, in sex autem diebus consummata sunt quæ facta sunt, manifestum est quoniam consummatio ipsorum sextus millesimus annus est: quotquot enim diebus hic factus est mundus tot et millenis annis consummatur." And, again, c. 29; "Antichristi, in quem recapitulabitur sex millium annorum apostasia."

Hippolytus too is said by Photius to have thus reasoned; and so to have fixed Antichrist's coming, and the world's end, at about A.D. 500. See Lardner ii. 425.

Cyprian, in his *De Exhort. Mart. to Fortunatus*, thus writes; "Jam sex millia annorum pæne compleantur ex quo hominem Diabolus impugnat:" ad init. Again in c. 11, he speaks of the world's seven days of creation, and rest, as typifying its seven millenniums.

In the curious Tract moreover *De Pascha Computus*, attributed to Cyprian, and appended to the Oxford Edition of his Works (1682),—a Tract which, whether his or not, is fixed by the notice of *Arrian and Pappus* as Consuls at the time at which his computation ends, and by other evidence, to about A.D. 243,—an expectation is expressed of the consummation, and its judgments on the wicked, occurring at the end of the 6000 years then, according to Cyprian, near expiring. "Ecce, Dei gratiâ, quàm præclara et admirabilia nobis ostensa sunt per annos xlviiii. Qui anni à contrario infidelibus, et persecutionem servis Dei facientibus, magnam demonstrant superventuram calamitatem. Quâ autem ratione videamus. Hic enim mundus, in quo justî et injusti ab initio sæculi conversantur, sex diebus est consummatus; quibus suppletis benedictus est dies septimus; ille scilicet superventurus sabbati æterni. In his itaque diebus ab initio non tantùm Diabolo et angelis ejus, sed et omnibus peccatoribus à Deo ignis est preparatus." The 49 years mentioned refer to some supposed mystical intimation in the seven hebdomads of Daniel.

These are the earliest applications, I believe, of the world's supposed nearness to its seventh millennium, in proof of the nearness of the consummation: an argument which, in the course of our Apocalyptic exposition, we shall more than once have again to recur to.—They were all based on the *Septuagint's* mundane chronology. Of which however there were different versions; Clemens Alexandrinus (*Strom.* i. 21) making Christ's birth A.M. 5624, others earlier; and the expectation prevailing (so the *Computus*) that God would shorten the days.

Lactantius, who belonged as much to the time of the sixth Seal as to that of the fifth, or more, will be quoted p. 234 Note ¹ infra.

² So *Cyprian*, *De Lapsis*, explains the phrase; saying that the souls under the altar are bade in it "requiescere ac *patientiam tenere*." Compare Daniel xii. 13, "Thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days."

Apocalypse was cited and commented on by them; as in part, and conjunctively with the other prophecies, an authority for such their expectation and hope.¹

It of course needs not to say that in regard to this last point, I mean the *time* to which they looked for their final avenging and reward, History, the great interpreter, has proved them wrong. In fact the phrase "yet a *little* season," (if the adjective *little* be genuine, which is doubtful,) just like the word "*quickly*" elsewhere used by our Lord respecting the time of his coming,² was one of larger or less duration according to the standard by which it might be measured. And I may remark here, what I shall have occasion to remark perhaps more than once again, that the phrases used in prophetic Scripture respecting the time of the consummation were purposely so framed as to allow of a duration shorter or longer being attached to them; and thus of the Church in each age looking for its Lord's advent as not far distant. Admitting (what was generally understood to be the fact) that the great destroying vengeance on persecuting Rome was not to take place *at* the breaking up of its empire into ten kingdoms, but *after* their rise, and Antichrist's rise and reign synchronically over them, there was needed, in order to decide the length of the time still to intervene before that catastrophe, (so as indeed I have already hinted,)³ the decision of the two preliminary points following: viz. 1st, what the interval before the empire's breaking up into its last decemregal form, and Antichrist's contemporary or immediately subsequent manifestation; 2ndly, what the length of the three

¹ So *Tertullian*, De Res. Carn. ch. 25: "Etiam in Apocalypsi Johannis ordo temporum sternitur, quem martyrum quoque animæ sub altari, ultionem et judicium flagitantes, sustinere didicerunt: ut prius et orbis de pateris angelorum plagas suas ebibat, et prostituta illa civitas à decem regibus dignos exitus referat, et bestia Antichristus, cum suo pseudo-prophetâ, certamen ecclesie Dei inferat, atque ita, Diabolo in abyssum interim relegato, primæ resurrectionis prærogativa de solis ordinetur; dehinc, et igni dato, universalis resurrectionis censura de libris judicetur."

And again, in his *Scorp. adv. Gnostic.* ch. 12: "Quinam isti tam beati victores, (Apoc. iii. 12,) nisi propriè martyres? Illorum etenim victoriæ quorum et pugnæ; eorum vero pugnæ quorum et sanguis. Sed et interim sub altari martyrum animæ placidum quiescunt, et fiduciâ ultionis candidam claritatis usurpant, donec et consortium illarum gloriæ impleant. Nam et rursus innumera multitudo, albat, et palmis victoriæ insignes, revelantur; (Apoc. vii. 9, &c. :) scilicet de *Antichristo* triumphales."

² Apoc. xxii. 12, &c.

³ pp. 68, 69 suprâ.

and a half predicted years of his persecuting reign, and whether to be understood literally, or of a much longer period.—But on these questions it is not my present business to enter. They will come up for full discussion in a later Volume. Suffice it now to have shown that the Christian Church and Fathers passed through and out of the period of the fifth Seal, and of the persecutions referred to in it, with the distinct conviction impressed on their minds, even as by a voice from heaven, that there only needed to be completed another and different series of martyrs, viz. those to be slain under Antichrist; and that then, without further delay, their Redeemer would surely manifest himself, and execute final vengeance on their enemies.

5. In the mean while there was to be fulfilled, in regard to the souls of martyrs already under the altar, the fact symbolized by their *investiture with white robes*, just when the voice under this Seal ended speaking. A symbol certainly very remarkable! Explained *forensically*, or with reference to persons condemned or arraigned as criminals, it signified their *justification*. So elsewhere, “The white robes are the justification of the saints.”¹ In case of this investiture occurring in the inner sanctuary, or before God, so as in the passage just cited, or again in the case of the High Priest Joshua described in Zechariah,² it would imply justification *in the sight of God*. But where the scene was the open altar-court,—just as their dejection there under the altar indicated the condemnation and execution of the Christian saints as criminals *before the world*,—so their investiture with white on the same public scene must be construed to imply their as public justification *before the world*, and in the view of *their fellow-men*.—But how so? How could there be a public recognition of these martyrs’ righteousness, begun even before the opening of the sixth Seal, and that great revolution which it was to signify?—Yet the fact was even so. Before Lactantius had yet finished that famous treatise *De Divinis Institutionibus*,³ wherein

¹ δικαιωματα, Apoc. xix. 8.

² Zech. iii. 4, 5.

³ Lardner, iii. 492—494, shows that the writing of Lactantius’ Institutes must have been probably between A.D. 306 and 311; and its publication soon after the

he repeated, as its latest echo by the Church under Rome Pagan, that same prophetic voice about Rome, and the Antichrist, and the consummation, that we lately noted in the writings of the Fathers of the third century that preceded him,¹ an edict of the persecutor Galerius was issued, (an edict agreed to by two of the other emperors,) confessing, by implication at least, to the wrong he had done the Christians, putting an end to the persecution, and even entreating the Christians *to pray to their God for him.*² An act of justification this that was applicable of course as well to the memory of the martyred Christian confessors, as to the character of those that still survived: and thus surely a true fulfilment of this clause of the Apocalyptic vision.³—

latter epoch. See especially Book v. ch. 11, 12 of the Institutes; which was evidently written during the raging of the persecution. The inscription to Constantine, i. 1, is wanting in many MSS; and may probably have been added after the completion, and perhaps the first publication, of the Book. Lardner refers also to his Epitome of the Institutions, c. 53, speaking of some of the persecuting princes as having miserably died, some still surviving: a circumstance, he justly says, only suited to the date A.D. 311, 312, or 313.

Gibbon (iii. 239) says; “I am almost convinced that Lactantius dedicated his Institutions to the sovereign of Gaul (Constantine), at a time when Galerius, Maximin, and even Licinius persecuted the Christians; i. e. between A.D. 306 and 311.”

¹ In his Div. Institut. vii. 15, he speaks of the predicted destruction of Rome as near. “Romanum nomen, quo nunc regitur orbis, (horret animus dicere, sed dicam quia futurum est,) tolletur de terrâ; . . . et id futurum brevi conciones prophetarum denunciant.”—And so again, ib. 25. “Etiam res ipsa declarat lapsum, ruinamque rerum brevi fore: nisi quod incolum urbem Romam nihil istiusmodi videntur esse metuendum. At vero cum caput illud orbis occiderit, . . . quis dubitet venisse jam finem rebus humanis orbique terrarum? Illa est enim civitas quæ adhuc sustentat omnia: precandusque nobis et adorandus est Deus cæli, (si tamen statuta ejus et placita differri possunt,) ne citius quàm putemus tyrannus ille abominandus veniat, qui tantum facinus molitur, ac lumen illud effodiat, cujus interitu mundus ipse lapsurus est.”—He had immediately before noted 200 years, as the largest margin which the varying mundane chronologies of chronologists allowed before the completion of the 6000 years (a point already argued on by Irenæus, Hippolytus, and Cyprian, see p. 231 *suprà*) and the consummation. But on this I shall have to speak more fully in a subsequent part of my Book; viz. on Apoc. viii. 13.

² “Debeunt Deum suum orare pro salute nostrâ.”—Galerius’ Edict of Toleration was issued by him in his last illness, Apr. 29, A.D. 311. It is given in full by Lactantius, M. P. 34, and Eusebius, H. E. viii. 17; also by Gibbon, ii. 485; and will be noticed by me again in my next Chapter. “In consequence,” says Gibbon, “great numbers of Christians were released from prison, or delivered from the mines. The confessors, singing hymns of triumph, returned to their own countries.”—Donatus, to whom the M. P. is inscribed, was one of these liberated confessors. “Tunc, apertis carceribus, Donate carissime, cum cæteris confessoribus è custodiâ liberatus es; cum tibi carcer sex annis pro domicilio fuerit.” M. P. 35.—Maximin issued a similar Edict A.D. 314, just before his death, which is given by Eusebius, H. E. ix. 10.

³ This view of the *justification* of the martyred Christians, as symbolized by the white robes given them on the Apocalyptic scene, may be illustrated by a somewhat parallel case in an earlier æra of the imperial history, that of Pertinax’s accession. It is thus related by Gibbon, i. 162. “The unburied bodies of murdered senators (for the cruelty of Commodus endeavoured to extend itself beyond death) were deposited in the sepulchres of their ancestors: *their memory was justified*; and every

Nor was it less notable at the period itself as a sign of the times. For it was a confession of the *moral* triumph of Christianity over Heathenism, while the latter was in all its imperial power and supremacy; and thus might almost seem to portend, sooner or later, even a *political triumph* following.—And hence indeed it appeared, with regard to the slaughter of Christian saints by the Roman emperors, that whereas the varied calamities depicted under the *three* preceding Seals, were *causes* and *symptoms* of the *decline* of the Roman Heathen empire, politically considered, this too, which was prefigured under the *fifth* Seal, was in perfect consistency with the dramatic unity of the Seals, a *cause* and *symptom* of its decline *religiously* considered, fully as influential as the others;—indeed that it was in God's providence the immediate cause, as well as precursor, of its *fall*.

CHAPTER VI.

THE SIXTH SEAL'S PRIMARY VISION.¹

“AND I beheld when he had opened the sixth Seal, and there was a great earthquake. And the sun became black as sackcloth of hair; and the full moon become as blood; and the stars of heaven fell unto the earth, even as a fig-tree casteth forth her untimely figs, when she is shaken of a mighty wind. And the heaven departed as a scroll when it is rolled together; and every mountain and island were moved out of their places. And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the chief captains, and the

consolation bestowed on their ruined and afflicted families.”—Now a similar indignity was offered to the bodies of some of the martyred Christians in Diocletian's persecution. (See Aringhi, Lib. i. c. 4.) But, on Galerius' Edict of Toleration, which was for a while accepted and acted on also by Maximin, these bodies would, as a matter of course, receive honourable burial.

It is almost needless to observe that the fulfilment of what the white robes given them signified continued, and became still more marked, on the revolution of the sixth Seal, figuring the overthrow of heathenism in the Roman empire, and ever afterwards.

¹ The Sealing and Palm-bearing Visions are evidently included in, and constitute the second part of, this 6th Seal: just as, in regard of the 6th Trumpet, its primary part ends with the end of Apoc. ix.; and the vision of the Covenant Angel, and his address to St. John, with the sequel down to Apoc. xi. 14, constitutes its second part. In the one case the 7th Seal's opening marks the termination; in the other the 7th Trumpet's sounding.

rich men, and the mighty men, and every bondman, and every freeman, hid themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains; and they say to the mountains and the rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of Him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb; for the great day of His wrath is come, and who shall be able to stand? ” Apoc. vi. 12—17.¹

Thus, just as on the fifth Seal’s opening, the Evangelist’s eye had been directed from the terrene landscape to the nearer altar-court, so now it was directed back from the altar-court to the *terrene landscape*; with which landscape the *temple* and *holy city* adjoining were, as before observed, associated; and which seems to have appeared with both seas² and land outspread in view, and with its heaven (or sky) and heavenly luminaries above them. It imaged evidently *the Roman world*: that in which the Christian church had already planted itself; and with which its future fortunes were, in God’s providence, to be most closely connected, even to the end. And, as the Jewish-like Apocalyptic *temple* did fitly symbolize the *faith* and *worship* of Christ’s people through an atoning and mediating Redeemer, (the same that the ancient Jewish temple, altar, sacrifices, and priesthood had ever while standing prefigured,) and moreover the holy city symbolized their *polity*, as the aspirant and constituent members of the kingdom of heaven,—so was *the earth*, outspread in vision, as fitly emblematic of its heathen inhabitants: even as of a people in taste, principle, and feeling belonging only to this world; “of the earth,” as St. Paul expresses it, “and earthy.”³ The *heaven* above this Apocalyptic earth, was, we must

¹ Και ειδον οτε ηνοιξε την σφραγιδα την εκτην· και σεισμος μεγας εγενετο· και ο ηλιος εγενετο μελας ως σακκος τριχινος, και η σεληνη ολη εγενετο ως αιμα, και οι αστερες του ουρανου επεσαν εις την γην, ως συκη βαλλει τους ολυνθους αυτης, υπο ανεμου μεγαλου σειομενη· και ο ουρανος απεχωρισθη ως βιβλιον ελισσομενον, και παν ορος και νησος εκ των τοπων αυτων εκινηθησαν· και οι βασιδεις της γης, και οι μεγαιστανες, και οι χιλιαρχοι, και οι πλουσιοι, και οι ισχυροι, και πας δουλος και ελευθερος εκρυψαν εαυτους εις τα σπηλαια και εις τας πετρας των ορειων. Και λεγουσι τοις ορεισι και ταις πετραις, Πεσετε εφ’ ημας, και κρυψατε ημας απο προσωπου του καθημενου επι του θρονου, και απο της οργης του αρνιου· οτι ηλθεν η ημερα η μεγαλη της οργης αυτου, και τις δυναται σταθηναι;

² In verse 14 the *islands* are specified as visible.

³ See p. 103 *suprà*.

remember, its own *firmamental* heaven, or sky;—being altogether distinct from that spiritual unchanging heaven constituted by the Divine Presence in the inner temple. According to the usual Scripture use of such terms, it was to be considered as representing the ruling department in the dominant polity; and its luminaries as the actual rulers, and governing powers, therein.¹

Now ere the sixth Seal was opened, these luminaries appeared fixed in the sky, and the earth at rest and still. But behold, on its opening, the whole scene in agitation! A great and sudden earthquake shakes the earth. The mountains and the island-rocks sink beneath the shock. The sun becomes black; the full moon blood-red, as in total eclipse. The stars fall from the heaven in which they were before shining, even as figs from a fig-tree in a windy tempest. Kings and generals, rich men and great men, freemen and slaves, (dress probably in a measure distinguishing them,²) appear in flight; as men panic-struck, and seeking to caves or holes in the rocks wherein to hide themselves. And this was chiefly observable,—that in the cry which St. John heard uttered by them, no earthly foe was named as their object of terror.³ They spoke as men conscious that Jesus who was crucified was their conqueror and their foe. They called on the rocks to hide them from *Him who sat upon the throne*, and from the wrath of *the Lamb*.

The general intent of this vision does not seem to me to have been difficult to understand. It surely betokened some sudden and extraordinary *revolution in the Roman* ✓

¹ This will be illustrated at the close of this chapter.

² A distinctive servile dress was not actually *enjoined* on slaves by the Roman law. In fact, when a law of that purport was once proposed, it was negatived as dangerous, because it would have revealed to slaves their numbers; which, according to the most probable calculation, equalled that of freemen in the empire; and under the early emperors amounted to perhaps sixty millions. (See Seneca de Clemen. i. 24, and Gibbon i. 66, 68.) The emperor Severus was similarly dissuaded afterwards from enjoining a distinctive dress on the different ranks and classes in the empire, save only as regarded the equestrian and senatorial orders. (Æl. Lampridius Vit. A. Severi, c. 27.) Yet a distinctive dress for slaves was *customary*; as appears from the phrase in common use, *servilis habitus, servilis vestis*, &c. So Eusebius and Lactantius speak of Maximin disguising himself after his defeat in a slave's dress, *οικειου σχημα*, "servilis vestis." Euseb. V. C. i. 58, Lactant. M. P. 47.—The official dress of emperors, officers of state, and soldiers was also distinctive.

³ Unless perhaps the enthroned one referred to might be some earthly *Christian* king, wielding his power in Christ's name against them. Compare Apoc. xii. 5

empire, which would follow chronologically after the æra of martyrdoms depicted under the Seal preceding; a revolution arising from the triumph of the *Christian cause* over its enemies, and in degree complete and universal. No *partial* change would answer to the strength of the symbolic phraseology; nor, again, any mere overthrow of the persecuting emperors by other milder and more tolerant, but still *heathen* emperors. Nothing less would answer it than a destruction of Heathenism itself throughout the empire, before the progress and power of Christianity; or, at least, a sweeping from their high places in it of Heathen powers and authorities:—and this, not through the gentle progress of opinion, but with circumstances of force accompanying, such as to strike those Heathen opposers with consternation and dismay.—Let us look then to history to see whether, so interpreted, the vision received its accomplishment.

Doubtless, according to mere human probabilities, it must have appeared most unlikely that such a consummation should be brought about, and at such a time:—a time when Christians constituted but a small minority of the population;¹ and when, by the long previous persecution, they had been reduced apparently to the lowest point of depression. But unto Him who ruleth all things after his will, both in heaven and on earth, what are difficulties, what are improbabilities, to frustrate the accomplishment of His declared purpose? Rather, as has been often and most truly observed, man's extremity is God's opportunity. That precisely at the time depicted in the vision,—the time following on the æra of the Diocletianic martyrdoms,—a revolution of the character described took place in the Roman empire, is one of the most memorable and most astonishing facts of history. The contemporary writers seem lost in admiration when they speak of it;² and, in the calm

¹ Lactantius, writing at this precise epoch, says, “Quoniam *pauca* utuntur hoc cœlesti beneficio:” i. e. that few *comparatively* had embraced the Christian religion. Instit. i. 1. So also Gibbon ii. 371; who estimates the Christians as not more than a *twentieth* part of the population before the conversion of Constantine.

² Eusebius again and again speaks of the deliverance and triumph of the church through Constantine's victories, as most extraordinary, and beyond expectation:—*παραδοξοτατα φως ἡμιν καταλαμπων ειρηνης*—*παραδοξοτατα πιπτει ὑπο Κωνσταντινου Μαξιμιανου*—*ἡδη παρα τοις πλειστοις αποψυχουσης προσδοκίας* &c. H. E. ix. 7, 8, 9, &c.

estimate of modern philosophy, it has lost nothing of its character of the marvellous.¹

And whose then the agency employed? When God is about to act, the fittest instruments appear ever ready for his service. Behold, as in the olden times He raised up *Cyrus*, in order to be the restorer, agreeably with foregoing prophecies, of his captives from Babylon,—so now from the far west, for the deliverance of his church in the Roman empire, as *here* prefigured, He raised up *Constantine*.² Already that Prince was known as a favourer of the Christians,³ ere he bore down from the Alps against Maxentius, the son and successor of the persecuting emperor Maximian.³ Then in a manner most extraordinary, and most illustrative of the prophecy under consideration, he avowed his espousal of the Christian cause, and of that of Him whom the Christians worshipped, the crucified One of Nazareth, the LAMB of GOD. From as early a date as that of the great battle with Maxentius, according to the testimony of both Lactantius and Eusebius, he adopted the *cross* as his distinctive military ensign.⁴ That object

¹ Dr. Adam Clarke, on this passage in the Apocalypse, observes;—"The final destruction of Jerusalem, and the revolution which took place in the Roman empire under Constantine, were the greatest events that have ever taken place in the world, from the flood to the 18th century of the Christian era; and may well justify the strong figurative language here used." In the details he only applies the prophecy, like myself, to the Constantinian politico-religious revolution; the fall of Jerusalem being both by many of these details, and by the Apocalyptic date, excluded.

² This was his character, indeed, from the beginning of his reign. Gibb. iii. 243, 244. Eusebius represents his father Constantius as inclining at least to be a Christian at the time of his death. V. C. i. 21, 27.—Lactantius' early dedication of the Divine Institutions to him has been already noticed.

³ The following Constantinian dates may be useful.

A. D.

306 July 24, Constantius' death in Britain, and Constantine's accession as Augustus. Also Maximian reassumes the purple, and his son Maxentius is associated with him, at Rome.

307 Galerius makes Licinius Augustus, as emperor in Illyricum.

308 In Syria Maximin proclaims himself *Augustus*. So now six emperors.

309, 310 Maximian's capture by Constantine, and death.

311 Galerius' death.

312 C.'s war with, and defeat of, Maxentius; Oct. 27, Battle of Milvian Bridge, and C.'s entry into Rome.

313 April 30, Maximin defeated by Licinius; June 13, Milan Decree in favour of Christianity: deaths of Diocletian and Maximin.

314 C.'s first war with, and defeat of, Licinius.

323, 324 Second war with, and defeat and death of, Licinius. Constantine sole Emperor.

325 Council of Nice.

337 Constantine's death.

⁴ "Transversâ X literâ summo capite, circumflexo Christo, in scutis notat. Quo

of abomination to the heathen Romans¹ was seen “glittering on the helmets, engraved on the shields, and interwoven into the banners” of his soldiers.² The Emperor’s own person was adorned by it, wrought of richest materials, and with finest workmanship. Above all in his principal banner, the *labarum*,³ he displayed at its summit the same once accursed emblem; with a crown of gold and gems above it, and the monogram of the name of Him who, after bearing the one, now wore the other.

We may be sure that the question was in every mouth, Why so strange an ensign? And let it not be forgotten, that besides other reasons to impress him,—as the excellence of the doctrine, the virtues of its professors, and other internal and external evidence of the truth of Christianity,—there might have been mention made of a mys-

signo armatus exercitus capit ferrum.” Lactant. M. P. 44.—Eusebius (V. C. i. 31) states that Constantine himself wore the two initial letters of Christ’s name in form of the cross upon his helmet; and (H. E. ix. 9) how, on his entering Rome, after the battle and victory, he ordered the cross to be placed in the right hand of the statue that was about to be raised to him, with the following inscription on its base; “*Hoc salutari signo vestram urbem tyrannicæ dominationis jugo liberatam servavi, &c.*” — When sole emperor, according to the Latin translation of Eusebius, he wrote to Sapor, the Persian king, that his soldiers bore it on their shoulders. V. C. iv. 9.

¹ “*Nomen ipsum crucis absit non modo à corpore civium Romanorum, sed etiam à cogitatione, oculis, auribus.*” So wrote Cicero in his oration for Rabirius, ch. 5. And what a comment does it furnish on St. Paul’s magnificent exclamation, made in the midst of the Roman empire, when that empire was at its height of power and glory,—“God forbid that I should glory, save in the *cross* of our Lord Jesus Christ; by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world.”

² Gibb. iii. 257.

³ The *labarum** is described by Eusebius V. C. i. 31; also, as in Note ⁴ p. 239, by Lactantius. I add Prudentius’ description: (in Symmach. ii. 486:)

Christus purpureum gemmanti textus in auro
Signabat *labarum*; clypeorum insignia Christus
Scripserat; ardebat summis crux addita cristis.

It seems that fifty men were specially appointed to guard it. (V. C. ii. 8.)—I append an engraving of it from a medal of Constantius, with its famous motto circumscribed. Also one of Constantine, helmeted with the monogram.

The labaristic monogram appears in some of the inscriptions in the Catacombs. Dr. C. Maitland, p. 169, gives an example; with the heavenly words address in the vision to Constantine.

In Hoc Vinea.

X



Sinfonia et Filiis.

v. ann. xlviii. m. v. d. iiiii.

where the v. in the last line is vixit: “lived 48 years, 5 months, 4 days.”

* The word *labarum*, about the origin of which there has been some literary doubt and discussion, (see Ducange on the word,) had been long before used as the name of a chief standard in the Roman armies. So Tertullian, Apol. c. 16; “*Vexillorum et labororum.*” See Eckhel viii. 494. Constantine gave it a new device, but retained the old name.

THE CONSTANTINIAN LABARUM



terious vision of a *cross of flame*, just before seen on the sky, in the night-watches, by the western emperor; and how he had been warned in the vision, by a voice from heaven, to adopt that ensign of the *cross*, with the promise added that through it he should conquer.¹ Scepticism, as we know, has been frequent in expressing its disbelief of this asserted fact. For my own part I am unable to resist the force of Constantine's solemn declaration to Eusebius of its truth. The time, as well as solemnity of his statement,—a time when nothing was to be gained by the fiction, for it was made when life was drawing to a close,—and, moreover, the whole character of Constantine, so little prone either to credulity or to deception,—seem to me alike to forbid its rejection. If true, it satisfactorily explains

¹ Compare Mosheim's critical but candid discussion of the story (iv. l. 1. 9.) with Gibbon's sceptical critique, iii. 259. Eusebius, V. C. i. 28, represents the vision of the cross to have been seen soon after mid-day; and that in a dream in the night following Christ seemed to appear, and charged him to use the sign he had seen, which would lead him to victory. Lactantius, M. P. 44, speaks of the sign itself as seen in a *dream* at night. Mosheim's conclusion is that the vision was seen by Constantine in a dream before the battle with Maxentius, with the inscription, "Hâc vince:" so following Lactantius's account. "Commonitus est in quiete Constantinus ut celeste signum Dei notaret in scutis, atque ita prælium committeret. Fecit ut jussus est; et transversâ X literâ, &c. See Note⁴ p. 239.—This account was written by Lactantius very soon after the defeat of Maximin, and before Licinius' apostasy to heathenism, and first war with Constantine; as appears from the concluding chapters of the work: consequently in the year 313, or early in 314; i. e. at furthest, not much more than a year after the battle with Maxentius.

Lactantius was already acquainted, it would seem, with Constantine; judging from his dedication of the Institutions to him: and he was soon after Constantine's first victory over Licinius called from Bithynia into Gaul to be tutor to Constantine's son Crispus.

It is quite surprising to me that a writer like Dean Waddington should have entirely set aside this most important testimony, in his critique on the subject, i. 170: saying in his text; "The story is related by no contemporary author excepting Eusebius:" and in his Note; "We have ventured to omit the dream published by the uncertain author * of the Book 'De Mortibus Persecutorum.'"—Nazarius in his Panegyric, pronounced A. D. 321 at Rome, speaks of the rumour prevalent in Gaul that heavenly warriors had appeared to Constantine, and led him in the war, c. 14.

It may help to guide the reader's judgment on the question whether the vision was a truth, or an imposture, to compare it both in its own nature, and in the time and manner of its announcement by Constantine, with some other asserted vision of a similar character, such as was proved in fine to be an imposture; for instance, the vision of the *golden lance*, so famous in the first crusade. See Gibbon xi. 72—76.

* That Lactantius is the author is admitted unhesitatingly by Cave, Dupin, and other learned writers. Moreover, even Gibbon (iii. 261) allows the three arguments urged in favour of Lactantius' authorship of the M. P. to be conjointly very weighty; viz. from the title of the book, and the names attached to it of Donatus and Cæcilius. He might have added an argument from the place and time of the writing, indicated in the book itself:—the time, A. D. 313; the place (as seems implied in Ch. i.), Nicomedia, capital of Bithynia; where we know Lactantius to have been residing, till called away by Constantine three or four years later into Gaul.

to us the fact of his adoption of the cross as his ensign, otherwise all but inexplicable; and, as to its miraculousness, surely the case, if ever, was one that from its importance might seem to call for the supernatural intervention of the Deity.—Thus Constantine was the first *crusader*; and, with better reason than the Princes of the eleventh century at Clermont, might feel, as he prosecuted the war, that it was “the will of God.”¹

“By this ensign thou shalt conquer.” Such was the tenor of the promise. And well, we know, was the promise fulfilled to Constantine. Army after army, emperor after emperor, (for since Diocletian’s division of it there had been, according to the prophetic intimation, *several contemporary emperors*, or “*kings of the earth*,”)² were routed, and fled, and perished, in battle after battle, before the cross and its warriors;—Maxentius’ generals, Maxentius himself, Maximin,³ and, after his apostasy to the pagan cause, Licinius.⁴ A bas-relief still remaining on Constantine’s triumphal arch at Rome,⁵ represents to us the terror of Maxentius and of his army, in their flight across the Tiber after defeat

¹ “*Instinctu Divinitatis* ;” said the Inscription on Constantine’s triumphal Arc, with reference to his expedition against Maxentius. See Montfaucon’s engraving of it, iv. 108.

² So Gibbon, ii. 169, after noting Diocletian’s change of the government: “Three or four magnificent courts were established in the various parts of the empire; and as many Roman kings contended with each other for the vain superiority of pomp and luxury.”

³ I include *Maximin’s* defeat in this list, although accomplished by Licinius; because Licinius was at that time in strict alliance with Constantine as a joint champion of the Christian cause. So Eusebius speaks of the two together, as at this time *δυο θεοφιλων*; and tells how Licinius seemed only second to Constantine in understanding and piety. *Ecl. Hist.* ix. 9, 10.

⁴ I might have headed the list with *Maximian*; who, first of all, had been put to flight, besieged, taken, and then imprisoned and killed by Constantine. For this heathen and persecuting emperor was defeated by Constantine after the latter’s known favour to the Christians. See Note² p. 239.—On the whole there were not less than ten or eleven battles (including that of Licinius against Maximin) before the complete triumph of the Christian cause: viz. those of Susa, Turin, Verona, and the Milvian Bridge against Maxentius; that of Heraclea against Maximin; and those of Cibalis, Mardia, Hadrianople, Byzantium, Chalcedon, and Chrysopolis in the two wars against Licinius.

⁵ It is in the inside of the central arch; and is engraved in Montfaucon vii. 426. It represents Maxentius’s army drowning, while pursued by Constantine and his army, in the retreat across the Tiber.—This destruction of Maxentius and his host in the Tiber is compared by Eusebius, *ibid.*, to that of Pharaoh and the Egyptians in the Red Sea: and, to express the Christians’ triumph, he adopts the words of the song of Moses; “They sunk like lead in the mighty waters,” &c.

It is observable that neither in the bas-relief on the arc of Constantine, nor in the medals with the labarum, do the soldiers’ shields appear marked with the cross. In the triumphal arc this is accounted for by the circumstance of the sculptured figures

in the battle of the Milvian Bridge.¹ A similar consternation attended the others also.—And this was chiefly remarkable,—that it was not the terror of their earthly victor's wrath that alone oppressed them. There was a consciousness of the powers of heaven acting against them; above all, the crucified One, the Christians' God. For the war, in each case, was felt to be a religious war. In the persecution just preceding, the emperors Diocletian and Maximian had struck medals of themselves in the characters, and under the names, of *Jove* and *Hercules*, destroying the serpent-like hydra-headed monster Christianity;² and these titles of Pagan mythology had been adopted in the same spirit by their successors.³ When Maxentius went forth to battle, he went fortified by heathen oracles;⁴—the champion of heathenism against the champion of the cross. When Maximin was about to engage with Licinius, he made his vow to Jupiter that, if successful, he would extirpate Christianity.⁵ When Licinius, again, marched against Constantine and his crusaders, he was urged to the enterprise by the response of heathen gods that he had consulted: and then, in public harangue before the soldiers, he ridiculed the cross, and staked the falsehood of Christianity on his success.⁶—Thus, in all these cases, the terrors of defeat must have been aggravated by a sense of their gods having failed them; and of the power of heaven being with CHRIST, the Christians' God, against them. It was observed that wherever the *labarum*, the banner of the cross, was raised, there victory attended. In the war against Constantine, after Licinius' apostasy, "Licinius," says

on it having been taken from other triumphal Roman monuments of more ancient date; especially Trajan's arc of triumph. So Montfaucon, iv. 108.

¹ In a famous picture of this battle by Le Brun, the *labarum*, or *banner of the cross*, appears so prominent among the standards of the Constantinian army, and the consternation of the defeated Pagan Romans before it so strikingly depicted, that it might almost be deemed a comment on this part of the sixth Seal's prefigurations.—It is the subject too of one of Raphael's famous pictures.

² The medal of Diocletian as *Jovius*, striking down with his forked lightning a wretch whose form ends in the folds of a *serpent's tail*, is given in Walsh:—of that of Maximian as *Herculius*, smashing with his club a seven-headed hydra, a copy is given in my 3rd Volume on Apoc. xii. 3. Where, see my remarks on the medal.

³ See the passage from Lactantius, quoted p. 245 Note 2, *infra*.

⁴ M. P. 44.

⁵ Ib. 46. "Tum Maximinus votum Jovi vovit, ut, si victoriam cepisset, Christianorum nomen extingueret funditusque deleret."

⁶ V. C. ii. 4, 5.—Elsewhere Eusebius calls Licinius' war against Constantine a *θεομαχία*, or war against God. V. C. ii. 18.

Gibbon, “felt and dreaded the power of that consecrated banner; the sight of which in the distress of battle animated the soldiers of Constantine with an invincible enthusiasm, and scattered terror and dismay through the ranks of the adverse legions.”¹ All this must needs have deepened the impression.—Besides which there are to be remembered the recorded dying terrors of one and another of the persecuting emperors. A dark cloud seems to have brooded over the death-bed of Maximian, if not over Diocletian’s also. The report went abroad that, oppressed by remorse for his crimes, the former strangled himself, the latter died raving mad.² Again, Galerius had from an agonizing and awful death-bed evinced his remorse of conscience, by entreating the Christians in a public proclamation to pray to their God (i. e. Christ) for him.³ And Maximin soon after, in similar anguish of mind and body, confessed his guilt, and called on Christ to compassionate his misery.⁴ Thus did a sense of the wrath of the *crucified One*, the *Lamb of God*, whom they now knew to be seated on the throne of power, lie heavy, intolerably heavy on them.—And when we combine these terrors of the death-bed with those of the lost battle-field,—which latter terrors must have been experienced alike by officers and soldiers, each active partisan in the persecution and the war, including low as well as high, the slaves⁵ as well as the freemen, all in short that

¹ iii. 258.—Eusebius states that Licinius, on joining battle, bade his soldiers take care to avoid assaulting Constantine’s great banner of the cross. V. C. ii. 16.

² See respecting *Diocletian’s* death the M. P. 42, and Eusebius H. E. viii. 13, Orat. ad Sanct. 25: on *Maximian’s*, M. P. 30, and Euseb. H. E. viii. 13. Gibbon seems to think that Maximian was put to death by Constantine, and that the report published abroad of his suicide was untrue. But he has not substantiated his representation. Nor indeed is his disbelief of the reports of Diocletian having put an end to his own life, or died raving mad, sufficiently authenticated. See his Vol. ii. p. 177, 212.—The other view is, I see, adopted from Eusebius and Lactantius by the author of “Rome Pagan and Papal;” ii. 83—85.

³ The edict is given in full by Eusebius, H. E. viii. 17, and Lactantius, M. P. 34. Near the conclusion is the clause, already referred to by me p. 234 Note ²; “Juxta hanc indulgentiam nostram debebunt Deum suum orare pro salute nostra.” His death was by a horrid disease, like that of Herod described in Acts xii. 23: viz. being eaten by worms.

⁴ “Tunc demum, amisso visu, Deum videre cœpit candidatis ministris de se judicantem. . . Deinde quasi tormentis adactus fatebatur; Christum subinde deprecans et plorans ut suimet miseretur.” Lactantius M. P. 49. Similarly Eusebius, (H. E. ix. 10,) *Ἐνδίκως ταῦτα τῆς κατα τοῦ Χριστοῦ παροινίας χάριν ὁμολογήσας παθεῖν, τὴν ψυχὴν ἀφίησιν.*

⁵ Informations were frequently laid against the Christians by their slaves. So Tertullian in his Apol. c. 7: “Tot hostes ejus quot extranei: et quidem proprii; ex

are particularized in the sacred vision,—when, I say, we consider the terrors of these Christ-blaspheming kings of the Roman earth, thus routed with their partisans before the Christian host, and miserably flying and perishing, there was surely that in the event which, according to the usual construction of such Scripture figures, may well be deemed to have answered to the symbols of the prefigurative vision before us: in which vision kings and generals, freemen and slaves,¹ appeared flying and seeking to the caves of the rocks to hide them;—to hide them from the face of Him that sate on the throne of power, even from the wrath of the Lamb.

Thus, under the first shocks of this great earthquake, had the Roman earth been agitated, and the enemies of the Christians destroyed, or driven into flight and consternation.² Thus, in the political heavens, had the sun of Pagan supremacy been darkened, the moon become eclipsed and blood-red, and of the stars not a few been shaken violently to the ground. But the prophecy had not as yet received its entire fulfilment. The stars of the Pagan heaven had not all fallen; nor had the heaven itself been altogether rolled up like a scroll, and vanished away. On Constantine's first triumph, and after the first terrors of the opposing emperors and their hosts, though the imperial edict³ gave to Christianity its full rights and freedom, yet

æmulatione Judæi, ex naturâ ipsâ domestici nostri. And again; “*Quid? cum domestici eos vobis produunt? Omnes à nullis magis prodimur.*”

With reference to this notice of slaves in the vision, it is not unworthy of remark, (as already observed p. 237 Note ²) that one of the persecuting emperors, Maximin, after his defeat, put off his imperial insignia, and disguised himself in a *slave's dress*, the better to prosecute his flight, and elude the conquerors. V. C. i. 58, M. P. 47.

¹ The expression, “*every bondman and freeman,*” is to be restricted of course to those engaged in the war against the Christian side. This amplification of phrase is common. So in Michaiah's anticipative vision of the battle of Ramoth-Gilead, 1 Kings xxii. 17, “*I saw all Israel scattered on the hills, as sheep that have not a shepherd:*” also even in historical Scripture; e. g. Jer. xxxiv. 1; “*When Nebuchadnezzar, and all his army, and all the kingdoms of the earth of his dominion, and all the people fought against Jerusalem:*” and similarly Matt. iii. 5, &c. &c.

² So Lactantius M. P. 1. “*Nunc qui adversati erant Deo jacent: qui templum sanctum everterant ruinâ majore ceciderunt: qui justos excarnificaverant cœlestibus plagis, et cruciatibus meritis, nocentes animas profuderunt.*” And again, 52, ad fin. “*Ubi sunt modo magnifica illa et clara per gentes Joviorum et Herculiorum cognomina; quæ primùm à Dioelete ac Maximiniano insolenter assumpta, ac postmodum ad successores eorum translata, vigerunt? Nempe delevit ea Dominus, et erasit de terrâ.*”

³ It is given by Lactantius, M. P. 48, and Eusebius, H. E. x. 5.

it allowed to the heathen worship a free toleration also. But very soon there followed measures of marked preference in the imperial appointments to the Christians and their faith. And, at length, after Constantine's final defeat of Licinius, and establishment as sole emperor over the Roman world, in spite of the indignation and resentment of the Pagans, he issued edicts for the suppression of their sacrifices, the destruction of their temples, and the toleration of no other form of public worship but the Christian.¹ His successors on the throne followed up the same object by attaching severe penalties to the public profession of the heathen religion; which, from its rejection into outlying *pagi*, or villages, began to be now called *Paganism*.² And the result was that, under Theodosius' reign, before the century had ended, (all which I consider to have been included in this 6th Seal's primary vision,) its stars had all fallen to the ground: ³ its very heaven, or political and religious system, vanished: and, on the earth, the old heathen

¹ See Mosheim iv. 1. 1. 7, 10; also, for an authority justifying his statement, Eusebius V. C. ii. 45, Περὶ νόμων κωλυόντων μὲν θυσίας, οὐκοδοῦν δὲ ἐκκλησίας προσταττόντων and iii. 54, entitled, Εἰδωλείων καὶ ξοανῶν πανταχοῦ καταλύσις. As to the toleration of Pagans in office under Constantine, it seems, according to Eusebius, to have been the exception, not the rule. See V. C. ii. 44. See also Mosh. ib. 16, on a probable exception in the execution of the Christian emperors' anti-pagan edicts, in favour of certain philosophers and generals.

Hence the chief argument against my application of this vision. Say Vitringa, Cuninghame, and others, "Were not Pagans still promoted to the highest dignities of the state? What necessity for *them* to call on the rocks to cover them?"—But can we forget the introductory wars through which the revolution was effected, and the terror and dismay of the vanquished heathen emperors and their armies, whose terror the vision seems especially to picture? Or that after this, though heathenism subsisted for a while in a few great cities, yet it never more *flourished*? Except at Rome and Alexandria, says Gieseler, i. 181, "the heathens were everywhere obliged to conceal themselves in remote places in the country; whence the names *Pagani*, *Paganismus*." This under Constantius.

Compare, on this subject, the prophecy of Babylon's overthrow, noticed p. 247.

² Gieseler, i. 179, 180, gives, in brief, the chief anti-pagan laws of Constantine's family.—1st, C. himself, a little before his death, forbade all heathen sacrifices; (compare V. C. ii. 45, iv. 23, 25;) and on pain of death, according to Theophanes: but the law, says he, was not acted out.—2nd, Constantius, A.D. 341, referring to Constantine's prohibitory law, decreed the prohibition of sacrifices: "Sacrificiorum aboleatur insania;" with a "vindicta" against them. Cod. Theod. xvi. 10. 2.—3rd, A.D. 342, the "superstitio penitus eruenda," but extra-mural temple edifices preserved. Ib. 10. 3.—4th, A.D. 353. "Placuit omnibus locis claudi protinus templa; . . . etiam cunctos sacrificiis abstinere." As to the offender "gladio ultore sternatur," and his goods to be confiscated; with similar penalty on all provincial governors that might overlook the crime. (My Ed. of Gieseler is Cunningham's Transl. Philadelphia. 1836.)

³ Το δε πέσειν τοὺς ἀστέρας, καὶ τοὺς δοκουντας εἶναι φῶστηρας ἐνὶ κόσμῳ πίπτειν says Arethas.

institutions, laws, rites, and worship been all but annihilated; and its votaries constrained to seek to caves and rocks (erst the *Christians'* refuges,) wherein to hide *their* devotions, now prohibited on penalty of death.

The interpretation that I have given to the various symbols of this Seal has been illustrated and confirmed, by one and another interpreter, from the similar use of similar figures in other passages of prophetic Scripture. Thus, to show how, from earliest times, the symbols of the sun, moon, and stars were used of rulers, so as I have explained them, a reference has been made to Joseph's dream, (Gen. xxxvii. 9,) in which the sun and moon are expressly interpreted of the chief heads of a nascent nation, the stars of its inferior heads.—To illustrate the meaning of an earthquake, and the consequent convulsions and changes in the firmamental heavens and their luminaries, there have been quoted passages from Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and others; in which the symbol is used of political revolution in a state or kingdom, of the subversion of its institutions, and fall of its governing powers. So in Jeremiah's vision (iv. 23, &c.) of the destruction and desolation of the Jewish kingdom by the Babylonians: "I beheld the land, and lo! it was without form and void; and the heavens, and they had no light. I beheld the mountains, and lo! they trembled, and all the hills moved lightly. . . I beheld, and lo! all the cities thereof were broken down, at the presence of the Lord, and by his fierce anger. . . For this shall the earth mourn, and the heavens be black. The whole city shall flee for the noise of the horsemen and bowmen: they shall go into thickets, and climb up on [or into] the rocks." So in Ezekiel, (xxxii. 7, &c.,) of the overthrow of Pharaoh and his kingdom by the king of Babylon: "When I shall put thee out, I will cover the heavens, and make the stars thereof dark: I will cover the sun with a cloud, and the moon shall not give her light. All the bright lights of heaven will I make dark over thee, and I will set darkness upon thy land, saith the Lord." And so again in Isaiah, (xiii. 9, 10, 17,) of the overthrow of Babylon by the Medes: it being said that "*the day of the LORD* should come against it, with his wrath and fierce anger; and that

the stars of heaven and the constellations thereof should not give their light, and the sun should be darkened in his going forth, and the moon should not cause her light to shine.”¹ In which passages, besides the more prominent parallelisms with the Apocalyptic imagery in the symbolic changes noted of the heavenly luminaries, it will be well, I think, to observe also what is said of the presence of the Lord as manifested, though acting by *human agency*: and again, of the *day of the Lord*, and *his fierce anger*, being shown in the subversion of the former political government, and the dethronement and destruction of its political governors, even in cases where, after the first shock of the catastrophe, it does not appear that the conquered generally were treated with any particular oppression, or the yoke made very grievous.—Finally, to illustrate what is said of the pagan hosts “hiding themselves in the dens and rocks of the mountains, and saying to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of Him that sitteth on the throne,” &c., a reference has been made to Hosea’s prediction² of the Israelites thus calling on the mountains to cover them, and the hills to fall on them, under the terror and calamities of Shalmanezzer’s invasion. To which we may add what is told us, historically, of the Israelites hiding in such rocky caverns, whensoever, as in the times of Saul or of the Maccabees,³ the enemy might have gained possession of the country.—All which being put together, there will not, I believe, remain a single symbolic phrase in this prophecy of the sixth Seal unillustrated, or with the interpretation referring it to a political revolution (such as has been here given) unconfirmed, by similar figures in other prophecies, to which the scriptural context has itself already furnished a similar interpretation.

¹ Compare too Amos viii. 9, Zeph. i. 14, 15; in which latter passage the time of Judah’s destruction is spoken of as “the *great day of the Lord*.”

² Hos. x. 8; “The thorn and the thistle shall come up on their altars; and they shall say to the mountains, Cover us, and to the hills, Fall on us!”—In which passage, as in the vision of the sixth Seal, the falling on them is evidently meant of the caverned or hollowed hills,—falling, not to crush, but to hide.

Similar to this is the language in Luke xxiii. 30; “Then shall they begin to say to the mountains, Fall on us, and to the hills, Cover us!” with reference, first, to the sufferings in the siege of Jerusalem; and further also, as appears from the word “begin,” to the sufferings of the dispersion afterwards.

³ 1 Sam. xiii. 6; 1 Maccabees ii. 28, 36. Compare also 2 Esdras xvi. 28.

Since, however, in regard to not a little of the phraseology of the prophecy, there is in so far a resemblance to what is said elsewhere of the catastrophe of the last great day of judgment, as to have induced with many a suspicion, with some a full conviction, that such must be the reference and meaning also here,—it may be useful, with a view to the reader's clearer and fuller persuasion, to look a little more closely into the subject: and to add yet a further observation or two, on the *internal* evidence derivable, *first* from the language of the prophetic description, as compared with that of other prophecies confessedly predictive of the last convulsions; *secondly*, from its relative position in the series of the Apocalyptic visions;—in support of the meaning that I have attached to it.

First, then, it should be distinctly understood that the expressions here used respecting the earthquake, and the phenomena in the sun, moon, and stars, *cannot* be interpreted *literally*, or as referring to those *physical* changes in the *material* earth and firmament of heaven, which other prophecies lead us undoubtingly to expect at the consummation of the great day. The clearest literal description of these physical changes is perhaps that given in 2 Peter iii. 10:—"The day of the Lord shall come as a thief in the night, in the which the heavens (i. e. the firmament, Gen. i. 7, 8) shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat; the earth also, and the works that are therein, shall be burned up."¹ Now of a conflagration, like this, no hint is given in the vision of the sixth Seal. Moreover in such a conflagration neither would the sun become black as sackcloth, nor the moon

¹ So in Isaiah li. 6: "Lift up your eyes to the heavens, and look upon the earth beneath! For the heavens shall vanish away like smoke, and the earth shall wax old like a garment; and they that dwell therein shall die in like manner."—In that remarkable chapter, Isa. xxxiv., there seems to be a description both of the political and the physical revolution occurring at the end: the former very analogous to the language of the sixth Seal; but with a notice also of that which is the grand characteristic of the consummation,—the *burning of the mystical Edom, or Rome*. "The indignation of the Lord is upon all nations, and his fury upon all their armies. He hath utterly destroyed them. The mountains shall be melted with their blood. (Compare Rev. xiv. 20.) And all the host of heaven shall be dissolved; and the heaven shall be rolled together as a scroll; and all their host shall fall down as a falling fig from the fig tree. . . . And the streams thereof (of Edom) shall be turned into pitch; and the dust thereof into brimstone; and the land shall become burning pitch: it shall not be quenched night nor day:" &c.

appear blood-red; still less the stars fall to the ground. The expression *must* be taken *metaphorically*; and as referring to *political changes*, like those in the other parallel prophecies just before referred to. There seems to me a *physical necessity* for this from what *is* said; as well as almost a necessity from what is *not* said: besides the necessity arising from the requirements of symbolic language, in a confessedly symbolic prophecy.

Still the suspicion may remain that, though referring to *political* revolution and changes, it may be the political changes attendant on the last great consummation. For that there are to be then, and in connexion with the great final catastrophe of the earth's drama, extraordinary political commotions and revolutions, is a truth revealed both in the Apocalypse itself, and in many other of the sacred prophecies.¹ This I fully allow. But I think internal evidence is here, too, not wanting, to show that it is not these that are intended in the sixth Seal. For, let but the description of the earthquake of the sixth Seal be compared with that of the xvith chapter of the Apocalyptic book,—which latter is allowed on all hands to be the description of the great *final* political revolution,—and how is it possible but that an unprejudiced mind will be struck with the marked differences?² The earthquake of the xvith chapter is so great, that “there never was any like it since the time that men were on the earth;”—this, simply, “a great earthquake.” And whereas the most prominent points of accompaniment and result in the former case are the tripartite division of the great city, Babylon receiving the wine-cup of God's anger, and a tremendous hail-storm falling on the inhabitants of the Roman earth,—to neither one nor another of these is there the least allusion, in the description of the earthquake of the sixth Seal before us.—Were the one indeed but a notice in brief, as it were, the other the descrip-

¹ Such, not improbably, are Matt. xxiv. 21, &c., and the corresponding prophecies in Mark and Luke. Such, perhaps, Hag. ii. 6, Heb. xii. 26, and Joel ii. 10.

² I say an unprejudiced mind. One who is *not* unprejudiced writes thus: “The revolution of this sixth Seal is the same as that again mentioned on the sounding of the seventh Trumpet, xi. 19, and more particularly described under the seventh Vial; (xvi. 17—21;) between which, and the sixth Seal, there is a remarkable similarity.” Cuninghame, p. 23. Of this similarity let the reader judge; after comparing the two descriptions together, as here set before him.

tion in detail, the omission and the difference would not be so remarkable. And thus it seems to me very possible, and even probable, that the earthquake noticed on the sounding of the seventh Trumpet, at the close of chap. xi, may be the same in *brief* as that of chap. xvi in *detail*, on the effusion of the seventh Vial.¹ But in the vision of the sixth Seal the description is as detailed and full as that of chap. xvi, indeed more so.

Thus my conclusion *from simply comparing the descriptive language in the two passages* is this,—that they portray different and distinct earthquakes; that of the sixth Seal the less, that of the seventh Vial much the greater: although it is allowed that the former may be possibly in a certain sense typical of the latter; in the same way that a *less* event, of the same character, is often in Scripture typical of a *greater* following:—a conclusion confirmed by the figuring of the earth, sea, and sky, in this same Seal's next vision, as all restored; so as after the last earthquake they certainly will not be.²—Then, consider the vision further in respect of its *relative position* in the Apocalyptic series, and connexion with, and sequence on, those of the previous five Seals. And when we think how exactly every successive great *epoch of change* in the Roman Pagan Empire, with its characteristic *causes* and *symptoms*, from the time of Domitian's death, at the close of the first century, to the persecution by Diocletian and Galerius at the beginning of the fourth, has been depicted, all in order, in the consecutive visions of the successive Seals preceding, and find ourselves thus brought by them to the very eve of the great *politico-religious revolution* of the time of *Constantine*,—I say when, with the evidence of this its position and context, we consider the vision of the symbolic earthquake represented on the opening of the sixth Seal,—it seems to me that all reasonable doubt as to its intended application is precluded; and that it cannot but be the prefiguration of that wonderful revolution.—Nor let me omit

¹ Two characteristic notices serve to identify the earthquake of xi. 19 with that of xvi. 18:—1st, that of the temple in heaven being in either case previously opened; (i. e. connecting xvi. 18 with xv. 5;) 2ndly, that of the great hail, mentioned as a concomitant in the one case and the other.

² Except as a *new* earth.

to observe, in further confirmation of this explanation, that the infidel illustrator of the Apocalyptic prefigurations fails not here, as usual, to add his remarkable corroborative testimony. "The ruin of the Pagan religion," says Gibbon, "is described by the sophists as a dreadful and amazing prodigy; *which covered the earth with darkness, and restored the ancient dominion of chaos and of night.*"¹

CHAPTER VII.

THE SIXTH SEAL'S SEALING AND PALM-BEARING VISIONS.

"AND after this I saw four angels standing on the four corners of the earth, holding the four winds of the earth, so that the wind should not blow on the earth, nor on the sea, nor on any tree.—And I saw another angel ascending from the east, having the seal of the living God. And he cried with a loud voice to the four angels, to whom it was given to hurt the earth and the sea, saying, Hurt not the earth, neither the sea, nor the trees, till we have sealed the servants of our God in their foreheads.—And I heard the number of them which were sealed; and there were sealed 144,000 out of all the tribes of the children of Israel. Out of the tribe of Judah were sealed 12,000. Out of the tribe of Reuben were sealed 12,000. &c.

After these things 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. And they cry with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb. And all the angels stood round about the throne, and about the elders and the four living creatures, and fell before the throne on their faces, and worshipped God, saying, Amen! Blessing, and glory, and

¹ Και τι μυθωδες και αιειδες σκοτος τυραννησει τα επι γης καλλιστα. So Eusebius of the 4th century, in his Life of Eustathius; with reference to the then imminent utter ruin of Paganism. Referred to by Gibbon v. 123, 124.

wisdom, and thanksgiving, and honour, and power, and might, be unto our God for ever and ever. Amen! And one of the elders answered, saying unto me, Who are these which are arrayed in white robes? and whence came they? And I said unto him, Sir, thou knowest. And he said to me, These are they which are to come¹ out of the great tribulation; and they washed their robes, and made them white, in the blood of the Lamb. Therefore are they before the throne of God, and serve him day and night in his temple: and he that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among them. They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more, neither shall the sun light on them, nor any heat. For the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters; and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes."²—APOC. VII.

§ 1. THE FOUR TEMPEST-ANGELS THREATENING.

Thus the *first* of the two closely connected visions which together constitute the second part of the sixth Seal, opened with a representation of *four destroying tempest-angels*, just now under temporary restraint, but destined ere while evidently to desolate the Roman earth: which earth meanwhile appeared tranquil again after the earthquake, and with its luminaries shining in the new firmamental heaven.³ A fit and, I doubt not, true explanation of the figure is at once suggested by what history tells as to "the *threatening tempest of barbarians*, which so soon subverted the foundations of Roman greatness," being, just during the Constantinian æra, "repelled, or suspended, on the frontiers."⁴ But wherefore gathered with evident threatening against the empire so soon after the completion of a revolution such as

¹ οἱ ἐρχόμενοι. So Mark x. 30 and Luke xviii. 30, αἰὼν ὁ ἐρχόμενος, the world to come; Eph. ii. 7, ἐν τοῖς αἰῶσι τοῖς ἐπιερχομένοις the ages to come: 1 Thess. i. 10, ἀπο τῆς ὀργῆς τῆς ἐρχομένης, the wrath to come. Also Matt. xi. 3, John xviii. 4, &c. So M. Stuart, ii. 62; "ἐρχομαι, venturus sum."

² There is no variation in the critical editions, of the least importance, from the received text in this chapter.

³ This is obvious in part from verse 1 of this chapter, where the wind is spoken of as not blowing on the land or the sea; in part from verse 12 of the next chapter, where the sun, the moon, and the stars are implied to have shone during the three first Trumpets on the Roman earth.

⁴ Gibbon, iii. 97.

that which had just been foreshown as occurring, and the casting down from the high places in it of the persecuting antichristian powers of heathenism? Might not a very different result have been anticipated?

It will be interesting, I think, and may serve as a fit introduction to what follows, to suspend for a few moments our investigation of the prophecy; and to consider the feelings and anticipations of Christians, as exhibited in the Roman empire at the period just alluded to, of its first Christianization under Constantine.

When heathenism had been cast down from its supremacy, and Christianity established in the Roman world, the changes consequent were immense and universal. Now, throughout its vast extent, the *cross* once so despised was everywhere in honour;¹ and the preserving and conquering virtue made the theme of exultation, which everywhere attended it.² Now the righteousness of the slaughtered martyrs that had been gathered under the altar, was acknowledged in public edicts; and the living confessors restored to their homes in triumph, from the mines and dungeons where they were suffering.³ Instead of vaults and catacombs for the sacred assemblies of Christians, and other hiding-places shut out from the light of heaven, to which, like their earlier Christian brethren,⁴ they had been reduced during the late persecution, there arose in the cities and towns churches of magnificence; and the ritual was celebrated with a pomp corresponding. Instead of desertions

¹ "Attende gloriam crucis ipsius," said Augustine (in Ps. lv. 9) somewhat later than the epoch spoken of; "jam in fronte regum crux illa fixa est cui inimici insultaverunt." (In Augustine this Psalm is numbered liv.)

² τὸ σωτηριον σημειον' a favourite phrase used by Eusebius to designate *the cross*.

³ Euseb. V. C. ii. 30, 31, &c.

⁴ See Mosheim ii. 2. 4. 8, on the subject of the humble churches in which the early Christians assembled for worship, whether private houses, or caves and catacombs: also Burton's *History of the Church*, p. 299 (Ed. 4). "It was long," says the latter, "before the intolerance of their enemies allowed the Christians to enjoy the light of heaven, whilst engaged in their sacred duties . . . We may perhaps conclude that few, if any, religious buildings had been possessed by the Christians, till the time when Alexander Severus decided a case brought before him in their favour." The case decided by Alex. Severus in their favour, has been before alluded to, p. 219 Note ³.—After Gallienus' edict of toleration the Christians began to erect more convenient and spacious edifices (Euseb. *Hist. Ecc.* viii. 1); and, in some cases, not devoid of grandeur. So, for example, the great church of Nicomedia, which was destroyed at the first breaking out of Diocletian's persecution.

and apostasies from the Christian body, such as had been the case with not a few under the fiery trial, the daily accessions to it were innumerable. Candidates in throngs now applied for baptism; and at the Easter and Pentecostal festivals the newly-baptized neophytes, in their white vestments, grouped conspicuous around each Christian sanctuary.¹ Once more, under imperial auspices, the Christian professing Church Catholic was gathered for the first time in œcumenical council. Representatives attended from every province, nation, and tongue, in the vast empire. The palace-gates were thrown open to the holy delegates. The emperor stood, till requested to sit down, in respectful deference before them.² If in the use of his power he was to the church as a nursing father, his behaviour was respectful as that of a son.

Can we wonder then at the exultation that was felt at this time by many, perhaps by most, that bore the Christian name: or at their high-raised expectations as to the future happy destiny of the Roman, now that it had been changed into the Christian, nation?³ It seemed to them as if it had become God's covenanted people, like Israel of old: and the expectation was not unnatural,—an expectation strengthened by the remarkable tranquillity which, throughout the extent of the now re-united empire, followed almost immediately on Constantine's establishment of Christianity,⁴—that not only the temporal blessings of

¹ The white dress of the *neophyte*, or newly baptized, was worn eight days by him, then laid up in the church. See Bingham's *Antiq.* xii. 4, 1, 3, 4.

Gibbon, iii. 277, speaks sneeringly of 12,000 men baptized in one year at Rome, besides a proportionable number of women and children, to each of whom a *white garment* and twenty pieces of gold had been promised (according to report) by Constantine.—At a later period, near the beginning of the next century, we read of 3000, just baptized by Chrysostom's presbyters at Constantinople, being attacked by the soldiers while *λευχιμορονουντες*, i. e. in their white dress. (Bingham *ibid.* from Palladius.)—Again, we read of a law of Theodosius the Second, prohibiting the celebration of public games during the Easter and Pentecostal weeks; as being the time during which the neophytes, who had been baptized on the Easter or Pentecostal Sunday, (which Sundays were then the chief seasons of baptism,) wore their white robes. Bingham xx. 5. 10, and 6. 1, 4. These, though exemplifications of a later period, may yet illustrate to us the neophytes' numbers and conspicuousness.

² *V. C.* iii. 7, 10; also 15, &c.

³ "All former evils were forgotten. There was a self-abandonment to the enjoyment of the present good things and the expectation of future." So Eusebius concludes his *Church History*: x. 9.

⁴ With reference to this, Eusebius quotes, from Psalm xli. 8, 9, "Come and see the works of the Lord, what wonders he hath wrought on the earth! He maketh

the ancient Jewish covenant¹ would ~~the~~ ~~efforth~~ in no small measure attach to them, but even those prophesied of as appertaining to the latter day.—Hence on the medals of that æra the emblem of the phoenix, all radiant with the rising sun-beams, to represent the empire as now risen into new life and hope; and its legend which spoke of the happy restoration of the times.² Hence, in forgetfulness of all former prognostications of Antichrist and fearful coming evils, the reference by some of the most eminent of their bishops to the latter-day blessedness, as even then about fulfilling. The state of things was such, Eusebius tells us, that it looked like *the image of the kingdom of Christ*.³ The city built by the emperor at *Jerusalem*, beside the new and magnificent church of the *Holy Sepulchre*,—the sacred capital, as it were, to the new empire,—might be perhaps, he suggested, the *new Jerusalem*, the theme of so many prophecies.⁴—Yet again, on occasion of the opening of the new church at Tyre, he expressed in the following glowing language, not his own feelings only, but those, we may be sure, of not a few of the congregated Christian ministers and people that heard him. “Whereas the saints and confessors before our time sang of God’s won-


wars to cease unto the ends of the world.” He adds; “And now a day of cloudless serenity shone on the Church.” H. E. x. 1.—There is a medal of Constantine, a copy of which is given in the Plate opposite, from Banduri, (ii. 213,) struck A. D. 321 or 323, in commemoration of the remarkable tranquillity then begun, and which bears the legend *Beata Tranquillitas*.

¹ It was natural to compare what had been said of the rests given to Judah under the pious kings Asa and Jehoshaphat, 2 Chron. xiv. 1, 5—7, and xx. 30.

² A copy is given in my Plate from Spanheim, p. 245. It is a coin of Constantius.—Spanheim adds another medal, which he supposes to be of Constantine’s own striking: with two figures; one sitting on a trophy, the other in military dress presenting him a globe with a *phoenix*. Eckhel, viii. 111, doubts its having been struck in the great Constantine’s life. But Mionnet confirms Spanheim. See his *Medailles Romaines*. Tom. ii. p. 229. (Paris, 1847.) On the *Æxergues* of these and other Roman imperial coins the reader may consult my Paper on the Roman coinage in the Appendix.

³ “The event surpassed all words. Soldiers with naked swords kept watch around the palace-gate. But the men of God passed through the midst of them without fear, and entered the heart of the palace. And they sat down, some at the emperor’s table, the rest at tables on either side of his. It looked like the image of the very kingdom of Christ; and was altogether more like a dream than a reality.” V. C. iii. 15.




⁴ V. C. iii. 33; Κατ’ αὐτο τὸ σωτηριὸν μάρτυριον ἢ νέα κατεσκευαζέτο Ἱερουσαλὴμ, ἀντιπρόσωπος τῇ παλαιᾷ βωμένῃ . . . ταχὰ πονταύτην οὐσαν τὴν διαπροφητικῶν θεσπισμάτων κεκηρυγμένην καινὴν καὶ νέαν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἥς περὶ μακροὶ λόγοι μῦθια δι’ ἐθέου πνεύματος θεσπίζοντες ἀνιμνοῦσι. See also *ib.* iv. 40, respecting the dedication of this Church of the Holy Sepulchre.



ADDENDUM, Vol. I. p. 256.

The coins have been all found in the British Museum Collection,
and verified.

THE CONSTANTINIAN PHOENIX.



derful interventions in behalf of his people as a thing of the past, behold those wonders we now see acted out before our own eyes! It was of us the prophet spake when he told how the wilderness and the solitary place should be glad, and the desert rejoice and blossom as the lily.¹ Instead of the Church being, as once, widowed and desolate, her children have now to exclaim to her, Make room, enlarge thy borders: the place is too strait for us! Glorious indeed, as we see the prediction realized, appear the things spoken of thee, thou city of God. 'The promises are fulfilling, In righteousness shalt thou be established; all thy children shall be taught of God; and great shall be the peace of thy children.'²—And so too, with reference to other similar prophecies, in a direct Commentary on Isaiah.³

Could there well be a greater contrast to all such anticipations of the future, than in the true prospective of the coming future after the fall of heathenism in the empire, as here prefigured to St. John in vision, and three centuries later realized in fact:—the *vision*, we saw, one of *four tempest-angels*, the well-known Scripture emblem of desolating invaders,⁴ prepared, like the evil angels once let loose on Egypt,⁵ to burst in fury on this self-same Christianized

¹ So Eusebius, *εξανθει ως κρινον*.—His application of these prophecies to his own times is express: *Ταυτα προφυλαι περι ημων εν ιεραις βιβλοις καταβεβλητο*. H. E. x. 4; pp. 313, 310. So too in his *De Laud. Const.* c. 16, p. 543. (Ed. 1695.)

² H. E. x. 4, pp. 304—315.

³ This Work of Eusebius is given in the Folio Edition of Athanasius, Paris, 1706. The Comment appears to have been written after 324, the year of the Nicene Council; though the exact time is uncertain. The whole spirit of it is to the effect described above.

It is to be observed that *Lactantius*, in his "Divine Institutions," still, like the Fathers before him, dwells on the expected coming of Antichrist, and the evils consequent. But this seems to have been written originally before Constantine's overthrow of the heathen and persecuting emperors. See Note³ p. 233, *suprà*.

⁴ So e. g. Jer. iv. 11—13: "A dry wind from the high places of the wilderness towards the daughter of my people, . . . even a full wind from those places shall come unto me! . . . Behold he [*Nebuchadnezzar*] shall come up as clouds, and his chariots shall be as a whirlwind." And, again, Isa. xxviii. 2; "The Lord hath a mighty and strong one, [*se. Shalmanezar and the Assyrians,*] which as a tempest of hail, and a destroying storm, . . . shall cast down to the earth."

⁵ Psalm lxxviii. 49; "He cast upon them the fierceness of his anger, wrath, indignation, and trouble, by sending *evil angels* among them."

On the figuration itself of the tempest-angels, let me make the four following remarks.—1. The *four winds* may be considered as representing *all* the winds. Compare Ezek. xxxvii. 9, Dan. vii. 2, Matt. xxiv. 31.—2. Their angel-directors may be compared with the imaginary gods of each wind, in the *Æolian cave*, as depicted by Virgil.—3. *Κραουντες, holding*, may be understood probably, not in the sense of *restraining*, so as by Mr. Cuninghame and others; but in that of *holding*, so as we

Roman earth, so soon as a temporary restraint laid on them might be withdrawn:—the *fact*, to use Gibbon's words again,¹ that “the threatening tempest of barbarians,” which in Constantine's and Constantius' time “had been suspended or repelled on the frontiers,” did, on Valens' defeat and death in 378, establish itself within the frontier; prepared, had it not been for its brief temporary arrest through Theodosius' agency, even then and at once “to subvert the foundations of the Roman empire?” It surely needed nothing more to show how erroneous the Eusebian idea, not only as to the future destiny, but also as to the general character, of the now wide-spread professing Church and Israel in Roman Christendom. For could it be that in righteousness it had been established, or that all her children were taught of God, when such judgments from above were seen darkly lowering on the land?—In fact in the *Sealing Vision*, which next followed, intimation direct and distinct was given as to what would then be the very different state of the professing Church. Nor were hints wanting in the revelation, if I mistake not, as to the precise incipient form, and first principles, which (conjointly with Eusebius' earthly idea of the Church of the promises) would characterize the then already germinating antichristian apostasy. At the same time that God's own counter-view of what was his true Church, his true Israel, was also, I will not say *hinted*, but expressly and strikingly set forth before the Evangelist:—that counter-view which was destined to be the chief antagonistic idea and antidote, as received for ages after by the faithful, to the apostatic principle.—Proceed we to develop these three several points, agreeably with their importance, in three separate Sections: in each of which Sections (as will appear) we shall have first to revert to, and establish, a certain distinct and important *principle of Apocalyptic interpretation*, (principles already just hinted at in my Introduction,) then next to *apply* it.

might hold a weapon of war, *for use*. So κρατειν δορυ, σκυταλην, τοξον, &c.; 2 Chron. xxv. 5, 2 Sam. iii. 29, Jer. vi. 23. (Septuag.) For the commission to injure, implied in verse 3, belonged evidently to the same four angels that held the winds in verse 1.—4. The particle *iva* in verse 1 (“that it blow not”) seems to be meant in the sense *eventualiter*, as Schleusner expresses it: that is, as signifying the *event*, or *result*; not the *desire*, or *design*.
¹ iii. 97.

2

§ 2. INTIMATIONS OF GENERAL UNFAITHFULNESS IN
THE NEWLY PROSELYTIZED ROMAN ISRAEL.

As to the above-specified intimation, to the effect that *the great majority of the professedly Christianized population of the Roman world would be, at the time prefigured, Christians in profession only*, it will be found, I believe, to follow instantly and conclusively from the sealing Angel's words, "Wait till we have sealed the servants of God," (i. e. out of the twelve so-called tribes of Israel,) compared with what is added afterwards as to the *small number* of the sealed ones:—supposing this one thing only, viz. that by the Apocalyptic *twelve tribes of Israel*, (including of course the 144,000 sealed out of them,) we are to understand *the then professing Christian body*; not *the Jews, and their twelve tribes*, literally taken. And I think that, after what has before been intimated on this head,¹ I might really almost assume this as a point proved. Considering however its extreme importance as a principle of Apocalyptic interpretation, and the fact of not a few other expositors having founded a totally different system of exposition (however unsuccessfully) on the assumption of a literal Jewish sense attaching to the Israel of the Apocalypse,² I think it better to recur to the matter; and to draw out the proof more fully than before.

I. Let it be remembered then, in the first place, that long before the revelation in Patmos, and even while the literal Jerusalem was yet standing, St. Paul taught the Gentile Christians to appropriate to themselves, all fully and unreservedly, the name and privileges of Israel:—even as those that were Abraham's seed;³ those that were, by adoption, of the commonwealth of Israel;⁴ and those that had been grafted into the true Jewish olive-tree: while the literal Jews themselves, according to his teaching, having rejected their Messiah, were to be regarded as branches.

¹ See pp. 73, 74, 206 *suprà*.

² See my critical examination of the Præterist and Futurist systems of Apocalyptic interpretation in the Appendix to my Vol. iv.

³ Gal. iii. 29.

⁴ Eph. ii. 12, 13, 19.

from it broken off.”¹ Moreover both by him, and by others of the apostles, such appellative terms as *the temple*, or *house of God*, and such too as *sacrifice*, or *offering*, (whether that of prayer, praise, or self-devotion,) had been applied figuratively, and in a *Christian* sense, to Christian believers, and the Christian Church :² figures derived, as no one will think of denying, from the *Jewish temple*, and *Jewish temple-worship*. All this, I say, even à priori to the Apocalyptic revelation. —And then, turning to the Apocalypse, what, let me ask, was the nature of the symbol seen by John in the very opening vision, and as explained by Christ himself? Why, the scene presented was that of a sacred chamber like that of the Jewish sanctuary, with one habited as high-priest standing by its seven candlesticks : and Christ himself expressly interpreted the latter emblem to typify the seven then existing Asiatic *Christian churches*.³ Besides that he interwove, in his several addresses to those churches, other thereby similarly Christianized Jewish figures and even appellations :⁴ all as if expressly to prepare St. John (so as observed in the Introduction to this Commentary⁵) for attaching confidently, and at once, a similar *Christian* meaning to such *Jewish imagery* and *appellations* as might occur in the subsequent Apocalyptic visions on things future. Very specially to be noted on this head is the refer-

¹ Rom. xi. 17—19.—Not without intimation added (let me observe) of the possibility, indeed danger, of these engrafted branches falling away from the spirit of their profession, as Christ’s anti-typical Israel; even like the Jews, the typical Israel of old. So 1 Cor. x. 6; “Now in these things *they* were our *types* :” (for so, I conceive, the clause, *Ταυτα δε τυποι ημων εγενθησαν*, is to be construed, understanding *κατα* before *ταυτα*;) where the context sets forth the sundry *unfaithfulnesses* of the ancient Israel in the wilderness, as examples for the warning of Christians. So too Rom. xi. 21; “If God spared not the natural branches,” &c.

² *The temple*, or *house of God*; 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17, vi. 19; 2 Cor. vi. 16; Eph. ii. 21; 1 Tim. iii. 15; (“how thou oughtest to behave in *the house of God*, which is *the church* of the living God;”) 1 Pet. ii. 5, &c. :—*sacrifices*; Rom. xii. 1, Phil. iv. 18, Heb. xiii. 15, 1 Pet. ii. 5, &c.

³ Apoc. i. 20.—And so too the term *angel* used by Him for *bishop*; a term derived from the Jewish synagogue. See p. 74 Note⁵ *suprà*.

⁴ *Figures*: as Apoc. ii. 20, “Thou sufferest that woman *Jezebel*, which calleth herself a prophetess,” &c.; iii. 12, “I will make him a pillar in the *temple* of my God, and I will write upon him the name of the city of my God, which is *New Jerusalem* :” a passage noted above in my text. And so too Apoc. ii. 5.—*Appellations*; as Apoc. ii. 9, and iii. 9, “them that say they are *Jews*, and are not.”

See on this my Note³ p. 73 *suprà*: with the explanation given in which, I see, not Vitringa only, but also Mede, (on Apoc. vii.) coincides; “adeo ut *pseudo-christiani*, in Epistolis ad ecclesias, *pseudo-judæi* audiant.” Op. p. 454. So again in his Comment. Minor. p. 908. (Ed. 1672.)

⁵ P. 73 *suprà*.

ence made by him in one of the epistles to the *New Jerusalem*, that was to come down out of heaven, as the mother city of all true *Christians* in the Philadelphian as well as other *Gentile Churches*; of which city the citizens were designated in a later chapter of the Apocalypse as the *twelve tribes of God's Israel*.¹ A passage this so conclusive on the point in question, that I believe it utterly impossible to gainsay the fact of its fixing a *Christian* meaning on the *Israel*, and the *Israelitish* emblems generally, spoken of subsequently in the later part of the Apocalypse.

Thus directed then, and by Christ Himself as the explainer, it was unhesitatingly assumed by me, in my anticipative sketch of the Apocalyptic scenery,² that such was to be the intent of the Israelitish temple, and holy city connected with it, when apparent afterwards in the visions of the future. And the accordance of historic fact with the Apocalyptic figure, so construed, in the first and only example of Jewish scenery that has since occurred, (I refer to the vision of the souls under the *temple-altar*,) cannot, I think, but already have added confirmation in the reader's mind to the correctness of my presumption:³—confirmation that will be found to gather strength each step as we proceed, I may truly say, from the equally clear correspondence with historic fact of all the other Jewish visible imagery, so construed, yet to come;⁴ not to add, from the manifest failure also of all attempts at consistently explaining it, on the principle of a literal Jewish application.⁵ And

¹ Apoc. xxi. 12, iii. 12.

² See p. 102.

³ We must not forget moreover the fact of the understanding of the vision in this Christian sense, or at least the self-application of the Jewish figure, by the Christian martyrs of the æra figured in the 5th Seal;—for example by Ignatius, Polycarp, Cyprian. See p. 223 *suprà*.

To a similar effect Tertullian (adv. Marcion. iii. 23) thus specifically expresses himself on the symbols of the temple and holy city; “Abstulit Dominus Sabaoth à *Judæa* . . . Spiritum Sanctum, qui adificat *ecclesiam*;—templum scilicet, et domum, et civitatem Dei:”—thereby noting the *literal Jews'* exclusion from answering to the figure of *God's city and temple*; and the substitution for them, in that respect, of the *Christian Church*.

⁴ As in the explanation of the incense-offering scene, Apoc. viii. 3,—that of the voice from the four corners of the golden altar, Apoc. ix. 13,—that of the measuring of the temple and altar, Apoc. xi. 1, 2,—that of the 144,000 seen with the Lamb on Mount Zion, Apoc. xiv. 1,—and that of the New Jerusalem, Apoc. xxi;—besides the present vision.

⁵ There are two classes of interpreters who (as just hinted at my p. 259 *suprà*) have attempted this. The *one* consists of those who would make a large part of the Apocalyptic prophecy to be fulfilled in the destruction of the ancient Jerusalem; a class stopped and excluded, at the very outset, by the simple *date* of the Apocalypse,

if Israelitish inanimate visible symbols are thus to bear a Christian meaning, it would surely be nothing less than a palpable and gross inconsistency not to affix a Christian sense also to the personal *appellative Israel* in the Apocalyptic prophecy; even had there been no such declaration as that before observed on, to the effect of Christians, Gentile as well as Jewish in origin, being included in the twelve tribes of God's Israel; and constituting the citizens, wholly and only, of the New Jerusalem, which is the mother of us all.—Let me add, ere I pass on, that there are two peculiarities in the order and names of the tribes here enumerated, which might seem further fitly framed to confirm us as to the intended application of the term to the Christian Israel, and the exclusion of the Jewish. In the first place, there is an intermingling of the tribes sprung from the *bond-woman* with those sprung from the *free-woman*: an arrangement suited only to the Christian dispensation; in which we read, there is “neither bond nor free; but Christ is all, and in all.” In the next place *Levi* is here inserted in the twelve tribes; a token of his not being detached from the rest by any peculiar office, as under the Jewish dispensation:¹ in other words, of the

(A.D. 96,) compared with the declaration that the prophecy was to prefigure things subsequent to that date:—the *other* of those that explain the whole prophecy to be as yet unfulfilled, and as waiting the time of Israel's expected return to Palestine for its accomplishment; a class similarly shut out, at the very outset, by the declaration that the visions of the Book were to refer to things that would happen in continuous succession from immediately after the state of the seven churches described as then existing.

But on these two theories of Apocalyptic interpretation, and their literal explanation of the Judaic imagery in this Book, I must again beg the reader to consult my full examination of them in the Appendix to my 4th Volume.

¹ In Gen. xxxv. 23, &c. the list of the sons of Jacob is given according to primogeniture: those of the same mother only being placed together; and the sons of the freewomen, Leah and Rachel, taking precedence before the sons of their respective handmaids, the bondwomen Bilhah and Zilpah.

The relation of the order in this list to that here given in the Apocalypse, will be best seen in their parallel juxta-position. In that from Genesis subjoined, L. R. B. Z. are the initials of the four mothers.

<i>Gen.</i>	<i>Apoc.</i>	<i>Gen.</i>	<i>Apoc.</i>
L. Reuben	Judah	R. Joseph	Simeon
Simeon	Reuben	Benjamin	Levi
Levi	Gad	B. Dan	Issachar
Judah	Asher	Nepthali	Zabulon
Issachar	Nepthali	Z. Gad	Joseph*
Zabulon	Manasseh	Asher	Benjamin

In the enumeration in Numbers, after the institution of the Levitical law, Levi is

* The same as Ephraim; just as in Amos vi. 6.

Israel intended being one in which there would be no longer anything of the ancient peculiarity of the Levitical priesthood; and consequently one in which the Levitical ritual would be done away. "For, the priesthood being changed, there is of necessity a change also of the law."¹

II. This essential principle of Apocalyptic interpretation having been established, I next observe, as to the mutual relation of these twelve tribes of Israel and the 144,000 sealed ones, that they were not identical, so as many have represented the matter;² but the latter an *election* out of the former. It is not said of the 12,000 sealed from Judah that they *constituted* the tribe of Judah, but that they were sealed *out of* that tribe; or, again, of the 144,000 that they *constituted* the twelve tribes of Israel, but that they were sealed as an *election out of* them.³ Where the preposition $\epsilon\kappa$, or *out of*, stands after any such verb as *sealed*, between a definite numeral and a noun of multitude in the genitive, sound criticism requires absolutely that the numeral should be thus construed, as signifying not the

omitted, (i. 3, 49,) and Ephraim and Manasseh substituted in place of Joseph their father: his increase into two tribes having been provided, so as to supply the defect in the $\delta\omega\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha\phi\upsilon\lambda\omicron\nu\nu$ caused by Levi's withdrawal. In the placing also of Gad, Asher, and Nephthali there is a little variation from the order in Genesis; a variation arising out of their order of placing, respectively, in their marches and encampments.

For in their marches and encampments in the wilderness, they were formed in four divisions, East, South, West, and North (Numb. ii. iii.); in order as follows:—

	Dan,	Asher, Levi,	Nephthali,	
	Ephraim,			Judah,
(W.)	Manasseh,	Levi,	TABER- NACLE.	Levi,
	Benjamin, Reuben,	Levi, Simeon,		Zabulon, Gad.
				Issachar, (E.)

The first-mentioned tribe, in each case, was the standard-bearer. The reason of Judah's precedence is given, 1 Chron. v. 2; "Judah prevailed over his brethren, because of him came (or was to come) the PRINCE." See Patrick *ad loc.*

On *Dan's* omission in the Apocalyptic list, curious speculations have been founded by some of the fathers, as if it were an intimation of Antichrist's being of that Jewish tribe. It is to be observed that, in order to make room for *Levi's* insertion, which was important, the omission of some one tribe was needed. And, as in the genealogical series, 1 Chron. iv, v, &c., (where indeed Zabulon also is omitted,) so here, Dan seems to have been selected for the omission because of his adoption of, and continuance in, idolatry *from the time of the Judges even to the captivity*. So Judges xviii. 30. Thus early had he become a separatist in religious profession from the commonwealth of Israel.

¹ Heb. vii. 12.

² Many have called the 144,000 *the sealed tribes*. See p. 268, Note ³.

³ $\epsilon\sigma\phi\rho\alpha\gamma\iota\sigma\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota \epsilon\kappa \pi\alpha\sigma\eta\varsigma \phi\upsilon\lambda\eta\varsigma \nu\acute{\iota}\omega\nu \text{I}\sigma\rho\alpha\eta\lambda\prime \epsilon\kappa \phi\upsilon\lambda\eta\varsigma \text{I}\omega\upsilon\delta\alpha \iota\beta' \chi\iota\lambda\iota\alpha\delta\epsilon\varsigma, \&c.$

whole, but a part taken out.¹—Which being so the twelve tribes, the large body in all its tribual completeness, must necessarily signify the *whole Christian professing body* in the Apocalyptic world, or Roman empire; the latter, God's *true servants* out of it. In the figurative language of the Apocalypse, the one was the *professing* Israel, the other the *Israel of God*, or *true* Israel. For just as under the Jewish dispensation, so under the Christian, "all were not Israel that were of Israel;" ου παντες Ισραηλ οι εξ Ισραηλ. God had out of each his election of grace.²

And what then, as here indicated, was the *proportion* of the *faithful* to the *nominal*, the *true* to the *professing*? It was intimated that the former would be but few in the comparison. This appears from their number being stated as only 144,000 out of all the tribes of Israel: whereas the population of the twelve tribes, or δωδεκαφυλον, at the time when they were united as a kingdom under David or Solomon, (the standard, I conceive, to be referred to, answering as the Church now did to Israel settled under regal government,³) must have amounted altogether to

¹ The following passages may serve as illustrations. Exod. xxxii. 28; Και επεσαν εκ του λαου εις τρισχιλιους ανδρας. "There fell 3000 of, or out of, the people:" 1 Sam. iv. 10; επεσον εξ Ισραηλ τριακοντα χιλιαδες. "There fell of Israel, or out of Israel, 30,000:" Judges' xx. 35; Διεφθειραν εκ τω Βενιαμιν εικοσι και πεντε χιλιαδας, &c.: Numb. i. 21; η επισκεψις αυτων εκ της φυλης Ρουβην εξ και τεσσαρακοντα χιλιαδες και πεντακοσιοι; "46,500 (of the age of twenty and upwards) out of the tribe of Reuben." Similarly, again, in the latter half of the chapter we are considering; "I looked, and behold a great multitude, out of every nation, and tribe, and people, and tongue;" εκ παντος εθνους, και φυλων, και λαων, &c.: and in ch. vi. 1; "When the Lamb had opened one of the seals," μιαν εκ των επτα σφραγιδων, &c. Says Matthiæ; "Εκ serves to denote a choice out of several objects," &c. Greek Grammar (Blomfield's Transl.) p. 996.—In Josh. iii. 12, we have απο in the same sense; Προχειρισασθε υμιν δωδεκα ανδρας απο των νιων Ισραηλ, ένα αφ' εκασης φυλης.

² Lowth thus writes on Ezek. xlvi. 7. "The twelve tribes denote the pure Christian Church in the New Testament. See Luke xxii. 30, Rev. vii. 4, &c. Twelve is a hieroglyphical number in the same book; denoting the true Church, built upon the doctrine of the twelve apostles. See Rev. xii. 1, xxi. 14. By the same analogy the number 144,000 (Rev. vii. 4, xiv. 1,) signifies the Church of pure Christians who continue stedfast in the apostolic doctrine; 12 being the square root out of which the number ariseth."

A careful reader will mark Lowth's inconsistency in the above. It is only the 144,000 that represent the Church of pure or true Christians, not the 12 tribes. And these alone are the Israel of God, intended in Luke xxii.—In one of our Church's Good Friday Collects the title here given to true Christians is adopted; "that they may be saved among the remnant of the *true Israelites*."

³ Not to its wilderness-state: when however the number of *men* in Israel above twenty years old (Numb. i. 3, 46) was some 600,000, and whole population consequently near two millions; or above twelve times 144,000.

some six or seven millions;¹ and much the same probably, if the Jewish population in Christ's own time and the apostles', before the destruction of Jerusalem, were made the standard. According to which standard the proportion indicated was scarce more than *one to fifty*; according to any, a proportion but small.²

Besides which there was further to be inferred from the prophecy the substantial identification of these *twelve mere professing tribes*, in respect of their popular constituency, with *the inhabitants of the Roman earth*: seeing that whereas, on the one hand, the 144,000 were declared to be an election out of the twelve tribes, they were on the other depicted also as an election out of the inhabitants of the Roman earth. For in the saying, "Hurt not the earth till we have sealed the servants of God on their foreheads," it is implied that, but for the sealing, these servants of God[✓] would have been subject, like others, to injury from the tempests; and consequently that, in respect of the *locality* of their habitation, they were mingled among the inhabitants of the devoted land. Hence, forasmuch as both the habitant body of the Apocalyptic earth, and the *δωδεκαφυλον* of the Apocalyptic Israel, did alike include, though they were alike distinguished from, God's servants, the 144,000, the two former must have been either identical, or else the one have constituted a notable part of the other. In fact in the next chapter, just before the bursting of the tempests, two only out of three are alluded to as existent; viz. the inhabitants of the Roman earth, and the saints or sealed ones:³ so that by that time the identification I speak of must be regarded as having become complete.—But in what way? Not so much (so the designation adopted showed) by the Roman world being absorbed into the Church, as by the professing Church being too generally assimilated in spirit to the world. The mass of the professing Israel,—all in fact but the sealed ones,—were

¹ In Joab's numbering of the people under the reign of David, 1,300,000 were found to be the number of the *men of war*. So 2 Sam. xxiv. 9; or, as 1 Chron. xxi. 5, 1,470,000. And this exclusive of Levi and Benjamin. The which implies at least six millions for the whole population. Now under Christ (Gal. iii. 28) male and female are alike to be reckoned.

² See Note ³ p. 264.

³ Apoc. viii. 3, 5.

thenceforth designated (just like the Roman heathen population before)¹ as the *inhabitants of the earth*; that is, according to the sense of the term in Apocalyptic phraseology, as a people that was in spirit *earthly*, and *of the earth*:² the sealed ones alone being, in heart and spirit, raised above earth, and citizens of heaven.³

Such was the tenor of the *general* intimation given to St. John, regarding the state of religion as it would be in the Roman empire, after the dissolution of Paganism, and first national profession of Christianity.—And mark its verification in *history*. First it appears, as already shown from Eusebius, how, after the overthrow of the heathen emperors and heathen supremacy by Constantine, the Roman people in multitudes, and at length in the mass, embraced Christianity:—also how the Christian body, thus enlarged, imperially headed, and ere Constantine's death recognised as the *chief* constituency of the Roman state, and ere the end of the 4th century as its *only* constituency,⁴ did itself actually adopt the figurative designation used in this Apocalyptic vision; and exult in the application *nationally* to itself of the appellative *Israel*, and of the predictions too respecting *Israel's* final glory.⁵ An application this of those Old Testament prophecies to the then outwardly glorious state of the *earthly Church visible*, which was, if I mistake not, an innovation now *first* made on primitive doctrine:—the earlier Fathers having indeed, like St. Paul, applied the Scriptural promises about Israel to the Christian Church; but only in respect of that Church's *true* constituency of *real* believers; and as what would have their grand fulfil-

¹ So Apoc. vi. 10.

² See at p. 103 *suprà* the reference to Apoc. viii. 13, and Jerome's remark on the uniform bad sense in the Apocalypse of "the *inhabitants of the earth*."

³ Apoc. xiii. 6.

⁴ Before Theodosius' death laws were passed constituting heathen worship illegal in the Roman empire. About the end of the century, as observed in a former Note, the profession of the heathen religion was styled *Paganism*, or the religion of *pagani*, obscure *villagers*. So Augustine often calls its professors. In 423 a law of Theodosius the 2nd states that there were no more Pagans in the empire. See Gieseler § 77.

⁵ See my citations from Eusebius, pp. 255, 256, *suprà*. Twenty or thirty years after Eusebius the emperor Julian thus wrote: "They (the Christians) differ from the Jews of the present time, and say that *they* (i. e. nationally, or corporately) *are the true Israelites*." Cited by Lardner, vii. 624.

ment in it not till the end of the Church's pilgrimage at Christ's second coming, and introduction under him of a better dispensation.¹—Further, the most authentic accounts handed down to us of the actual religious state, at this time, of the mass of the professedly Christianized inhabitants of the Roman empire, do too well correspond with the Apocalyptic intimation, in their testimony to the general and grievous lack of vital practical godliness among them. Even Eusebius, notwithstanding his earlier glowing anticipations of good, and though in no wise altering his views of prophecy, yet confesses in later life the multitude of hypocritical accessions to the Church.² Similar to which are the representations of other Fathers of the middle of 4th century, as of *Cyril* and *Gregory Nazianzen*, for example; not to add those of candid and learned moderns, such as *Mosheim*,³ *Neander*,⁴ *Gieseler*.⁵ And indeed the ready and multitudinous professions of Arianism in the empire, on the Arian Constantius' accession, furnished practical corroborative proof clear and public.⁶ Πολλοὶ κλητοὶ, ὀλιγοὶ ἐκλεκτοὶ: "Many are called, but few chosen;" was a say-

¹ The earlier Fathers, in any application of the name and privileges of *Israel* to the *Christian Church visible*, made it in the spirit of *charity*; trusting that those who joined their body, depressed and persecuted as it then was, were sincere. So *Clemens Romanus*; (Ep. c. 29:) "Let us therefore come to Him with holiness of mind, loving our gracious and merciful Father, who hath made us partakers of his election: for thus it is written, . . . His people Jacob became the portion of the Lord, and Israel the lot of his inheritance." (Deut. xxxii. 9. Sept.) And so, again, Justin Martyr, Dial. cum Tryph. pp. 352, 360. In answer to Trypho's question, Ὑμεῖς Ἰσραὴλ ἐστέ; he says: Δειξάς τους ἀπο παντος γενοὺς αἰρουμένους πεπεισθαι αὐτου τη βουλη δια του Χριστου, (ὄν και Ἰακωβ καλεῖ και Ἰσραὴλ ὀνομαζει) τουτους και Ἰακωβ και Ἰσραὴλ· and again, p. 355, Παντες οἱ δι' αὐτου (Χριστου) τῷ Πατρὶ προσφευγοντες εὐλογημενος Ἰσραὴλ ἐστι. In another place (Apol. i. 25, 23) he thus limits his meaning to *true* Christians. Οἱ δ' ἀν μὴ ευρισκωνται βιονυτες ὡς ἐδίδαξε (ὁ Χριστος), γνωριζεσθωσαν μὴ οντες Χριστιανοι, κ' ἀν λεγωσι δια γλωσσης τι του Χριστου δι'αγματα.—The millenary views of those early Christian writers were of course in themselves directly antagonistic to the Eusebian idea of the professing Church's inheriting the promised glory during the present dispensation.

In the conclusion of my Work I shall have to refer again to this very important distinction.

² εἰρωνειαν ἀλεκτον των την ἐκκλησιαν ὑποδουομενων, και το Χριστιανων ἐπιπλαστως σχηματιζομενων ὀνομα. This he speaks of as one of the two grievous evils characteristic of the times which he had himself witnessed. V. C. iv. 54; a book written after Constantine's death.

³ E. H. iv. 2, 3, 17, &c.

⁴ See the quotations from him in my next Section.

⁵ Eccl. Hist. ch. vi. § 101, 102.

⁶ So *Mosheim* iv. 2. 5. 14. "The error is recognised in its true character," says *Athanasius* in his 1st Oration against the Arians, "and indignantly rejected, by those who bear the sign (i. e. God's mark) on their forehead:" in other words, the Apocalyptic 144,000. *Athanas.* Op. i. 285. (Ed. 1686.) A passage well deserving our observation.

ing now markedly true, according to the most trustworthy testimony. Hitherto the distinction between the *professing* and the *true*, the *outward Israel* and the *Israel of God*,—though existing indeed always,—had yet during the three first centuries been much less observable, in consequence of the repression in great measure of hypocritical professors by the general disfavour of Christianity, and its frequent and sharp persecutions.¹ But now that the sunshine of prosperity, and of imperial recognition and favour, had beamed on the Church visible, and men abused, as they are wont, the bounty of God, and the Christian ordinances of man thereunto conforming,² the distinction described became too prominent to escape contemporary and historic notice; just as it had long previously been foreshown by God in the visions of Patmos.

Thus much on the more *obvious* and *general* Apocalyptic intimation, as to the fact of a rapid defection from Christian faithfulness very soon after the nominal Christianization of the Roman empire, here given to St. John. Nor let me proceed further without suggesting to the reader the extreme importance of his marking the distinction just noted, between the large corporate body of the *professing Israel* in the Apocalypse, and its small election of the 144,000 of *God's true Israel*, with a view to his right understanding of this prophecy. From the neglect of observing what I speak of, commentators of eminence have fallen into what I cannot but call the grossest misconceptions, as well as inconsistencies:³ nor is

¹ Hence probably the selection of faithful confessors under Heathen Rome, for the one and only Apocalyptic picture of the Christian body, during the period of the five first seals, as being the most characteristic one.

² The duty of a Christian sovereign to favour, promote, and establish Christianity in his dominions, seems to me clear; being the same, only on a larger scale, as that of a Christian head of a family. I believe few of those who speak against Constantine's establishment and patronage of the Christian Church would be prepared to carry out their principle, *bonâ fide*, in their own families.

³ For example, *Mede* designates the 144,000 as the "ecclesia gentium catholica, figurata typo Israelis;" omitting all notice of the unsealed Israel. And so again in his Comment. Minor. on Apoc. ii. 9. The *empire* fell, says he, under the attacks of the barbaric invading hordes; but the *Church corporate* survived, and was perpetuated among them. Of such preserving efficacy was God's seal. Op. pp. 454, 908. But on Apoc. xiv. 1, where mention is again made of the 144,000, they are explained by him as the Church of the *true* and *faithful*, contradistinctively to the apostate professing Church. And so too on ix. 4.

it possible, without using the key it offers, to enter at all into the spirit of what remains of the sacred prophecy. For the distinction described was not a mere temporary, but an abiding one. The whole subsequent history of the Christian Church, as time would in its lapse evolve it, was prefigured in what follows of the Apocalypse under the two great divisions which this distinction recognises:—the *one*, the great body of professing Christians, the inhabitants of the Roman earth, and constituency of the Roman state or city, who are represented as departing farther and farther from spirituality and the truth, notwithstanding the checks of God's severe chastening judgments, until at length involved in complete apostasy:¹—the *other*, the little body of his elect and sealed ones, the constituency of the holy city, and worshippers in His temple and presence; who, though approved and sheltered by God from *real* evil, are yet described as having to pass through great tribulation, suffering persecution very soon from the professing world, and being trampled down, vilified, slaughtered: until at length, the time of their vindication having come,

Others, as *Daubuz* and *Bishop Newton*, interpret the *sealed ones*, or 144,000, of the *Jews* admitted by baptism into the visible Church about the time of Constantine; the *palm-bearing multitude*, afterwards seen in vision, representing the *Gentile* converts then made in the Roman empire. *Daubuz* even supposes the sealing angel from the east to represent Constantine!—But if all these were alike to be preserved, who were the excluded ones from the benefit of the sealing, and on whom the injury from the tempests was to fall? The still unconverted *Jews*? or the unbaptized heathen in the empire? Certainly not the *former*: for it is the mass of the Roman earth's inhabitants that are indicated as the destined sufferers. And, as to the *latter*, both *Daubuz* and *Newton* represent the angels as only beginning their tempest-blasts against the Roman earth, and its inhabitants, about the beginning of the fifth century; when, except in obscure villages, no unbaptized heathen were to be found upon it. The inconsistency is palpable.

The difficulty of their explanation meets them again, just as *Mede* before them, in another form at chapter ix. 4, where the locusts are commanded to hurt those only “who had not the seal of God on their foreheads.” To be consistent they ought of course to interpret these as signifying unbaptized *Jews* and heathens in the empire. But this they find impossible from the facts of history; and they now therefore interpret the expression, and I doubt not correctly, of apostatizing, though baptized, Christians. Thus they are at length forced on that distinction between the *true* and the *mere professing Christians*, on which I have insisted; and which, if applicable to the sealed and the unsealed in Apoc. ix, must necessarily be also applicable to them in Apoc. vii.—Moreover in Apoc. xiv. 3 they make the 144,000 to be the *whole* faithful Church; though in Apoc. vii. it was only its *Hebrew* section.

Vitringa, more justly, explains the 144,000 of Apoc. vii. as the *faithful ones* out of the *professing Church*.

¹ They are traced onward by notices in chapters viii. 5, 13, ix. 4, 20, xi. 2, 9, 10, &c., into the fully developed apostasy, headed by Antichrist, which is alluded to in Apoc. x, xi, and described in Apoc. xiii.

they appear under a designation that has reference evidently to this their original constitution, I mean that of "the called, and chosen, and faithful," to participate in their Lord's final triumph.¹

But the importance of attending to this distinction will soon appear more strikingly: as we proceed in the next Section to sketch, *in detailed contrast*, the characteristic features of the one class and the other, the sealed and the unsealed Israel; alike as prefigured in the sacred vision before us, and as illustrated in the history of the Christian professing Church at the precise æra that we have had under consideration.

§ 3. INTIMATIONS OF INCIPIENT ANTI-CHRISTIANISM IN THE UNSEALED AND UNFAITHFUL ROMAN ISRAEL.

I use the word *anti-christianism*, in the heading of this Section, in its truest and most peculiar sense:—the sense most properly affixed to it, as we saw long ago,² by reference to its etymology: the sense too affixed to it by John himself in his Epistles; when applying it to heretical pseudo-apostolical teachers, who, while in name professing Christ, did yet practically deny him, by virtually *substituting themselves*, in respect of his various saving offices, *in Christ's place*.—Now it had been foreshown to the evangelist, under these imperfect shadows of the future, that the great predicted Antichrist of Daniel and St. Paul was to appear under some such character in its full perfection. Moreover Paul had declared that he would have rule and precedency in *God's temple*; that is (for such seemed clearly the meaning of the phrase as used by him) in *the Christian professing Church*:³ and, yet more, that the germ of the evil, which was in due time to grow into, and be unfolded in, that great anti-christian apostasy, was even then already working; a declaration the truth of which the many self-styled Christian but really heretical antichrists, that soon after appeared, did well illustrate and prove. At that time, however, God's professing Church was in its

¹ Apoc. xvii. 14, xix. 14.

² See pp. 64, 65 *suprà*.

³ 2 Thess. ii. 4. See my notices in Vol. iii. of this prophecy by St. Paul.

mass sufficiently enlightened and faithful to recognise, disown, and cast off its heretical members.¹ But could this be so when the time drew near for the great foretold apostasy *in* the Church itself? Thus when St. John had intimated to him, so clearly as we saw in our last Section, that after the overthrow of heathenism in the Roman empire, while the bulk of its constituent population would become in profession the Christian Israel or Church, God's true Israel or Church would be but a small election out of it, it seems to me that he must have been predisposed to suspect that this might probably mark a first preparatory step to the unfolding of the great predicted apostasy: and, if so, that he would not fail to look out for some intimations as to the first and earlier features of anti-christianism, which might, even at this primary stage of its development, discover themselves in the now incipiently apostatizing Church.

For surely, considering the exceeding importance of the subject, it would not have been unreasonable for him to expect that some *hints* at least would be given respecting the primary and subsequent most characteristic *principles* and *features* of the great ecclesiastical defection, as at that time and afterwards to be developed; and so respecting the chief *steps*, and *æras*, of the downward progress of the corrupted Church into complete apostasy. Such had been the method constantly adopted by the Divine Spirit in its biographical portraiture of individuals in the Old Testament;—of a *Saul*, for example, or *Jehu*, or *Ahab*; selecting, as it did, for its sketchings the most characteristic traits, and most important steps and epochs, in their spiritual history and downward progress in evil. And indeed it seems to be the only method by which the great moral lessons of the subject, whether in retrospective or prospective history, could be duly set forth.—Nor, I think, if with impressions of this kind we apply ourselves to a closer examination of the Apocalyptic prophecy, shall we fail of becoming convinced that such notices about the apostasy were in fact there given: and that, before the fuller descriptions of it, first in Apoc. xi, then more at large

¹ 1 John ii. 19.

in Apoc. xii and xiii, (chapters where it is sketched out chiefly with reference to *Antichrist's heading it* after its completion,) there were *three* or *four* distinct references to its operation in the mass of the inhabitants of Roman Christendom, as *beginning, advancing, and then completed*:¹ though in the way of *hint* and *implication* chiefly;² by that method of *allusive contrast*, of which, as another important principle in Apocalyptic interpretation, I briefly spoke in my Introduction.³ Even by St. John personally, when seeing the vision, the hints given on this head would, as I conceive, be by no means overlooked in their significancy. But the fulness of that significancy could scarce be appreciated except by readers living afterwards: seeing that they only could compare the prophecy in its several parts with the actual historic facts of the period to which it might relate; and by that comparison see the exactness and fulness of its meaning.

I. I spoke of the hints by *allusive contrast* as that which to one versed in Holy Scripture, like St. John, could scarce fail of being intelligible. For did he not know that it was the habit of that holy book, in its portraiture of one out of two opposed classes, to sketch the one with distinct reference to the points of characteristic contrast in the other? For example, when *Ezekiel* spoke of the righteous man as one that "had not eaten on the mountains, had restored to the debtor his pledge, had spoiled none by violence," &c.,⁴—did not John well know that the prophet wrote that description *allusively*, and *in condemnatory contrast*, to principles and habits quite the contrary, by which the great bulk of the Jews were then characterized?—Nay, when he himself in his first Epistle insisted in one place on Jesus being the Christ, the Son of God,⁵—in other places on Jesus Christ having come in the flesh, and come not by water only, but by water and blood,⁶—also, again, on the *knowledge* of certain things the most precious being given

¹ The first in the sealing and palm-bearing visions of this chap. vii.; the next in Apoc. viii. 3; and then afterwards in ix. 20, 21, and x. 1, 2, &c.

² I say *chiefly*, because in Apoc. ix. 20, 21, the notice of the apostasy is a *direct* one.

³ See p. 113 *suprà*.

⁴ Ezek. xviii. 6, &c.

⁵ 1 John v. 1, 5.

⁶ Ib. iv. 2, v. 6.

by Christ distinctively to true Christians,¹—could he have helped knowing, and afterwards remembering, the point of his own statements; and their reference, in the way of allusion and contrast, to Gnostic heretics and heresies then abounding? I mean of course those Gnostics who taught that *Jesus* was a mere man, not *Christ*, the *Son of God*;—the Christ, a divine *Æon*, having indeed entered the man Jesus in the water of baptism, but left him at Calvary ere his baptism in blood: and who said moreover that *they* were the only *γνωστικῶν*, or *knowing ones*; *they* the only teachers that had attained to knowledge in divine things, and that possessed the key to and power of communicating it. Michaelis observes² that the scope and point of such verses in the Epistle are not fully to be discerned, without an eye to this allusive antithetic reference, as meant by St. John.—Thus was the apostle himself experimentally familiar with the nature and uses of this Scriptural principle of *allusive contrast*. And indeed it is so natural, and the occasions are so frequent for its application, that it is easy to find abundant illustration of it in *human* writings also.³

¹ Ib. v. 20, ii. 20, 3, iv. 13, 8, iii. 14, 5, 2, v. 15:—"We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding to know Him that is true." "Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and know all things." "We know that we know him, if we keep his commandments." "We know that we dwell in Him, and He in us, because He hath given us of His Spirit." "He that loveth not knoweth not God, for God is love. We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren." "If we know that he heareth us, we know that we have the petitions we ask of Him." "We know that He was manifested to take away our sins, and in Him is no sin." "We know that when He shall appear we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is." &c. &c.—St. John adds, ii. 26, "These things have I written to you concerning" (or with reference to) "them which seduce you."

In contrast with this, the Christian disciple might well feel how poor and vain was all the boasted knowledge of the wise of this world!—Compare Cowper's beautiful contrast of the unlettered and poor Christian widow with the great Gnostic of the French Revolution, Voltaire:—

"Yon cottager who weaves at her own door,
Pillow and bobbins all her little store,
Just knows enough,—no more,—her Bible true:
A truth the brilliant Frenchman never knew."

² Introduction to the New Testament, Chap. xxx. § 3; pp. 401, 402.

³ It may be well for the reader's satisfaction to give a few illustrations from *men's* writings. And in truth so copious are the illustrations, that we can scarce refer to any Code of legal enactments, any Creeds, Acts of Councils, or Articles of Faith, without finding the principle exemplified.—1st. Take the *Nicene Creed*. "I believe in Jesus Christ of *one substance with the Father*," is its language: in which it not merely marks therein the true belief, but marks it contradistinctively to that of the *homœousian* Arians, who would have Christ's nature to be *similar* indeed to the

II. And what then the particulars here pointedly noted to St. John, as characteristic of the sealed Apocalyptic Israel, contradistinctively to the unsealed Israel?—It will, I presume, be readily granted me that the seal-bearing Angel from the East was no created angel, but the Angel of the covenant, the Lord Jesus. For to what Angel but Him belonged the symbol of the “light of the world,” the “day-spring from on high visiting us?”¹ Of what other Angel was it the prerogative to seal with God’s seal of the Spirit,² whereby believers are “sealed unto the day of redemption”?³ Of what other, as the Father hath life

Father’s, but not *one and the same*.—2. Says the *Athanasian Creed*, “Though God and Man, yet not two, but one Christ;” and again, “One not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person:” therein primarily defining “the catholic and right faith;” but not without distinct *allusive contrast* to the Nestorians and Euty-chians; doctrinists who were supposed to hold, the *one* that Christ had two persons, the *other* that Christ had but one substance or nature.*—And so again, 3rdly, and once more, (not to extend the illustrations beyond what is necessary,) the *Articles of the Church of England* very generally. Take, for example, the vith on the Sufficiency of Holy Scripture, the xith on Justification by Faith, the xivth on Works of Supererogation, the xixth on the Church, the xxvth on the Sacraments, &c. &c.:—not only is the true Christian doctrine laid down there on these points; but it is stated in direct *allusive contrast*, all along, to the contrary and erroneous doctrines of the Church of Rome. Even on a first perusal of them a discerning person can scarcely fail to see a certain pointedness in the phraseology, which might make him suspect that some such allusion was intended: and then, on instituting inquiry, and turning to expositors, (e. g. Bishop Burnet,) he finds his suspicions verified; and, point by point, the peculiar force and value of the Article thereby illustrated.

¹ John viii. 12, Luke i. 78. In the latter passage the Greek word for the *day-spring* is *ανατολη*. And so too the Septuagint in Zech. iii. 8; “I will bring forth my servant, *την Ανατολην*;” not, as our Version, “*the Branch*.” In correspondence with this, Tertullian remarks, (cited by Bishop Kaye, p. 404;) “*Amat figura Spiritus Sancti (i. e. columba) orientem, Christi figuram.*” *Contra Valentin. c. 3.*—In 2 Cor. iv. 6, the illumination of the soul is ascribed to God; “God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give us the light of the knowledge of his glory in the face of Jesus Christ.” Now what God does, Christ, as God, of course partakes in: besides that the light given is only as reflected from the face of Jesus Christ.

Hengstenberg, in *Apoc. Vol. i. p. 291*, on similar grounds concludes that the sealing angel is Christ. “It suits him only.”

² So John i. 33, Matt. iii. 11, &c.; “He it is which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost:” also John xv. 26, “The Comforter whom I will send you from the Father:” and xx. 22, “He breathed on them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost,” &c.

³ Eph. iv. 30. So also in the same Epistle, i. 13; “On whom, also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance, until the redemption of the purchased possession:” (Greek, *Εν ὧ. . εσφραγισθητε τῷ Πνεύματι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας*;) marking, I think, Christ as the sealer, the Spirit as the seal impress. (See Macknight.) And, again, 2 Cor. i. 22: “He who stablisheth us in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God; who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts.”

* It is in fact known from these very allusive condemnatory references to Nestorius and Eutyches, that the Creed, though called Athanasian, was composed not till near a century after Athanasius: the Council of Ephesus, convened against the former, having been held A.D. 431; that of Chalcedon, against the latter, A.D. 451.

in Himself, so to have given him to have life in *Himself*;¹ (for such seems here to be the force of the epithet *living*, “having the seal of the *living* God :”²) and thus to number names in that register which was in fact the *Book of Life*?³ Of what other to stay the destroying angels, and in the plural language of Divinity to say to them, “Hurt not till *we* have sealed?”⁴—Admitting which, it was by *Him*, as the Author of their salvation,⁵ that the 144,000 were represented to St. John as distinctively noted, and chosen out,⁶ from amidst the mass of the professing Israel, while coincidentally illumined and quickened under his influences : by *Him* sealed with the Spirit, and numbered, without a single omission, in the register of the true Israel, the Book of Life : God’s mark resting thenceforward on their *foreheads*, in token of the consistent open testimony of a holy profession and life to the fact of their being indeed, what

¹ John v. 26. Compare verse 24. Also John i. 4 ; “In Him was life, and the life was the light of men ;” &c. : and John xvii. 2 ; “Thou hast given him power over all flesh, that He should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him : and this is life eternal, to know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.” Indeed the whole history of Christ’s people, as intimated in John xvii, may be most fitly and profitably compared with the history of the 144,000 as traced in the Apocalypse.

² This use of the word *living*, especially when applied to God or Christ, is common. So John vi. 57, “As the *living* Father (ὁ ζῶν πατήρ) hath sent me, and *I live by the Father* :” also ib. 51, “I am the *living* bread ;” called in verses 35, 48, “the bread of life.” Compare also Acts vii. 38, *λογια ζῶντα*, and Heb. x. 20, ὁδὸς ζωσά’ &c.

³ Compare Apoc. iii. 5 ; “I will not blot out his name from the book of life :” also Ezek. xiii. 9, “They shall not be in the assembly of my people, neither shall they be written in the register of the house of Israel.” Which last passage should be collated with the preceding vision (so parallel with this Apocalyptic one) of Ezek. ix. : in which the sealing angel-priest is represented with an ink-horn, as the registrar of God’s servants in apostate Jerusalem.—Compare too Ps. lxxxvii. 6, Apoc. xiii. 8, xvii. 8.

⁴ On the *staying of the destroying angels* compare 2 Sam. xxiv. 16, and Ezek. ix. 5, 6 ; where the act is spoken of as Jehovah’s.

On the appropriation of the *plural* first person, *αχρὶς σφραγισωμεν*, “Wait till *we* have sealed,” compare Gen. i. 26, “Let *us* make man in our image :” also Gen. iii. 22, xi. 7, and Isa. vi. 8 ; “I heard the voice of Jehovah saying, Whom shall *I* send ? Or who will go for *us* ?” Commentators are generally agreed in explaining the use of the plural, in these collated passages, as the indication of one of the persons of the Holy Trinity ; and Vitringa *here* makes the same inference from it.—I observe that Kimchi, on Zech. xi. 5, refers to Job xxxv. 10, “Where is God my *makers*,” and Psalm cxlix. 2, “Let Israel rejoice in his *makers* ;” as passages where the plural is similarly used. “Another instance,” says Kimchi’s Editor, Dr. M’Caul, “of the *plural* being applied to *God*.”

⁵ Elsewhere, if I mistake not, we shall find this same Angel of the Covenant depicted, in similar contrast to opposed anti-christian agencies, as the *Angel-Mediator* and the *Angel-Justifier*. So viii. 3, x. 1.

⁶ They are called in Apoc. xvii. 14, “the called, *chosen out*, and faithful,” κλητοὶ καὶ ἐκλεκτοὶ καὶ πιστοὶ a passage already referred to.

they are called, God's servants.¹—In the present world, amidst the threatened and quickly-coming judgments, this sealing was represented as a *preservative* to the sealed ones:—a preservative evidently of the aggregate body, in its completeness, from destruction; ² a preservative too of the individuals constituting it from real evil. And, as regards a future and better world, a glimpse was opened in the here appended and intimately connected vision of the *palm-bearers*, of their assured ultimate realization of the true Israel's promised heavenly blessedness. They are depicted, in the numbers numberless of all their aggregated generations, (for of these doubtless the palm-bearing host was constituted,) as entering at the close of the one great remaining and now imminent earthly tribulation into the beatific presence: ³ the palms they bore indicating the

¹ So that this description of the origin, concomitants, and moral consequences of the sealing with God's seal answers well to the two characteristics elsewhere attached to it:—first, *recognition of his own by God*; “The Lord knoweth them that are His:” secondly, *holiness in the appropriated*; “Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity.” 2 Tim. ii. 19.

² Compare Apoc. xiv. 1.—Mede, p. 454, as observed p. 268 *suprà*, represents the perpetuation of the *professing* Church, as thus ensured: whereas it is that of Christ's *true* Church out of the *professing*.

³ I here take for granted the entire identity, in respect of origin and constituency, of the *sealed ones* and the *palm-bearers*: an identity which, I presume, none will hesitate to admit, supposing my proof previously given (see pp. 259—263 *suprà*) to be decisive, as to the *Christian* significancy of the Israelitish tribes in this vision; just as of all other Israelitish or Jewish representations and references throughout the Apocalypse.

The following parallel of the points noted of the *Sealed ones* and the *Palm-bearers* respectively, may be useful with a view to their yet clearer identification. I distinguish between what is said of the one and the other in their *earthly* state, during the present *αιων*, and what is said of their *heavenly* state afterwards.

The *Sealed ones*, or 144,000; i. q. *God's servants*, Apoc. vii. 3.

In this *αιων*, or world, they are persecuted through the primarily coming tempests, Apoc. vii. 3, the tribulation of the Trumpets, Apoc. ix. 4, and that of the reign of the Beast, Apoc. xiv. 1.—Also, they wash their robes (i. e. in the blood of the Lamb), Apoc. xxii. 14,* compared with Apoc. xxii. 3, 4.—Further, at the close, they are exhibited as “the called, and chosen, and faithful,” Apoc. xvii. 14, victorious over the Beast and his allies.

In the future *αιων* they are described distinctively as the inhabitants of the New

The *Palm-bearers*.

In this *αιων* they have to pass through the trials of the coming “great tribulation:” also they “wash their robes white in the blood of the Lamb.” Apoc. vii. 14. And the palms indicate their having come out from the great conflict victorious.

In the future *αιων* they are before the throne of God; God dwells (*σκηνωσει*)

* *πλυνοντες τας στολας αυτων*. Such is the best reading.

triumphant issue of their conflict; their white robes the white garments of justification, washed and made white in the blood of the Lamb: ¹ a welcome greeting their entrance from the 24 presbyter-representatives of the Church in Paradise, as well as from the great company of angels; and the song bursting from themselves of thanksgiving to their Saviour God, and to the Lamb,—a song which would never end.²

Now the 144,000, as St. John would have observed, were not thus pointedly characterized in the Apocalyptic vision in contradistinction to the members of any open or profest apostasy from the Christian Church and faith; so as God's earlier sealed ones, in the very parallel vision of Ezekiel,³ were contradistinguished from Jews that practised direct idolatry in the chambers of imagery, or were worshippers of the Sun, or of Thammuz:⁴ but contradistinctively to the mass of those out of whom they had been chosen for sealing; and who themselves, *in profession*, made up the *δωδεκαφυλον* of the Christian Israel, the corporation of the newly established Catholic Church. In which character would not the latter too (just like the literal Israel of old, who prided themselves as being all the children of Abraham) be likely to presume on the self-same blessings as attached to *them* of the divine election, illumination, and sealing, the registry in the book of life, salvation through this world, the washing away of sin, and the immortality of future blessedness? And so a contrast exist *even in detail*

Jerusalem; in virtue of their character alike as God's Israel, God's servants, those whose names are in the Lamb's book of life, and those that have God's mark on their foreheads: Apoc. xxi. 12, xxii. 3, 4. Also, as its citizens, they are before the throne of God and of the Lamb; God dwells with them; they have access to the river of life; and God himself wipes away every tear from their eyes. Apoc. xxi. 3, 4, xxii. 1, &c.

with them; the Lamb leads them beside living fountains of water, and God himself wipes away all tears from their eyes. Apoc. vii. 15, 17.

¹ It is said in the *past* tense, "they *washed* their garments and *made* them white," &c. So that the white was their colour while in this world, as well as after it. Compare Apoc. iii. 4, 5.

² "They serve him day and night in his temple,"—"they shall hunger no more," &c.; statements which indicate the never-ending of their sacred enjoyments and employments.

³ Ezek. ix. 1—7.

⁴ Ezek. viii. 10, 14, 16.

between the truth and the delusion, the real thing pre-figured in the one case, and the unreal in the other?—Even *à priori*, I think, thus much might have been suspected by the apostle. But, however obscure in respect of particulars this might at the time of the vision have been to him, not such is the case with us who live after the *æra* prefigured, and have the advantage of looking back into the history of the times. Turn we only to the ecclesiastical history of the 4th century. And, as we carefully ponder its sketches of the professing Church of that period, very much mistaken am I if there will not meet the eye certain things in the most characteristic of its ecclesiastical doctrines and practices so singularly antithetic to what is here distinctively told of the Church of the 144,000, as to force upon our minds the conviction that the latter cannot but have been dictated by the Holy Spirit in direct and intended allusive contrast to the former.

For here, in a manner somewhat remarkable, it is specially to the *initiation* of *its* members that our attention is first directed, (I may almost say forced,) by its prominence in the historic records of the *æra*. This was of course by the rite of *baptism*. And in so far as the outward rite was concerned, we find that all was done in order. They were regularly admitted by the bishops and presbyters into the congregation of the visible Church. The crowds of adults thus admitted by baptism, after Constantine's accession to the supremacy, have been already noted.¹ It was quite a feature of the times. But what of the neophytes' personal *looking in faith to Jesus*, as the soul's life and light, whereby alone to secure the spiritual blessings shadowed out in the sacramental rite? Of this, and of the doctrine inculcating it, we read little. On the other hand it is scarce possible for a student of the Church history of the times not to be struck, as he reads, with the exaggerated and unscriptural notions then widely prevalent of the virtue attached to the *outward baptismal rite*, as if *in itself* sufficient to secure the blessing: that is, when duly performed

¹ See p. 255 *suprà*. I beg the reader to mark my word *adults*. We have here little comparatively to do with the difficulties of *infant* baptism.

by the ministering presbyter; or, as in ~~Levitical phrase, and with Levitical functions attaching, he was now more and more generally called, the ministering~~ *ἱερεύς, sacerdos, or priest*?¹—Throughout the whole of the preceding century, and even earlier, a preparation had been making for these views by the accumulation of *titles* of honour on it. Besides its earlier title of the *λουτρον παλιγγενεσιαις*, it was now denominated, as Bingham tells us,² the *σφραγίς, χαρακτηρ Κυρίου, φωτισμος, φυλακτηριον, εφοδιον, αφθαρσιαις ενδυμα, σωτηριον*;—the *seal*, the *Lord's mark*, the *illumination*, the *phylactery* or *preservative*, the *viaticum* through the journey of life, the *investiture of incorruption*, the *insurer of salvation*. In the language of an eminent bishop of the day; “It was the ransom to captives, the remission of offences, the death of sin, the regeneration of the soul, the garment of light, the holy seal indissoluble, the chariot to heaven, the luxury of Paradise, the procuring of the kingdom, the gift of adoption.”³ The partial counteractives that had previously operated to prevent the abuse of similar unguarded expressions by earlier Fathers of the Church,⁴—the counteractives, I mean, not of mere doctrinal cautions, (such as were still indeed at times addressed to candidates, neophytes, and the Church generally, though by no means, either in frequency or evangelical clearness of doctrine, according to the exigency of the case,) but that of a stricter probationary discipline, and yet more that of *persecution from without*,⁵—these were now either wholly or compara-

¹ It is much to be regretted that the same word *priest* should have come to be used in our language both for the Greek word *πρεσβυτερος, presbyter*, and the very different word *ιερευς*: the latter properly a *sacrificing priest*, as in the Jewish or the heathen ritual. Says Hooker (Ecl. Pol. v. 78) most justly; “In truth the word *presbyter* doth seem more fit, and in propriety of speech more agreeable than *priest* with the drift of the whole gospel of Jesus Christ.”

² xi. 1, &c.

³ Cyril. Cat. Lect. Introd. And so again, very similarly, Cyril's contemporary in the fourth century, Gregory Nazianzen: who in his 40th Oration writes thus of baptism; *Δωρον καλουμεν, χαρισμα, χρισμα, φωτισμα, αφθαρσιαις ενδυμα, λουτρον παλιγγενεσιαις, σφραγιδα, παν ο τι τιμιον.*

⁴ E. g. by Clement of Alexandria, about A.D. 200. “Baptism is called *grace*, illumination, perfection, washing:—*washing*, because by it we wash away our sins; *grace*, because through it there is remitted the punishment due to our sins; *illumination*, because by it that holy saving light is beheld through which we behold God; *perfection*, because in it there is nothing wanting.” Pæd. i. 6.

⁵ Mr. Faber, in his Work on the Primitive Doctrine of Regeneration, p. 123, thus notes both these counteractives. “In early times, during the period of vehement

tively inoperative. A *magical* virtue, as it has been expressed, was too generally thought to attach to the rite; and that not only were all sins *ipso facto* washed away by it,¹ but all evils, as by an amulet, averted; for it was a *phylactery*, or *preservative*, to conduct the baptized safe through this world, even unto life everlasting.²—The *ceremonies* now superadded to the simple form prescribed and practised at its original institution, added to this impression. The custom is recorded how the candidate turned to the *west*, while priestly words of exorcism were uttered, by which it was supposed that he was now at length delivered from the dominion of the Prince of darkness;³ then to the *east*,⁴

persecution, few would become candidates for baptism, who were not deeply impressed with the necessity of seeking a refuge from the wrath to come: and the Church was careful to admit none to the holy rite, save those who had passed through the probationary and educational state of catechumens; and who might be justly hoped to have given the required answer of a good conscience to the legitimate interrogation propounded solemnly at the font."

¹ So Cyril above. Again Athanasius speaks of it as *καθαρικον πασης οιας δηποτε αμαρτιας*: (a passage quoted by Faber, p. 168 :) and Ephrem Syrus, on Dan. xii. 9, 10, explains "the many to be made white," as "baptismi lavacro dealbandos."

Dr. C. Maitland in his Book on the Catacombs, p. 221, gives the inscription following, to much the same effect, from a fragment in the Vatican Lapidarian Gallery, which seems to have belonged to a subterranean baptistery:

Corporis et cordis maculas vitali[s] aquæ fons]
Purgat, et omne simul abluit und[a] nefas.]

In this way of speaking of the pardon of sin in baptism Clemens Alex. had, we have seen, preceded. So too (not to mention others) the Council of Carthage, under Cyprian, called it *indulgentia divina*; a term famous afterwards.—Says Bingham; "The true ancient proper notion of an *indulgence* is God's pardoning sin by the ministerial application of his sacraments." xi. 1, 2. It was in fact a phrase borrowed from imperial usages. In them it signified, 1st, remission of punishment due; 2nd, remission of tribute due. See *Capitolinus*, in Antonino Pio c. 10, with Salmasius' Note; *Ammianus Marcel.* xvi. 5; and the *Codex Theodos.* Tit. *De Indulgentiis*.

² On its virtue as a *phylactery*, Cyril says; "The blessed John discourses much concerning this chrism:" (that used in baptism:) "for this holy thing is a spiritual *preservative of the body*, and *safeguard of the soul*." Cat. Lect. xxi. 7. And similarly Basil says of it: Μη απολεσης το φυλακτηριον; μη ζημωθης τα εφοδια where, like other contemporary fathers of the Church, he represents it as the *viaticum* for the journey and dangers of life. Bingham xi. 1. 10.

The earlier writer Clement of Alexandria, in his history of the youth that was reclaimed from his apostasy by St. John, furnishes a notable example of the manner in which, in Clement's view, this notion of the preservative power of baptism might be abused. He says that the Bishop entertained, cherished, and at length *enlightened*, that is, *baptized* him; (τον νεανισκον ετρεφε, συνειχεν, το τελειαιον ε φωτισε) then neglected the young man, trusting vainly and wrongly to this his *baptism's prophylactic* virtue: υψηκε της πλειονος επιμελειας και παραφυλακης, ως το τελειον αυτη φυλακτηριον επιστησας την σφραγίδα του Κυριου. See pp. 33—35 *suprà*.

³ Neander (p. 422) says that the first unequivocal trace of *exorcism in baptism* is found in the Council of Carthage A. D. 256, mentioned above. So too Mosheim.

⁴ This turning to the *east* was a custom early applied to *prayer*. Tertullian notes the practice in his *Apology*, ch. xvi. And Clemens Alexandrinus thus explains it: Επι δε γενεθλιου ημερας εικων η ανατολη, κάκειθεν το φως αυζεται, εκ σκοτους

as to receive, together with the baptismal immersion, the illumination of the Spirit. And then after baptism he was enrolled in the church-register, as being of the number of the Christian Israel.¹ A crown was placed on his head, in token of his victory over sin and the world; a white dress put upon him, as on one washed from sin, and robed for immortality: and, as we find reported by Gregory Nazianzen and Paulinus, he was led up into the church sanctuary, and received with psalmody and hallelujahs, as if in prelude to the hymnings of the blessed.² Yet once again, not only was the more ancient custom acted on thenceforward by the baptized of frequently signing the cross, by movement of the finger upon their breasts and foreheads,³ but the new custom was superadded of actually *painting* that sign on their foreheads, and visibly bearing it about, as the saving mark and seal of God attached to them.⁴

Thus were all the constituent members of the δαῶδεκα-φυλον of the professedly antitypical Israel initiated into the Christian Church; thus unguardedly its consequent blessings intimated to them. After which initiation, besides the title of εκλεκτοι, or *chosen*, (a title already attached to them from the time when they were accepted by the bishop as fit candidates for baptism,⁵) they were

λαμψαν το πρωτον, αλλα και τοις εν αγνοια κυλινδουμενοις ανετειλε γνωσεως αληθειας ημερα, κατα λογον του ηλιου προς την εωθινην ανατολην αι ευχαι. Stromat. vii. p. 856. See Bingham xiii. 8. 15.—Mosheim ii. 2. 4. 7, notes its superstitious tendency.

¹ Bingham, xi. 7. 12; and 8. 13.

² Bingham, xii. 4. 8.—Mosheim (iii. 2. 4. 4) notices the *crown* worn by the neophytes, and its understood typical intimation of their victory over the world and sin. "Initiati, coronâ candidâque veste ornati, domum revertébantur. Illa victoriæ de mundo vitiisque partæ, hæc innocentie acquisitæ signum erat."—Paulinus, Ep. 12, thus describes the scene:

Hinc senior sociæ congaudet turba catervæ;
Alleluia novis balat ovile choris.

³ So Tertullian De Cor. Mil. c. 2.

⁴ So Chrysostom on Ps. cx, cited by Suicer ad voc. Σταυρος. He says; Παντες επι μετωπι σαυρον περιφερομεν εκ ιδιωται μονον, αλλα και αυτοι οι τα διαδηματα περικειμενοι επι τω μετωπι υπερ τα διαδηματα αυτον βαταζουσιν. And again, Homil. cxxxix. Το συμβολον τη σαυρη και επι οικιας . . . και επι των μετωπων μετα πολλης επιγραφουμεν σπεδης.

Also Jerome in Ezek ix.: "Tau litera cruris habet similitudinem; quæ in Christianorum frontibus pingitur, ex frequenti manûs inscriptione signatur."

And Julian thus reproaches the Christians. Το τω σαυρη προσκυνειτε ξυλον, εικονας αυτη σκια γραφηντες εν τω μετωπι, και προ των οικηματων εγγραφοντες. Cited in Spanheim's Julian and Cyril, p. 194.

⁵ Bingham, x. 2. 5.

further designated as ~~ἅγιοι~~ and ~~πιστοί~~, the *saints* and *faithful*. For, as Bingham says, with reference to the practices of the Church as early as the century under consideration, “The names ἅγιοι, πιστοί, εκλεκτοί, *saints, believers, elect, &c.*, names which occur frequently in ecclesiastical writers, signify not any select number of Christians, (as now the words *saint* and *elect* are often used to signify only the *predestinate*,) but all Christians in general, who were entered into the communion of the Church by the waters of baptism.”¹—Oh how different all this from the simplicity of the rite as set forth in the New Testament Scripture! How different from its simplicity in our own and other Churches of the Reformation!

And now it is needful that I draw the reader’s attention to the parallel, or rather contrast in the way of parallel, which, point by point, meets the eye between this historical picture of the *general professing Church catholic* of the æra of Constantine, after becoming sole Emperor, and his successors in the 4th century, (specially in respect of the *initiation* of its members,) and that of the 144,000, God’s *election of grace* chosen out from them, as sketched to us in the Apocalyptic vision? In the ecclesiastical phraseology of the times,—a phraseology continued, it is to be observed, from Constantine’s time downwards,—the *former* were the *elect, holy, and faithful*. In the divinely inspired language of the Apocalypse these same titles *elect, holy, faithful* are attached to the *latter*, and to *them* distinctively and alone.²—The *former*, we read, claimed to have been marked with what they called *the Lord’s seal and mark* upon the forehead; yea, and often actually bore there a visible mark in sign of it: it was the seal of water-baptism, impressed on them by the offi-

¹ i. 1. 1.—It was a little before the third century that Christians were divided into faithful and catechumens, the initiated and uninitiated. Ib. x. 5. 3.

² The appellation of ἅγιοι, *holy, or saints*, is often thus distinctively applied to Christ’s “peculiar people.” A notable instance, the first after this chapter, occurs chap. viii. 3, and will be there noticed. In Rev. xix. 8, the *saints* are identified with the *white-robed*; “The white robes are the righteousness of the *saints*.” The title occurs also Rev. xiii. 10, xiv. 12, xi. 18, xx. 6, &c.—As regards the other appellations *elect* and *faithful*, we find them (as already observed) distinctively applied in Rev. xvii. 14, to the partakers in Christ’s final triumph. These are called the κλητοί και εκλεκτοί και πιστοί, the *called, and chosen, and faithful*.

ciating presbyter, and perfected with the chrism of the confirming Bishop.¹ The *latter* are here represented as marked with God's true seal on the forehead; even the seal of the Holy Spirit's baptism, and as applied by Christ himself.—The *former*, looking to the *east* at the time of baptism, were supposed to receive from it, (and perhaps through angelic ministration on the waters of the font,) both *life* from the death of sin, and spiritual *illumination* as from Christ the Sun of righteousness.² The *latter* are here symbolized as receiving those heavenly gifts in reality: and this through the direct ministry and spiritual revelation of Himself to them of the Lord Jesus; ³—that only true Angel from the east, the day-spring from on high, the life and light of each dead soul.—The *former*, we read further, after receiving the mark of the baptismal seal, were *enrolled* by the priest

¹ The Presbyter only *baptized* by permission from the Bishop. The Bishop's *confirmation*, of which *anointing* was the sign, (whence the word *christening*, i. e. *anointing*), was then administered soon after baptism. See Bingham, xi. 4. 1, xii. 1. 1.

This last was deemed essential to the full efficacy of the baptismal rite. See Cyprian's 73rd Epistle on this point. He strenuously insists on the invalidity, and even uselessness to spiritual good, of baptism administered either by heretics or unauthorized persons; and on the necessity of the Bishop's adding his confirmation to it. "Intelligimus non nisi in ecclesiâ Præpositis, et in evangelicâ lege ac dominicâ ordinatione fundatis, licere baptizare, et remissam peccatorum dare. . . . Qui . . . baptizantur Præpositis ecclesiæ offerantur; et per nostram orationem ac manûs impositionem Spiritum Sanctum consequantur, et signaculo Dominico consumentur." Cyprian urged the necessity in other cases of re-baptism. "Quicumque ab adulterâ et profanâ aquâ veniunt, abluendi sunt et sanctificandi salutaris aquæ veritate." *ibid.*

Rome allowed the baptism; but, equally with Cyprian, required episcopal confirmation. So the Roman Bishop Stephen; and Cornelius, as quoted by the Oxford Editor of Cyprian (p. 202) from Eusebius; 'Ὁδὲ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐτυχε ὡν χρῆ μεταλαμβάνειν, τοῦ τε σφραγισθῆναι ὑπο τοῦ ἐπισκοποῦ· τοῦτου δὲ μὴ τυχῶν πως αὐ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐτυχε. —Also, about the *forehead-anointing* specially, Pope Innocent I, (who died A. D. 417,) in his 1st Epistle, D'Achery i. 545. "De consignandis infantibus manifestum est non ab alio quàm ab *episcopo* fieri licere: nam presbyteri, licet sint sacerdotes, pontificatûs tamen apicem non habent. Hæc autem Pontificibus solis deberi, ut vel consignent, vel Paracletum Spiritum tradant, non solum consuetudo ecclesiastica demonstrat, verum et illa lectio Act. Apost. (viii. 14, 15,) que assertit Petrum et Joannem esse directos qui jam baptizatis traderent Spiritum Sanctum. Nam presbyteris, seu extrâ episcopum, seu præsentē episcopo cum baptizant, chrismate baptizatos ungerē licet; sed quod ab Episcopo fuerit consecratum: non tamen *frontem* ex eodem oleo signare, quod solis debetur episcopis, eum tradunt Spiritum Paracletum."

² "Angelus baptismi arbiter," &c. So Tertullian de Baptismo, c. 6; referring, c. 5, to the angel at the pool of Bethesda. See the whole passage in Bishop Kaye's Tertullian, p. 433.—The baptismal water is explained by Cyprian, Ep. 63, to be "the water of eternal life," spoken of Joh. iv. 14, vii. 38.—As regards the *illumination* consequent on the act by *sprinkling*, in case of *clinical* baptism of invalids, as well as of baptism by *immersion*, Cyprian writes thus: "If the day breaks alike on all, and if the sun pours his light on all in equal measure, how much more shall Christ, the true sun and the true day in his Church, distribute the light of eternal life with unstinted equality." Ep. 76 to Magnus.

³ Compare 2 Cor. iv. 6.

in the diptychs or registers of the earthly Church catholic, the professing Israel. The *latter* are here described as numbered and enrolled by Christ in his own register of the Israel of God; an enrolment of names the same as that which is elsewhere called their being written in heaven.—The *former* in the outward act of baptism had, as they supposed, a *phylactery*, or amulet of defence from evil, alike in life and in death. The *latter* are here represented, in vision, as alone and already possessed of the one real phylactery from evil: even in his recognition and care, who stays the angels of destruction in their defence; and, as in Lot's case, shows that He can take no step in the way of judgment until He has first provided for their security.—The *former* are described to have made display before their fellow-men of their *white garments*, as those who by the washing of baptism, even as if it had been by the blood of Christ,¹ had been both justified from guilt, and made innocent and holy. The *latter* are represented, in the second and appended vision, as having the white garments of their justification recognised before God and his holy angels in heaven: but as made white through another and different washing, the washing from the fountain opened on Calvary, the blood of the Lamb.—Finally, the *former* are described to us as in their white robes, and with crowns of victory, introduced into the inner sanctuary of the Christian temple: and there, as the *σωζομενοι*, or *saved ones*,² received with psalmody, in anticipation of the heavenly ending of their pilgrimage. Nor ought I to omit in the parallel, how, as the year rolled round, they were wont in *palm-bearing processions* to resort to the churches, on the festival substituted in the Christian Church for the feast of *Tabernacles*; and, not without similar anticipations of personal salvation and triumph, to place their palms that symbolized it on

¹ “The neophyte emerged from the waters of baptism in a state of perfect innocence. The dove (the Holy Spirit) was constantly hovering over the font, and sanctifying the waters to the mysterious ablution of the sins of the past life. . . . The *water* itself became, in the vivid language of the Church, the *blood of Christ*: it was compared by a fanciful analogy to the Red Sea. The daring metaphors of some of the Fathers might seem to assert a transmutation of its colour.” Milman, *Hist. of Christianity*, iii. 427.

² Cyril. *Cat. L. Intr.* § 15.—Compare Gregory Nazianzen's *τηνικαυτα σωθησομαι*, “then I will be *saved* ;” in the sense of, “then I will be *baptized*.” Bingham, xi. 1. 5.

the altar, and hymn their alleluias:¹ or, again, how the custom had grown up at the time we refer to of going forth with palms and with hosannas, to give greetings to the bishops and presbyters of the Church, the earthly operators of their supposed salvation.² The *sealed ones*, on the other hand, are here symbolized, as the real *σωζόμενοι*, or *saved ones*; and, like the palm-bearing Israelites at the feast of Tabernacles, as celebrating, though not till after a long interval of tribulation, the actual triumphant accomplishment of their earthly pilgrimage: then as received into the heavenly presence amidst the hymnings of angels, and rendering their alleluias of salvation alone to their Saviour God and to the Lamb.

After the consideration of which parallel between these two classes, and supposing what, after all that has passed,

¹ The *πιστοί*, or church-members, including the baptized of the preceding Easter, bore palm-branches in procession on the next return of the Easter festival. For its fourteen days of festival,—then the chief season in the Church for baptism,—included the week before Easter Sunday, as well as the week after; and thus began with *Palm Sunday*, which was called also *Dominica Competentium*, from candidates for baptism then offering themselves. On which Sunday, as we learn from Epiphanius, there was already begun in the fourth century, and celebrated with much pomp, that same *palm-bearing* festival which continued afterwards through the middle ages. (See the Homily of this Father *Εἰς τὰ Βαυα*.) It was the substitute in fact in the Christian Church for the Jewish *Feast of Tabernacles*, and its palm-branch bearing; (*Lev. xxiii. 40*;) the time of the celebration being however changed from the *autumnal* equinox to the *vernal*, in consequence of the palm-bearing procession at our Lord's entrance in the paschal week into Jerusalem.

Epiphanius, in his Homily on the day referred to, speaks as if the whole professing Christian body (designated as the *daughter of Zion*, in *Judaic* figure similar to that of the Apocalyptic vision,) might expect to partake of the benefit of Christ's triumph: the Church *ουκετι αἵματι δουλικῶ φρωμένη, ἀλλ' αἵματι θεικῶ σφραγίζομενη*, and in its service imitating the songs and stations of angels.

In the Jewish festival there was a similar union of the *commemorative* and *anticipative*. They *commemorated* their ancient dwelling in booths in the wilderness, and subsequent triumphant entrance into Canaan. They *anticipated* Messiah's giving them further and greater triumphs: whence, in accompaniment of their palm-bearing, their shouts in the language of *application*, “Hosanna! Save, Lord!”

² Valesius, in his notes on Eusebius, (H. E. ii. 23.) mentions that it was the manner of the Christians of those earlier times thus to meet the bishops and presbyters with hosannas and palm-branches: citing as follows from the monk Antoin's Jerusalem Itinerary, whose journey appears to have been made just before the death of Constantine. “Ibi venerunt mulieres in occursum nobis, cum infantibus, palmas in manibus tenentes, et ampullas cum rosaceo oleo; et prostratis pedibus nostris plantas nostras unguebant, cantabantque lingua ægyptiaca, psallentes antiphonam, Benedicti vos à Domino, benedictusque adventus voster! Hosanna in excelsis!”—Well might Jerome (on Matt. xxi.) soon after express alarm at this appropriation to the earthly ministers of the Church of what belonged to its heavenly Head only. “Videant ergo episcopi, et quantumlibet sancti homines, cum quanto periculo dici ista sibi patiantur, si Domino, cui verè hoc dicebatur, . . . pro crimine impingitur.” It was indeed a sign of the times!

the reader will, I trust, be fully prepared to allow me,—viz. *first*, that the sealing vision appertains chronologically to the times following on the politico-religious revolution under Constantine and his immediate successors in the 4th century, *secondly*, that the 12 tribes of Israel, and the 144,000, mentioned in it, designate respectively the visible professing Church in the Roman empire, and Christ's true Church, the election of grace, gathered out of it,—I say, granting this, is it conceivable that the sketch here given us of the *latter*, in regard specially of their initiatory constitution as Christ's peculiar people, by his own electing, life-giving, enlightening, and sanctifying influence, can have been drawn without distinct reference to that which history tells us characterized the *former*? Or, again, if thus drawn in designed contrast, can it have been so drawn for the mere sake of point and effect, by the heavenly limner; or without the implication of his solemn condemnatory judgment on both the doctrinal system, and the Church characterized thereby, to which his sketch of the 144,000 stands so markedly opposed:—the Church that of the mere *outwardly* professing, and *outwardly* or *ecclesiastically* initiated and constituted; the doctrine that of the *ex opere operato* efficacy of the legitimately ministered initiatory sacrament? To my own mind alike the one supposition and the other seem inconceivable. The Apocalyptic *Christian* picture cannot, I think, but have been drawn antithetically to the *anti-Christian ritualistic system and doctrine* of the times referred to. For in it, just as in other figurations of this wonderful book, we see sketched, though but in hintings, the real *spirit of the age*;

The very age and body of the times,
Their form and pressure.

—And the rather so as the error referred to was no light or passing error. It was an evil the deep-rooted *permanency* of which in the Christian professing Church (like that of the cognate error in the Jewish)¹ is attested by the protests

¹ See St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, ("the foolish Galatians,") *passim*: also of that to the Romans chaps. iii, iv, &c. Thus, as against the doctrine of an *ex opere operato sacramental justification*, or *forgiveness of sins*, Rom. iv. 8, &c.; "Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin. Cometh this blessedness on the circumcision only, or on the uncircumcision also? For we say that *faith* was reckoned

of the Anglican and other Reformed Churches against it 1200 years after; ¹ and the *gravity* of which appears from the fact of its being the foundation-stone of the great predicted apostasy, which thenceforward we shall find to have been more and more developed:—that apostasy of which the one grand object and characteristic, ever followed out by the MASTER SPIRIT OF EVIL its originator, and with admirable unity of purpose, was to be this;—within the Christian Church itself, ² and while professedly exalting Christ and his institutions, *practically to set Christ aside out of the Christian system, from first to last*; a human pseudo-Christian priesthood being substituted in his place, (as well indeed as in that of the Holy Spirit,) in respect of *one and all of his saving acts and offices.* ³

I have spoken of this baptismal error as one peculiarly

to Abraham for righteousness. How was it then reckoned? When he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised:” &c.—And, against resting in *the mere outward form*, ib. ii. 28, 29; “He is not a Jew which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter:” &c.

In these and similar passages, who that considers the subsequent history of the Church can suppose that the Eternal Spirit, speaking by St. Paul, had only as his object to guard the Church against *Judaizing* errors then prevalent? and not rather to guard it against similar errors also which He foresaw would prevail, and with yet longer and more pernicious influence, through abuse of the *Christian* corresponding sacrament?

¹ Let it be well observed that the doctrine of the *Anglican Church* as to the grace following the baptismal rite is pointedly opposed to that of *Rome*. The former says in its *Articles*, that no sacrament is of use, but “to them that receive it *worthily*;” and in its *Catechism*, that *repentance* and *faith* are essential to its right reciprocity. (See p. 289, Note ³.)—On the other hand, the doctrine and spirit on this point of the Church of Rome is well illustrated in what passed at the first discussion of Cardinal Cajetan with Luther: in which one of the two things which the Cardinal required to be retracted by Luther, and to which Luther above all other things was resolved to adhere, was this statement,—that, in order to benefit from the Sacrament, there must be *the exercise of faith in the recipient*. See Merle D’Aubigné’s *History of the Reformation*, B. iv., c. 6; and Waddington’s do. Vol. i. p. 157.—But in this I am anticipating.

² The professing Church no longer having strength and purity to cast out the antichristian leaven as heretical; so as in the case and times of the Gnostic anti-christianity, alluded to in St. John’s Epistles.

³ Various occasions will occur afterwards for illustrating further from history the development, in this point of view, of the apostasy, and of Antichrist, its destined head.—For the present let me only add *Dr. Arnold’s* opinion, expressed on the modern revival of that particular perverted doctrine of the fourth century, which has been the subject of this Section: “I call all this *Judaizing* a direct idolatry. It is *exalting the Church and the Sacraments into the place of Christ*; as others have exalted *Christ’s Mother*, and others in the same spirit exalted *circumcision*.” *Life*, Vol. ii. p. 74.

characteristic of *the times of Constantine and his successors* in the 4th century :—not indeed overlooking the 3rd century, as that in which it began to appear ; but resting on the 4th as that in which it was most fully and largely developed, after that the subversion of the Pagan power in the Roman empire had made the way open and easy to the profession of Christianity. In illustration of this historic fact I have noticed, from eminent and approved fathers of the *third and fourth centuries*, the various exaggerated titles of honour, and superstitious ceremonies, which had been then superadded to the simple title and ritual ordained by the Lord Jesus. And perhaps these might of themselves suffice to show the *chronological propriety* of the contrasted Apocalyptic picture. In order, however, that no suspicion may remain with the reader of my having strained the unguarded expressions of certain Church-writers of the day, however eminent, construed too harshly a harmless ceremonial, or given an exaggerated view either of the prevalency or perniciousness of the error at the time spoken of,—it may be well that I set before him the opinions, on the point in question, of a few modern ecclesiastical historians, who are generally known and approved. — *Dean Waddington* then, speaking of the *preceding*, or 3rd century, thus observes : “The original simplicity of the office of baptism had *already* undergone some corruption. The *symbol* had been gradually exalted at the expense of the *thing signified* : the *spirit* of the ceremony was beginning to be lost in the *form*.”¹—*Mosheim*, while noting the multiplication of rites and ceremonies in the Christian Church during that same century, specifically in the matter of baptism, attributes this, as well as other nascent superstitious notions and practices, very much to the corrupting influence of the Platonic and Oriental or Gnostic philosophy, which, about the middle of the century, had partially infused itself into the Church : and, in his sketch of the doctrines and rites of the Church in the 4th century, represents those superstitions as then only increased and aggravated.²—By *Milner* this is the judgment pronounced on the prevalent religion of the 4th century, after Con-

¹ i. 94.

² iii. 2. 4. 1, 4, &c. Also iv. 2, 3, and 4.

stantine's establishment of Christianity in the Roman empire. "The true doctrine of *justification by faith* was scarce to be seen at this time; and that of *real conversion* very much lost, or *external baptism* placed in its stead. There was much *outward* religion, but this could not make men saints in heart and life."¹—A *living writer*, not unacquainted with the subject he handles, designates the religion of the Constantinian æra as "*a religion of sacraments*:"² and quotes in confirmation a striking passage from the celebrated Boethius's Compendium of Christian Faith, (a work in date somewhat later,) in which, as the grand means of man's recovery from the evil, guilt, and condemnation consequent on Adam's fall, he declares that Christ has granted to us *remedial sacraments*:—"just as if the sacraments," says Mr. Taylor, "when duly accepted from the priest's hand, were potent drugs, or chemical antidotes, infallibly dispersing the poison inherited from Adam!"—*Neander*,—in terms often so similar to those of Bishop Burnet in his exposition of the Articles of the Church of England, that but for the greater warmth and feeling of the former, one might almost doubt whether it was the German historian, illustrating the corrupt doctrine of the Church catholic of the third and fourth centuries, or the English prelate that of the Romish Church in the sixteenth,³—again and again laments the prevalency of what he designates as the *opus operatum* doctrines, then germinated and in vogue,—more especially in respect of

¹ Cent. iv. ch. 2, p. 211. (Ed. in one Vol. 1838.)

² Ancient Christianity, Vol. i. p. 247. See also pp. 190, 191, 235, &c.

³ *Neander*, i. 422, 427, 429, &c. At p. 431 he says; "The idea had sprung up that on the bishops, as successors of the apostles, the propagation of the Holy Spirit in the Church was dependent: it was considered as their prerogative to seal by the consecration of the imposition of hands (as with a signaculum, or σφραγίς) the whole act of baptism." He refers this, and the beginning of the rite of episcopal confirmation, to the middle of the 3rd century. A rite this, so as it was then administered, as significant of the instealing superstition as any other!

Says Bishop Burnet on Art. xi. p. 152; "The doctrine of *sacramental justification* is justly to be reckoned among the most mischievous errors in the Church of Rome. . . . It is as if the sacraments were of the nature of *charms*," &c. Again on Art. xxv.; "We look on all sacramental actions as acceptable to God only with regard to the temper and inward acts of the persons to whom they are applied; and cannot consider them as *medicines*, or *charms*, which work by a virtue of their own." Again: "The doctrine of Rome represents them as so many *charms*; which may heighten the authority of him who administers them, but which extinguish or deaden all true piety." pp. 316, 351.

baptism,—and the idea of a *magical effect* and *charm* attaching to the rite. “Oh!” he exclaims, “that men had not so soon confused the *divine thing* and the *sign* which represented it; and had not wished to bind the work of the Spirit on the outward sign!”¹—Finally, both he and *Bishop Kaye*,—the latter in his learned sketch of the Church in the age of Tertullian,² and thus with reference to as early a period as the beginning of the third century,—notice a practice then introduced, and in the fourth century prevalent, (I mean the *delaying of baptism to the death-bed*,) that furnishes the most striking possible illustration of the real nature and evil working of these notions respecting baptism; and show that the *Φαρμακειαί*,³ the *phylacteric charms* of the APOSTASY, had already begun. They did this, says Neander, “under the false notion of baptism being an *opus operatum*,” in order that they might the longer abandon themselves to their lusts; and yet, “in the hour of death, being purified by the magical annihila-

¹ Neander, p. 360. 1st Ed. Rose’s Transl.—My citations are elsewhere given from Clark’s Transl. of Neander’s 2nd Ed., in which, I see, the passage is omitted.

² pp. 247, 248. “The teachers began” (i. e. in the age of Tertullian) “by insisting on the necessity of repentance and amendment of life. Unfortunately, the effect of their exhortations upon the minds of their hearers was frequently counteracted by a fatal perversion of the doctrine of the Church respecting the efficacy of baptism. In every age the object of a large portion of those who call themselves Christians has been to secure the benefits without fulfilling the conditions of the Christian covenant. When therefore the proselyte was told that baptism conferred upon him who received it the *remission of all his former sins*, he persuaded himself that he might with safety defer the work of repentance,” &c.

The learned prelate speaks of this as a “*perversion of the doctrine of the Church*.” And, doubtless, many cautions are to be found in Cyprian, Origen, Cyril, &c. Yet while so much was made of the ceremonial, and while such language was common on the subject as in the passage that Bishop Kaye quotes from Tertullian, (*De Pœnitent.* ch. 6,) “*Neque ego renuo divinum beneficium, id est abolitionem delictorum, inituris aquam omnimodo salvum esse*,”—was not the perversion a natural one? Tertullian’s suggested difficulty of a man’s obtaining baptism in case of his being impenitent,—“*Quis enim tibi, tam infidæ pœnitentiæ viro, asperginem unam eujuslibet aquæ commodabit*,”*—was not likely to be of much counteractive force. It is also observable that the qualifications now insisted on were mostly *repentance* and *amendment*, not *evangêlic faith*;—faith in HIM with whom personal communion is essential, both to the beginning and the continuance of spiritual life.

³ The continuance long after of these *φαρμακειαί* is noted Apoc. ix. 21, in reference to the times following on the destruction of the Greek empire in the 15th century.

* Let the reader observe, in passing, this proof from Tertullian of baptism having been sometimes administered by *sprinkling*, ere the close of the second century. To which add Cyprian’s somewhat later testimony, given p. 283 *supra*.

tion of their sins, might be able to pass without hindrance into eternal life.”¹ It was in fact, in estimation and in practice, the *extreme unction* of the day.²

After the establishment of Christianity in the Roman empire, this practice became, as I said, prevalent. The emperor Constantine himself offers us the most illustrious example of it. Notwithstanding his conversion to Christianity full 20 years before, and more, he deferred his baptism to his death-bed. I subjoin the affecting account given us of it in Eusebius;³ and commend it to the read-

¹ p. 363.—The following note of Gibbon is too illustrative of the subject to be omitted. “The fathers who censured this criminal delay could not deny the certain and victorious efficacy even of a death-bed baptism. The ingenious rhetoric of Chrysostom (Ep. ad Hebr. Hom. xiii.) could find only three arguments against these prudent Christians. 1. That we should love and pursue virtue for her own sake, and not merely for the reward. 2. That we may be surprised by death without an opportunity of baptism. 3. That, although we shall be placed in heaven, we shall only twinkle like little stars, when compared to the suns of righteousness who have run their appointed course with labour, with success, and with glory.”—He adds; “I believe this delay of baptism, though attended with the most pernicious consequences, was never condemned by any general or provincial council, or by any public act or declaration of the Church.” iii. 274.

² When the whole empire had become Christian in profession, and baptism consequently came to be administered almost universally to infants,—this ceremony of *baptismal extreme unction* was cut away from the superstitious ritualist. But the ministrations of the *Lord's Supper* was ready at hand as a substitute. So Paulinus A.D. 794, to the homicide Heistulphus: herein following the judgment of the Council of Nice (Can. xiii), in reference to the *lapsed* under the previous Licinian persecution: “In ultimo termino vitæ tuæ pro viatico . . . ut accipias communionem corporis et sanguinis Domini tibi concedimus.” Harduin Concil. iv. 912.—*Extreme unction*, as a seventh sacrament, was afterwards added or substituted. See Martene De Rit. And, I imagine, it had its origin from the act of *baptismal unction* performed on the dying in the 4th and 5th centuries.

³ The account is thus given by Eusebius. On finding his health declining, Constantine gathered the bishops around him, he relates, and declared his wish to have the rite administered; as that whereby all the sins of his past life would be cleansed and washed away.* “‘This,’ said he to them, ‘is the time so long looked for by me, thirsting and praying that I might partake of the *salvation* of God. This is the time of my enjoying the *seal* that confers *immortality*. I had wished to have partaken of this washing in the streams of Jordan, where the Saviour is related to have been baptized as an example to us. But God, who knows what is best, has ordained that it should be here. Now then let there be no hesitation. If the Lord of life and death will that my life be prolonged, and it is once settled that I be *numbered with his people*, I promise that I will lay down to myself a rule of life becoming.’—Then they, after the usual ritual, imparted to him the holy mysteries. And thus Constantine, first and alone of Roman emperors, in the Church of the Martyrdom of Jesus, was regenerated and made perfect: and, having the *divine seal* impressed on him, he rejoiced in spirit, and was filled with heavenly *light*.—Then, after the other ceremonies, he put on a dress of *white*, bright as the light; for he would no more touch the purple: and, raising his voice, he thanked God, and spoke of his happiness, as having been thought worthy of *immortal life*. After which, having admitted some of his generals and captains into his presence, as they wept around him, and wished

* επειδη δε εις εννοιαν ηκει της τω βιω τελευτης, καθαρσεως τωτον ειναι καιρον των ποτε αυτη πεπλημμελημενων δειν ωστο, οσα οια θνητη διαμαρτειν επηλθε.

er's perusal. The charitable hope is most allowable,—and it is one which we will fondly cherish,—that his error was forgiven him: and that the spiritual grace of the sacramental rite, and all the blessings of the gospel covenant, were in this case really imparted to the dying neophyte; even as to one, in sincerity of heart, repentant and believing. And thus we may look with a melancholy satisfaction to the narrative, as an exemplification alike of his conversion to the truth, and of the wonderful triumph of Christianity over heathenism, effected so greatly through his instrumentality, in the Roman empire. But we must also painfully look to it as illustrating the manifestation and acting, even then, of this earliest unfolded feature of the mystery of iniquity.¹ It may serve as a memorial to us of the *first æra*, and, as Gibbon would say, of the first *symptom* and *cause*, (here allusively pre-intimated to St. John,) of the now rapidly advancing *anti-christian* APOSTASY.

Oh! how was it, we may well say with Neander, that men so soon came to confuse the divine thing with the sign which represented it! And how was it that they did not even then perceive the real nature and portentous evil of the doctrine! Surely, had they profited by the light of Scripture and its holy prophecies, as by a light shining in a dark place, they would have recognised, through the obscure mistiness of the moral atmosphere, the awful fea-

him years of prolonged life, he answered them that he had now been made partaker of that which was indeed the *true life*: that none but himself could be aware of the blessings he had received; and that he was fain to depart and not delay his passage to God. All this took place in the Pentecostal festival:” (i. e. the fifty days between Easter and Whitsunday, the chief season of baptism at that time:)—“and on the Pentecostal Sunday itself, the seventh Lord’s day from Easter, at the noon-tide hour of the day, by the sun, Constantine was received up to his God.” V. C. iv. 61—64.

¹ Let me observe that Constantius similarly deferred his baptism to his dying hour. (Athanas. de Synodis Op. i. p. 907.) Also the emperor Valentinian 2, towards the close of the fourth century, furnished another example of the operation of the same erroneous views of the baptismal rite: but in his case death overtook him before Ambrose, whom he had sent for to perform it, arrived. Ambros. de Obit. Valentinian.—The Count Theodosius, father to the great emperor of that name, was yet another eminent example of delaying it till immediately before death. Orosius, B. vii. (B. P. M. vi. 443.)

Let me further observe that Ambrose, in noting Constantine’s baptism, tells how “Baptismatis gratiâ, in ultimis constitutus, omnia peccata dimiserit;” without any remark on the error of thus delaying it. De Obit. Theodos.

tures of the instealing phantom, and the enemy of man animating and guiding it.

Apparent diræ facies, inimicaque Trojæ
Numina.

—But the word of God, though not as yet forbidden, was nevertheless not studied or explained with the same simplicity and singleness of mind as once. Silently and slowly an advance had been already made to that which was essential to the successful establishment of the Apostasy, the *supersession of the written word*. In the undue reference to supposed *apostolical unwritten tradition*¹ an almost co-ordinate standard of authority had been set up. In the *philosophy* of the Alexandrian Platonics, an engine had begun to work, which, through *allegorizing*, did away with much of its true and simple meaning.² In the *discipline of the secret* it was made part of a religious system to hold *reserve*, except to the baptized, or initiated,³ on certain of the gospel verities: especially on one the most glorious of all, and against which, as the great object of justifying and saving faith, the Apostasy was to direct its bitterest enmity,—I mean the vicarious and propitiatory atonement of the Son of God.⁴ Once more, by the *falsitas dispensativa* it was

¹ Even in some of the earlier fathers unguarded statements will be found on this point. Thus *Irenæus*,—although noting the preference of *unwritten traditions* to Holy Scripture as a characteristic of certain then existing *heretics*, and in iii. 2 saying of them, “Cùm ex Scripturis arguuntur in accusationem convertuntur ipsarum Scripturarum, quasi non rectè habeant, . . et quia non possit ex his inveniri veritas ab his qui nesciant *traditionem*, non enim per literas traditam illam sed per vivam vocem,”—does yet soon after himself appeal to the tradition kept by the Bishops of the Church. Though indeed he might perhaps intend by this the *written* tradition of Holy Scripture.—Again *Tertullian*, De Cor. Mil. ch. 3, thus asserts its authority. “In traditionis obtentu exigenda est, inquis, auctoritas scripta. Ergo quæramus, an et traditio non scripta non debeat recipi?” And then, having first limited the cases in which unwritten tradition was of authority to such as Scripture had not determined, (“Si nulla Scriptura determinavit, certè consuetudo corroboravit, quæ sine dubio de traditione manavit,”) he exemplifies in the baptismal rite: in which rite sundry things then done, that had not been enjoined in Scripture, (as three dippings, tasting milk and honey, and abstaining for a week from the usual ablutions, &c.,) were, he thought, thereby sufficiently sanctioned.—Yet the very limitation shows that Tertullian was mainly sound on this point. See Riddle’s *Christian Antiq.* p. 71.

² See Burton’s *Church History*, ch. xiv.

³ ἱερασι οἱ μνηστειοι. So Chrysostom frequently, says Bingham, x. 5, 8.

⁴ Bingham, *ibid.*—This too originated in the Alexandrian School. See Bishop Kaye’s *Tertullian*, pp. 35, 250, 251. He concludes: “Having already delivered our opinion respecting the mischievous consequences which have arisen to the Church from the countenance lent by the writings of Clemens Alexandrinus to the notion of a *disciplina arcani*, we shall now only express our regret that Protestant divines, in their eagerness to establish a favourite point, should sometimes have been induced to resort to it.”

deemed permissible, and even meritorious, for approved ends to pervert truth and Scripture.¹—Thus no wonder that the true and only source of light, life, and justification to the soul should have been more and more forgotten. No wonder that the doctrinal error should have crept in of mistaking the form for the spirit, the outward for the inward, the instrument for the original and effectual agent, the means for the object and end. No wonder that the so-called priesthood too, as well as Church and ritual, should have begun to interpose themselves between the people and Christ.—Indeed it should never be overlooked, in our view of the first germinating of the Apostasy, that this was very mainly owing to a neglect of the spirit and cautions of the written word; even while otherwise by many held in honour.² Hence the mistaken and formal earthly view of God's true Israel, or Church. Hence the superstitious exaltation of the ceremonial. Hence the misapprehension of the character and functions of the clergy that ministered in it; and the changing of the *communion-table* into a priests' sacrificial *altar*, and of the commemorative *supper*³ into something like the *sacrifice of the*

"The *disciplina arcani*," says Lardner, iv. 231, "was unknown to Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Minucius Felix, and other primitive Christian writers." I think however Bingham (*ibid.* 3) has reason in saying that in Tertullian a clear intimation is found of the Church then making a distinction in what it taught between catechumens and the baptized or believers. So in his *Apol.* 7 and *De Præscr.* c. 41.

¹ See Gilly's *Vigilantius*, pp. 268, 269. He specially refers to Jerome as its advocate, and gives a striking extract from Coleridge's *Essays* condemning it.—Augustine's strong reprobation of this, as advocated by Jerome, appears both in his *Letters* xxviii. 3, lxxxii. 21, address to Jerome himself, and also abundantly elsewhere. Mosheim is unjustifiable in classing him with others his contemporaries as an advocate of it. iv. 2. 3. 16.

² Witness Origen's more early critical labours on it, and Jerome's later: also Chrysostom's strong exhortations to its study; not to add those of that apostolic man, of whom I shall have to speak fully in my next section, Augustine.

³ Basnage *ad ann.* 100, quoted by Lardner, iv. 212, says that this Judaizing language about the Christian clergy and sacraments had not come into vogue in the *earlier* half of the second century: "Germana virorum apostolicorum scripta, Clementis scilicet, * Polycarpi, Justini, vocabula pontificis, sacerdotum, Levitarum, Christiano clero significando nunquam usurparunt: neque magis Clementinæ ætatis est vocabulum *θυσιασθηριον*, *altare*, ad eucharistiæ mensam iudicandam."—These earlier fathers applied the Judaic sacerdotal figure, like St. Peter, † rather to the whole Christian body; and used the terms of the old Jewish temple service, like St. Paul, in a Christian sense figuratively. ‡

* i. e. the *Roman* Clement.

† 1 Pet. ii. 5; "Ye [i. e. all true Christians] are a royal priesthood:" 2 Cor. vi. 16; "Ye are the temple of the living God;" &c.

‡ E. g. for *Ignatius'* view on this point see the quotations given p. 15 *suprà*. He

mass :¹—it being forgotten at length that in the *Christian* Israel, *Levi* mingles with the other eleven tribes ;² and that

On the subject of the *altar* as an appellation of the *communion table* in the early Church, the reader will find the question discussed, and pretty well exhausted, in Mede's Treatise on it, Works, pp. 382—392, Suicer on *θυσιασθηριον*, and Bingham viii. 6. 12—15. It results that, if the so-called Apostolical Constitutions be received as of a date before A.D. 200, and Ignatius' Ep. to the Philadelphians be genuine, the term *altar* would appear to have been used for the holy table before the end of the second century ; but only figuratively, or at least in the sense of the scene of the Christians' general offering of prayer and thanksgiving. Alike Origen, Minutius Felix, and Arnobius admitted to the *heathen* that *they had no altars*, i. e. like theirs. Our Church Prayer Book has done well in eschewing the word.

But the innovations had *begun* even before the third century : (see Mosheim ii. 2. 4. 4 :) and Cyprian continually applies the term *sacerdos* to the Christian Minister ; e. g. Epist. i. "Singuli divino sacerdotio honorati, et in clerico ministerio constituti, non nisi altari et sacrificiis deservire debeant," &c. : and in Ep. 55, in startling language about the Bishop, "Unus [est] in ecclesiâ ad tempus *sacerdos*, et ad tempus iudex, *vix Christi*."—Compare Neander's observations, i. 451 : also Waddington i. 84, &c.

¹ Mosheim (iv. 2. 4. 8.) says that in the fourth century the elevation of the sacramental elements prepared the way for their adoration soon afterwards.

² See p. 262 *supra*.

uses the figure of being *within the altar* (of the antitypical altar-court) as a figure not of the local ministering position of the Christian clergy, but of church-membership generally.—So too *Justin Martyr*. "The prayers and thanksgivings offered by worthy men are the only true sacrifices acceptable to God : " and this, says Neander *ibid.*, "he regards as a proof of the high priestly lineage of Christians."

Again, *Irenæus* speaks of *all* believers as *priests*, in the Levitical or sacerdotal sense of the word. So iv. 20, "Omnes justi *sacerdotalem* habent ordinem." Also v. 34, "Ostendimus quoniam ecclesia est semen Abrahamæ : " and again ; "Ostendimus quoniam *Levitæ et sacerdotes* sunt discipuli omnes Domini."—The *offerings* too that he speaks of were the offerings given by the whole early Church at the Lord's Supper ; as the whole Jewish Church offered their first-fruits : "Novi testamenti oblationem, quam ecclesia ab apostolis accipiens in universo mundo offert Deo, ei qui alimenta nobis præstat, primitias suorum munerum in novo testamento : " citing Malachi's prophecy, "From the rising of the sun to the setting, incense shall be offered to my name, and a pure offering," iv. 32. Compare iv. 34, where he says that God "dedit populo præceptum faciendarum oblationum, ut disceret Deo servire : sic et ideo nos quoque offerre vult munus ad *altare* frequenter sine intermissione ; " explaining the altar meant by him thus ; "Est ergo *altare* in *cælis* ; illuc enim preces nostræ et oblationes diriguntur, et ad *templum* ; quemadmodum Joannes in Apocalypsi ait, 'Et apertum est templum Dei in cælo,' " &c. (Apoc. xi. 19).

Tertullian too, though he sometimes speaks Levitically of the Christian ministry, does yet in a well-known passage (De Exhort. Castit. ch. 7) apply the sacerdotal figure to *all* Christians ; "Nonne et *laici* sacerdotes sumus ? Scriptum est, Reges nos et sacerdotes Deo fecit." &c.

I agree with *Basnage* in not excepting on this head *Clemens Romanus*. For that the *three Levitical orders* mentioned by him, ch. 40, (just as the *Jerusalem and the altar* of ch. 41,) were meant *literally* and *simply* of the old Jewish system, and not of the three orders of the Christian ministry, bishops, presbyters, and deacons, appears sufficiently from his reference to the same Jewish ecclesiastical ministers, ch. 31 : where, speaking of God's gifts to his people, after notice of the blessings conferred on Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, he proceeds thus ; "From him are the priests and Levites, all that minister at the altar of God ; from him the Lord Jesus according to the flesh ; &c." A view this confirmed by his reference, ch. 36, to *Christ* as the Christian's *High Priest*, and chs. 42, 44, 47, 54, 57 to *presbyters* and *deacons*, as if the only ecclesiastical rulers in the Corinthian Church ; for the contexts show that by the *επισκοποι* of ch. 42 were meant *presbyters*. The same I see, is Gieseler's judgment ; i. § 52.

the proper priestly functions attach, all and only, to its great High Priest above.

So, in fine, did instealing *Judaism*, by the infusion of its spirit into the religion which had subverted it, furnish one primary principle of the Apostasy :¹ while *Heathenism* too, (as we shall very soon see more fully,²) found occasion also, even thus early, to enter in and assist. And together they helped forward,—and with singular union of effect,—that which was the grand object of the Apostasy with the Master Spirit of evil that devised it ;—viz. the obscuration and supersession in the *professing* Church of its Lord and Saviour Christ Jesus.³

§ 4.—CONTRA-DISTINCTIVE REVELATION OF GOD'S ISRAEL,
OR TRUE CHURCH, OF THE SEALED ONES.

It may probably have already occurred to an attentive reader that there is this remarkable novelty and peculiarity in the double prefigurative vision now under consideration, as compared with others previously given, that whereas those earlier visions, in regard of all that was figured outside of the heavenly sanctuary of God's manifested presence, depicted simply and only what was to be visibly realized afterwards upon the earthly scene before the eyes of men,—there was now on the contrary depicted to St. John, though upon the same earthly scene, a something *spiritual*, and such as mortal eyes could not see ; viz. the Lord's marking out, and sealing, and numbering the constituent

¹ See Whitby's "Parallel" betwixt what he calls "the Jewish and the Papal Antichrist," appended to his Comment on 2 Thess. Also his Note on 2 Thess. ii. 3, on the early Judaizing elements of an apostasy in the Christian Church.

² See my Part ii. ch. 1, *infra* : also Part iii. ch. 3, &c.

³ Let me illustrate on this point by a citation from Dr. Arnold. "That the *priest* system is not to be found in Scripture is as certain as that the worship of Jupiter is not the doctrine of the gospel. . . . It was not that the Eucharist was to succeed to the temple sacrifices,—one carnal sacrifice and carnal priest succeeding to another ; but the spiritual sacrifice of each man's self to God, connected always with the commemoration of Christ's sacrifice in the Eucharist. . . . That the great enemy should have turned his very defeat [i. e. in the overthrow of heathenism] into his greatest victory, and have converted the spiritual self-sacrifice, in which each man was his own priest, into the carnal and lying sacrifice of the Mass, [the consummation of the *priest* system,] is to my mind, more than anything else, the exact fulfilment of the apostolical language concerning *Antichrist*." Life Vol. ii. p. 262. The letter is dated June 19, 1841 ; just a year only before his death. It expresses his mature judgment on the point. So too *ibid.* pp. 174, 241.

members of the Israel of God, his own true Church, individually and personally, from among the visible corporate body of the professing Church, the *soi-disant* Israel.—And this may have been further noted, as yet another remarkable peculiarity in the vision before us, that not only was there thus depicted in it the constitution of God's true Church, which, though a spiritual and invisible transaction, did yet occur chronologically at what has appeared to be the precise æra that the vision related to, (i. e. the close of the 4th century,) but also a fact concerning this true Church, which might seem *primâ facie* altogether *unchronological*, as it was only to be realized at the consummation;—viz. the ultimate salvation of all its aggregated generations.¹ A consummation, let it be observed, not to happen till after some great intervening tribulation, the same doubtless that had been pre-intimated to the souls under the altar,² in other words that of the times of Antichrist: it being after *it*, according to the presbyter-informant's declaration,³ that their introduction was to take place, whether as palm-bearing conquerors,⁴ after the *Roman* simili-

¹ The identity of the aggregated sealed ones and the palm-bearers has been already proved. See p. 276 *suprà*.—So the ancient expositor *Berengaud*, as I see, explains the symbols. “Per 144,000 electi, qui in ecclesiâ Dei singulis temporibus laborant, designantur: et quia in comparatione reproborum exigua est turba electorum, non inmerito numero 144,000 designatur. In cœlesti vero beatitudine, ubi singulis temporibus ex omnibus gentibus tribus et linguis congregantur, tanta eorum efficitur multitudo, ut nullo numero comprehendi possit.”

The difference of number between the sealed ones and the palm-bearers was afterwards beautifully illustrated by the form of the heavenly Jerusalem, a later symbol of the same collective body of the redeemed in their heavenly glory:—it being a *eube* whose height and length and breadth were equal; whereas each living generation of the sealed ones was but a *square* number, viz. 144, or 12 times 12 chiliads. See *Apoc.* xxi. 16.

² It was said unto them that they should wait “until their brethren, that were to be slain even as they, should be completed.” Which words implied a *second term of tribulation*, as well as second body of martyrs, to succeed after that of the persecutions of Pagan Rome. See pp. 227—233, *suprà*.—“*The great*” tribulation is a term of comparison evidently with some other previous and less tribulation; and might imply its being the *longer* as well as *fiercer* tribulation of the two. Such is the force of the word in the case of the Jews' great tribulation. Compare *Matt.* xxiv. 21 with *Luke* xxi. 24.—As to the historical fact, see what *Gibbon* says, at the conclusion of his chapter on the Pagan Persecutions, about the superior greatness of those that Christians suffered from Papal (so called) Christians. ii. 495, 496.

³ The circumstance of *St. John's* instruction by *one of the presbyters*, as to the meaning of the palm-bearers in the vision, (certainly a remarkable circumstance,) might perhaps be meant to indicate the *scriptural* source of the doctrine thus manifested: in other words, that it would be derived from the scriptures of the twelve apostles: the same that, as I conceive, might be symbolized by twelve of the twenty-four Presbyters, as the heads of the New Testament Church.

⁴ In Roman medals a palm-branch is the perpetual symbol of victory: and hence

tude, or palm-bearing pilgrims after the *Jewish*,¹ into the divine presence.

In truth, it is doubtless very mainly from this evident figuring in the palm-bearing vision of things that were to happen at the consummation that many expositors have adopted views different from my own of the Apocalyptic structure; views such as to refer the whole sixth Seal, its sealing and palm-bearing Visions inclusive, just as well as the last Trumpet and last Vial, to the time of the end.—Now that this structure cannot be the true one, follows as a necessary consequence from the proof of my explanation of all that precedes; (supposing only that that proof be deemed satisfactory;) not to note other clear evidence against the theory, which will however be given by me fully elsewhere.² And I wish besides to add (and I beg the reader's particular attention to it) that there exists, if I mistake not, in the palm-bearing vision itself an internal mark, clear and distinct, though hitherto unobserved by expositors, indicative of the Vision being *necessarily*, so as I explain it, one *prospective* and *anticipative* of a futurity still distant at the æra of the tempest-angels and the sealing. The mark is this,—that *there is no change in the general Apocalyptic scenery during its exhibition*, correspondent with that new state of things which is to be introduced at the *actual* time of the consummation, and of the saints en-

was sometimes sculptured on the tombs of the dead, to betoken the soul's entrance into Elysium. So on that of the Nasoni, in Montfaucon v. 102.—Similarly on the early martyrs' tombs in the Roman catacombs *palm-branches* were often sculptured, in token of their then heavenly triumph and joy. See an example in the Epitaph of a Christian martyr, taken from Boldetti; in my examination of the Church Scheme of the Seals, given in the Appendix to this Volume.

¹ Compare Lev. xxiii. 34—43; "The fifteenth day of the seventh month shall be the feast of tabernacles: . . . And ye shall take you branches of palm-trees, and shall rejoice before the Lord seven days: . . . And ye shall dwell in booths seven days, all that are Israelites: that your generations may know that I made the children of Israel dwell in booths, when I brought them out of the land of Egypt."—Compare too Isa. xii. 3, "With joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation:"—a figure drawn from the same festival. Also Isa. xxxv. 1—10; "The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them, &c. &c. And the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs, and everlasting joy upon their heads: they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away." So again Isa. xxv. 8, &c.—Compare too 1 Macc. xiii. 51.

² Viz. in my Examination of the Church Scheme of the Seals, referred to in the Note next but one preceding, as given in the Appendix to this Volume. The important fact of the sealing vision, with its earth, and sky, and living men, being interposed between the earthquake of the 6th Seal and the palm-bearing vision has been already just hinted at. See p. 250 *suprà*.

tering on their heavenly blessedness. The emblematic inner temple, depicted before St. John on the Apocalyptic visions first opening, and which afterwards continued in view as the perpetual foreground of the scene, with its twenty-four presbyters and four living creatures, the representatives of the separate spirits of the just, in their time of waiting and expectation, around the throne of God and the Lamb,¹ still continued throughout this palm-bearing Vision, just as before, in the heavenly foreground. Nor again is a hint given of any happy change taking place contemporarily in the visible *terrene* landscape. There the angels of the winds seem to have remained still each in his quarter; all ready, as before, to let slip the winds in their fury, the instant that the Almighty restraint upon them might be removed.—Whereas, when the occasion came for representing, in its true order of time, *the actual realization of this blessed consummation*, there was instantly a corresponding change in all the visible scenery; a change such as not the propriety alone, but indeed the very necessity of the case required. Instead of the representative presbyters and living creatures then observing any more their posture of quiescent waiting, new thrones were seen set; and on them the King of kings, the Lord Jesus, took seat, together with all the saints, whom these presbyters and living creatures had hitherto represented, for his assessors.² Moreover the New Jerusalem appeared descending upon earth, with the visible glory of God enlightening it; a glory then no longer hidden within a temple-wall's covering:³ and there was a new heaven and a new earth, the former things having passed away.⁴—So that, whatever the peculiarity of the case, the palm-bearing vision, if judged of simply by the light of its own internal evidence, *could not* depict the saints' consummation of blessedness, *at the real time of its accomplishment* in the calendar of the Apocalyptic chronology. It could only be, so as I have supposed it, a *prospective* vision of the final salvation of the sealed ones of the mystic Israel, given *anticipatively* to St. John, from the

¹ See pp. 86—92.

² Apoc. xx. 4.

³ Apoc. xxi. 22: "And I saw no temple therein; for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it."

⁴ Apoc. xxi. 1.

earlier Apocalyptic epoch of the tempest-threatenings and sealing.—Is it asked, Why such a vision here alone, and not elsewhere? The answer will be found, if I mistake not, in the circumstance of St. John seeing it as a *symbolic* or *representative man*; a principle of Apocalyptic interpretation that now demands our attention. As to the importance of the vision, indeed necessity, in order to the complete figuring of a certain *doctrinal truth*, revealed at the real æra of the threatening tempests and the sealing vision, to those whom the apostle here thus symbolically represented, it will afterwards soon appear.

I. As to the fact that the Evangelist saw, heard, and acted too as a *representative man* on the scene of vision, (a fact just hinted in the Introduction,)¹ we have already, in the vision of the souls under the altar,² had an example of its use and application. It is here first, however, that its application becomes a point of exceeding importance as a principle of interpretation. Which being so, this seems the fittest occasion for our pausing a while well to consider it, and to illustrate the nature and truth of the principle by examples from previous Old Testament prophecy.

It is to be observed then, as remarked long since by Irenæus,³ that the ancient prophets fulfilled their office of predicting, not merely in the verbal delivery of predictions, but by themselves seeing, hearing, or acting out the things in *type*, which were afterwards to be seen, heard, or acted out by others in *reality*:—and this whether in real life, or perchance in vision. In all which cases they were to be considered, as they are called in Isaiah⁴ and in Zechariah,⁵

¹ p. 102.

² pp. 224 et seq.

³ Lib. iv. ch. 37. “Non enim solo sermone prophetabant Prophetæ, sed et visione, et conversatione, et actibus quos faciebant, secundum id quod suggerebat Spiritus: quæ quidem videnda erant videntes, quæ vero audienda erant sermone præconantes, quæ vero agenda erant operatione perficientes; universa vero prophetice annuntiantes.”

⁴ Is. viii. 18; “Behold I and my children are for *signs* and for *wonders* in Israel, from the Lord of Hosts.” On which Patrick observes, “The word *mophthim*, translated *wonders*, signifies here more properly *types* or *figures*.” So too Gesenius on the word מִיִּזְמִי; “typical or symbolical men;” “symbols of future events.”

⁵ iii. 8; where the word is rendered in our version, *men wondered at*.—Compare also Ezek. xii. 11; “Say I am your *sign*: like as *I* have done, so shall it be done to *them*.”

מוֹפְתִים, *mophthim*; that is, *figurative* or *representative persons*.

Thus, to begin with their actings in this character in *real life*, when Isaiah went barefoot, and without his sackcloth-garment, for three days, or years, it was for a sign of *the men of Egypt and Ethiopia* soon walking similarly unclothed, as captives to the king of Assyria.¹—When Jeremiah made yokes, and wore them on his neck in public, he typified, as he declared, *the kings and people of Moab, Edom, Ammon, Tyre, Sidon*, that were soon about to come under the yoke of the king of Babylon.²—When Ezekiel, having portrayed on a tile the city Jerusalem, laid siege thereto by casting up a mound, setting a camp, and planting battering-rams against it, he figured, as was evident, *Nebuchadnezzar* and his besieging army.³ Again, when, as described elsewhere, he publicly prepared his stuff by day for removing through the wall in the twilight, and then carried the stuff forth thereby, as those that flee from captivity, he represented *the Jews* seeking to escape on the capture of Jerusalem by the enemy.⁴ So again when, on the loss of his wife, he was to make no mourning for the dead.⁵ And most generally indeed it was *these, their own people*, that the prophets in such cases typified.⁶

Next, and in nearer parallel with the case of the apostle *St. John* hearing, speaking, and acting representatively, so as we presume him to have done in the Apocalyptic visions, take we cases where the ancient prophets acted as *mophthim*, even while *rapt in vision*.—Such then, 1st, is the example at the beginning of *Isaiah's* prophecy. In that early vision with which he was favoured of Jehovah, upon a throne high and lifted up,⁷ we read of his being solemnly commissioned as a prophet, (after previous purification, through the application of a live coal from the altar,) and then receiving the charge, “Make the heart of this people fat and their ears heavy; lest they see with their eyes, and

¹ Is. xx. 2. See Vitringa or Bp. Lowth in loc.

² Jer. xxvii. 2, &c.

³ Ezek. iv. 1, &c.

⁴ Ezek. xii. 3—7.

⁵ Ezek. xxiv. 16—27.

⁶ For a N. T. example I may mention the case of Agabus, Acts xxi. 11.

⁷ Is. vi. 1, &c. Ireneus, ubi supra, makes Isaiah here symbolic, but somewhat differently.

hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and convert, and be healed." On which the question and answer that followed,—“Then said I, Lord, how long? and he answered, Until the cities be wasted without inhabitant, and the land be utterly desolate,”—showed that the terms of the commission extended to times long subsequent to the prophet's own life, even up to the destruction of Jerusalem; and so had reference not to Isaiah himself only, but to the succession of Prophets long after:—that prophetic line of which, as measured from the epoch of Israel's casting off in Isaiah's days, Isaiah may properly be regarded as the representative and head. Again, in some of the latter chapters of Isaiah's prophecy, especially the 63rd and 64th, another notable exemplification occurs.¹ Rapt into future times, the prophet seems here almost to lose his own personality. His mind and soul being thrown, as it were, into that of the Jewish people, such as it will be developed at the crisis of their restoration, whatever he sees, hears, or speaks, is as their impersonator. It is in this character that he sees and speaks with the Redeemer coming from Bozrah; in this that he mourns over the then state of Jerusalem, “Zion a wilderness, Jerusalem a desolation, our holy and beautiful house burned up with fire;” in this that he expresses both remorse for the past, and concomitant relentings and penitential prayers. To which we may add yet again the case of *Ezekiel* prophesying to the dry bones in the valley of vision; at which prophesying the bones began to move and come together: all this being in type of Israel's latter-day restoration, at the voice of gospel-preachers of that latter day, Ezekiel's successors in the prophetic office.²—And so once more, much the same, in Zechariah's vision of Joshua the High Priest before Jehovah's bar in heaven.³

¹ I think Hengstenberg has vindicated these latter chapters, as Isaiah's *εν εκστασει*.

² Ezek. xxxvii. 7, &c.

³ Zech. iii. 8. For it was *in the vision* which Joshua was depicted as having had of the Angel Jehovah that he was told, “Hear now, Joshua, thou and thy fellows are *mophthim* ;” —i. e. figurative men. After which followed the prophecy of the Branch, and then the vision of the golden candlestick and two olive trees: to which latter vision it will be necessary to revert when considering the description of the two Apocalyptic Witnesses in Apoc. xi. 4.—In Dr. McCaul's edition of Kimchi on Zechariah there is given a very interesting and elaborate explanation of the prophecy in

Thus, I think, we have all that can be needful to satisfy us on the soundness of the hermeneutic principle in question. And, its soundness and propriety thus established, how can the thought help striking us, with reference to its application to the visions of the Apocalypse, that, if important to the understanding of *other* Scripture prophecy, it must be pre-eminently so in the Apocalyptic:—seeing that, whereas other prophetic visions were insulated and detached, those of the Apocalypse form a continuous chronological series: so that at each chief crisis in the history of the true Christian Church and ministry, we must expect St. John in his seeings and doings to enact a varying representative part; accordantly with the seeings and doings of those represented by him at each æra respectively. Thus the principle will be no barren one, such as it has been in the hands of the older interpreters *Tichonius*, *Primasius*, *Andreas of Casarea*, *Ambrosius Ansbertus*, &c.: and of certain modern expositors too of eminence, as *Vitringa* and *Daubuz*; who, though recognising the principle, have yet altogether failed to work it out with consistency or advantage. In the present Commentary the reader has already seen its use and truth, on a minor scale, in the vision of the souls under the altar.¹ Elsewhere, where St. John is described as something more than a mere observer, he will find it applied with results more new, striking, and important, towards the elucidation of the prophecy. Most of all this will appear in my explanation of the *present* two-fold Vision of the sealing and the palm-bearers; and in that of the *later* Vision of the rainbow-crowned Angel in Apoc. x, xi; the latter the very fellow or sister-vision, if I may so say, to the former.

For, as regards the twofold vision now under consideration, if the *sealing* vision first seen by him was one figurative, not of events cognizable in real life by mortal eyes, or of the visible actings on the Roman mundane scene of a *visible Providence*, but of certain *invisible and spiritual actings* by Christ Jesus, whereby to constitute and mark out for himself an election of grace, as his true Israel from

Zech. xi, of the shepherd priced at thirty pieces of silver, on this same principle. pp. 138—147. See too Lowth on either of these passages. ¹ See p. 224 *suprà*.

amidst the professing, his spiritual Church from amidst the formal,—then the Evangelist's seeing this must have indicated a perception *on the part of apostolic men of the depicted era, such as he was then impersonating*, of those self-same spiritual actings of Christ; and of the so constituted true Church of the elect.—Moreover the added *palm-bearing* vision must have indicated that the view of Christ's true Church, thus strikingly revealed to those whom St. John here represented, embraced the far future respecting it, as well as the present:—the perpetuation of this true Church in its integrity, amidst the already-gathering tempests of the political world, and through the great predicted tribulation of the coming apostasy and Antichrist; (a perpetuation of it which forms a prominent subject in fact in all the subsequent figurations of the Apocalypse;¹) and, in fine,

¹ For these 144,000, or *sealed ones*, God's election of grace, are alluded to afterwards as a succession still existing on the earthly scene, undestroyed by the tempests of the four first trumpets,* in contrast with the perpetual succession, generation after generation, of what are called the *inhabitants of the earth*, or children of this world, alike at the opening of the judgments of the fifth Trumpet,† and also both during, and up to the close of, the Beast Antichrist's reign.‡ Further, on the blast of the seventh Trumpet, they are described as *all*, both dead and living, being about collectively to receive reward, on Christ's taking the kingdom; the identity of the *rewarded ones* of that final Trumpet with the *sealed ones* of chap. vii being evinced by their having attached to them the same designatives, elsewhere attached to the 144,000 also, of *God's saints* and *servants*:§ and finally, as already elsewhere noted,|| their constituting the whole citizen population of the New Jerusalem.

* The correspondence of the fearful tempests which, on the soundings of the four first Trumpets, after the seventh Seal's opening, fell upon the Roman *earth, trees, sea, and sky*, (viii. 7, &c.) with those which the four angels of the winds pictured in this viith chapter were, just before that Seal's opening, spoken of as destined to cause,—the commission of these latter being (so soon as the time of respite was ended) to “blow on the *earth, trees, and sea*,”—is almost too obvious to need suggestion to the reader.

† On the fifth Trumpet sounding, Apoc. ix. 4, the scorpion-locusts, which constituted its woe, are said to have had the charge given them to “hurt only those men that had not *the seal of God* in their foreheads:”—a charge implying that there were others on the scene of action who bore *that seal's impress*, and were not to be hurt.

‡ Apoc. xiv. 1; “I looked, and lo a Lamb stood on Mount Zion, and with him 144,000, having *his Father's name* written on their foreheads.” This is in contradistinction to the mass of the Apocalyptic earth's inhabitants, that had *the Beast's name and mark* on their right hand or foreheads (xiii. 16); and consequently, in respect of *time*, a symbolization synchronous with the Beast's reign, or some part of it.

§ Compare Apoc. vii. 3, “till we have sealed the *servants of God* in their foreheads,” with what is said, viii. 3, just after the sealing and palm-bearing visions, of the “prayers of *all the saints*;” evidently meaning those of the *sealed ones*. (So too xiii. 7, 10, xiv. 12, &c.) Also Apoc. xi. 18: “The time is come that thou shouldest give reward unto *thy servants*, the prophets, and the *saints*, and them that fear thy name, both small and great:”—in which passage I think the expression, “*thy servants*,” was intended to include not the prophets only, but the rest of the saints, also specified.

|| See p. 276 supra.

the realization by the whole collective body of its many successive generations, and by each and all of its individual members, of the blessedness of accomplished salvation, and glory of the beatific vision.

II. And can it be shown then that there were those of the true apostolic line of ministry, at the close of the 4th century, to whom a revelation about Christ's true Church, as thus distinct from the professing, thus constituted, thus characterized, thus tried, thus preserved, even unto the end, was thus strikingly given:—a revelation so remarkable in itself, and so important in its results, as well to mark it out as a fit subject of Apocalyptic prefiguration? We ask the question; and the answer is given decisively, and at once, in the single word, AUGUSTINE.

Let me 1st briefly note the chief events of the life of this eminent servant of God, in chronological order; 2ndly the view imprest on him, and which he was the chosen instrument for communicating largely to others, respecting *Christ's true Church*, (a view that may be called characteristically *Augustinian*,) on the various points that we have been considering.

1. As to the *chronology* of Augustine's life, the dates of its chief epochs may be stated as follows.¹ He was born near Hippo, in North Africa, A.D. 354, during the reign of Constantius. He went to Rome, and thence to Milan, A.D. 383, 384; shortly after the fatal battle of Adrianople had, agreeably with the Apocalyptic prefiguration, established the Gothic hosts on the Roman earth:² (that "tempest of barbarians" which, to use Gibbon's illustrative words yet again, "was so soon to subvert the foundations of Roman greatness:") and when Theodosius, raised up by an extraordinary intervention of Providence for the purpose, had been enabled, still accordantly with the prophecy, effectually to arrest them. There and then he heard the Bishop

¹ I follow the dates given in the Life prefixed to the last Volume of the Benedictine Edition of Augustine; Paris, 1836; to which Edition my subsequent references are made.

² "I saw four angels standing on the four corners of the earth, holding the four winds," &c.—Compare Ezek. vii. 2; "An end is come on the four corners of the land:" said with reference to the time when the woe had actually arrived there.

of Milan, Ambrose; and was converted, and baptized. This was between the years 385 and 387. In 388 he returned, a changed man, and with changed views, to Carthage; was in 391 ordained Presbyter, and in 395 Bishop of Hippo, near Carthage; the last shortly after the death of Theodosius,¹ and consequent loosing of the four winds. His episcopate and life continued for near thirty-five years afterwards. At length, when the tempests which had during all that time been desolating the European or *land* provinces of the empire, crossing the *sea*, began to make their ravages felt in the *African transmarine province* also,²—just then, the great work assigned him by his Divine Master having been completed, and as if the tempests' reaching him had been the signal preordained for his death, he was taken from the evil to come, and fell asleep in Jesus, the 25th of August, A.D. 430.

2. As to his most characteristic views of divine truth, we find them from the very first³ to have had reference to two things, and those the self-same two things that are most prominent in the Apocalyptic visions before us:—viz. 1st, that of *Christ's true Church* consisting of real spiritual believers, simply and alone, contradistinctively not merely to heathens, heretics, and schismatics, but also to the mere formal professing corporate Church of the baptized; 2ndly, that of the origin and formation of this true Church as the work of *divine sovereign grace*:—of grace electing, preventing, quickening, illuminating, adopting, saving: saving alike from sin's dominion, and from all other *real* evils of this life,⁴ and saving unto the end. So copious is he on this subject, and so much is it his own, that his name has in fact been associated with it in all subsequent ages;—I mean his own, in contradistinction to other con-

¹ Jan. 395.

² "Hurt not the *land*, nor the *sea*, till we have sealed," &c. Apoc. vii. 3.

³ His earliest Treatise, according to the Chronology of his Life by the Benedictines, was the "*De Moribus Ecclesie Catholice*," written A. D. 388, before returning from Italy to Carthage. Also A. D. 388 he began his three Books *De Libero Arbitrio*. And in 394, while yet a Presbyter, he published among other works his "*Inchoata Expositio*" on the Epistle to the *Romans*, and his *Exposition of the Epistle to the Galatians*. The reader should bear these dates in mind, when reference is made to these Treatises.

⁴ See p. 310, Note ⁴, infra.

temporary or preceding *human* teachers of theology. For from the time of Justin Martyr, downward, this doctrine of grace had been by the doctors of the Church very partially propounded and obscurely taught.¹

The manner in which he was himself *prepared* by Divine Providence to understand and feel its truth and value, and the manner in which by the same Providence he was *led* zealously and effectively to advocate it, alike deserve notice. Born of a Christian mother, and at one time anxious while a boy for Christian baptism, (it was on occasion of a dangerous illness,) his wish was strangely not complied with; the danger of sin after baptism, according to the current superstition of the day, constituting an objection in the minds of his parents.² So that he grew up into life not even by baptism, or outward profession, a Christian. In the course of his youth and early manhood, that followed, he tells us in his Confessions how he was led captive by his lusts: and then how, in the desolation of a mind dark, restless, and unhappy, he wandered into speculations on man's formation, and the origin of evil; and at length in the sensual and fatalistic doctrines of Manicheism,³—doctrines which alike did away with all idea of holiness and love attaching to God, and of moral guilt and responsibility attaching to sinful man,—sought refuge from himself, but in vain.—It was in this state of heathenism, sensuality, hardness of heart, and philosophic pride and darkness, that he visited Milan, and heard, and was converted to Christianity. Thus was he plucked like a brand out of the

¹ So Milner, Cent. v. 2, p. 297, remarks that *Chrysostom*, in commenting on that passage 'Not of him that willeth, nor of him that runueth,' &c., "introduces the doctrine of *free-will* in the same manner as most of the Fathers did who spoke of it at all, from the days of *Justin*; and observes that the *whole* is said to be of God because the *greater part* is." At p. 276 he remarks somewhat similarly of *Ambrose*.—Compare Justin Martyr's 2nd Apology, p. 80 (Ed. Colon.); and *Tertullian* adv. Marc. ii. 5; on the subject of free-will.

In Mr. Faber's historical Work on the Primitive Doctrine of Election, the *patristic novelty* of the Augustinian doctrine is the foundation of his argument. He appeals against it to *pure primitive consenting antiquity*.—But where, let me ask, was the doctrine of *pure antiquity* to be found, except in the *apostolic* writings; seeing that *the leaven of the apostasy* was to begin its insidious working in the Church visible even from apostolic times?

² So he tells us in his Confessions i. 11; "quia videlicet post lavaerum illud major et periculosior in sordibus delictorum reatus foret."

³ A sketch of this doctrine, very much drawn from Augustine, will be found in a later portion of this work. See my paper No 3, in the Appendix to Vol. ii.

burning ; and made to feel in his own experience, *while yet unbaptized*, both the truth of God's free, sovereign, electing, enlightening, converting grace ; and the fact too of God's *true Church* being constituted, just as in the sealing vision, distinctively and only of those that had felt and been sanctified by the same divine influence.¹ And so he began, we find, very early afterwards, (in fact ere the fury of the barbarian tempests had yet been let loose on Roman Christendom,) both to preach, and to write, on this subject of God's free grace towards his true Church ;² and about that true Church as thus chosen, thus sanctified, thus sealed with God's likeness. Very soon the view of the *final perseverance* of the saints was added to his other views of Divine grace :³ the same that was implied in the immediately appended vision of the palm-bearers ; " After this I beheld, and lo a great multitude," &c.—A few years later the diffusion of the *Pelagian* heresy of *free-will* drew from him argumentative and copious dissertations on the whole subject : and, under his direction, ecclesiastical Councils were induced solemnly to condemn the Pelagian error ; and solemnly at the same time to recognise the doctrines of God's free grace as operating in his Church of the really faithful.⁴

¹ So in his *De Mor. Eccl. Cath.* c. 75, he charges the Manichees, to whom it was addressed, not to object to what he said of real vital Christianity the evil morals or superstitions of many vain professors of the Christian name. " Look not," says he, at the " *turmas imperitorum, qui vel in ipsâ verâ religione superstitiosi sunt, vel ita libidinibus dediti ut oblitii sint quid promiserint Deo:*" or at the many whom he knew to be " *sepulchrorum et picturarum adoratores, &c.:*" (a passage which I shall refer to again on *Apoc. viii.* 3 :) adding that these were but the tares among the wheat, or chaff in the threshing-floor. As to the true servants of God, it was all (c. 28, 29, &c.) through Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God, (that light which was the life of men,) that the life is given : love of God being the master-principle infused in the heart, because he first loved us ; and God's own likeness the seal stamped by the Holy Spirit.

² See, for example, his *Inchoata Expositio Epistolæ ad Romanos*, written while he was yet a Presbyter, 1, 7, 8, &c.

³ In later years, when charged with innovation on the doctrines of grace, election, and perseverance, he says that he *wrote* on the subject as early as the beginning of his bishoprick, A.D. 395. See his statements to this effect *Tom. xiii.* col. 1353, 1354, &c., also col. 1434, 1435, in his *Treatises on the Predestination and Perseverance of the Saints*; to which allusion will again be made *Note* ³ p. 313 *infra*.

Compare his *Comment on the Epistle to the Galatians*, written in 394, ch. 31, 40, 46, 61, where the same views appear.

⁴ So the Councils of Carthage, held A.D. 412 and 416. See *Harduin*, i. 1214 ; and for Rome's primary anti-Pelagian declaration, *Hard.* i. 1255 : also *Mosheim* v. 2. 5. 23, 24 ; who says that Pelagius looked on the doctrine of the original corruption of human nature, and the *necessity of divine grace to enlighten the understanding, and purify the heart*, as prejudicial to the progress of virtue."—*Milner*, p. 322, notes, as I do, God's providence in the matter.

Further, on occasion of Alaric's capture of Rome, A.D. 410, the heathens that remained having cast reproach on Christianity, as if the cause of the catastrophe, and Christians too being disappointed and in bitterness, such as had entertained hopes and opinions, like Eusebius before them,¹ that there would attach a preservative virtue to the Roman Empire in the fact of its political and professed Christianization,—he was led to write his great work on the *City of God*:² (of the main characteristic idea of which work we see the germ even in his earliest Treatises:) it being his object therein to distinguish this *city, commonwealth, or kingdom of God*, from the *city, commonwealth, or kingdom of this world*, alike in respect of its *constituency, character, privileges, present state, home, destiny*:—its *constituency*, the whole body (not of the circumcised,³ or baptized, or professing, many of whom though *called* were not *chosen*,⁴ but) of the predestinated and elect by God's sovereign grace; their *character*, that of the love of God, contradistinctively to the love of self and this world;⁵ their *privilege*, that of being enlightened, quickened, sanctified, and saved

¹ See pp. 256, 257 *suprà*.—In a work by Cosmas Indicopleustes, of the later date of Justinian, I find him declaring that the Roman Empire, being identified with Christianity, and in fact Daniel's kingdom of the saints, (Dan. vii. 14.) would be eternal: (B. ii, p. 147:) μετεχει η βασιλεια των Ρωμαιων των αξιωματων της βασιλειας τα δεσποτα Χριστη.

² *De Civitate Dei*. Our word *city* can scarcely convey the idea that *civitas* does, of a *community, or state*, made up of its citizens. "Civitas nihil aliud est quam hominum multitudo aliquo societatis vinculo colligata." C. D. xv. 8. 2.

³ Under the law.

⁴ So C. D. i. 35, "De falsis intrâ ecclesiam Christianis:" and xviii. 49, headed, "De indiscretâ multiplicatione Ecclesie, quâ in hoc sæculo multi reprobi miscentur electis." &c. Also ib. 51. 2; "Multi sunt intus qui corda piè viventium suis perditis moribus cruciant."—In C. D. i. 35 he speaks of the *Civitas Dei* having many connected with it by the tie of sacramental communion, during its state of earthly pilgrimage, who will not be with it in the saints' eternal blessedness: and, xx. 7. 3, distinguishes between the *regenerate* (by baptism), and the *elect* (the citizens of the Jerusalem above); saying that the former are often seduced by the devil, i. e. to perdition, the *elect* never.

So, too, often elsewhere. E. g. Vol. iv. 2508, in his Tract on 1 John ii. 18, § 5, "They went out from us because they were not of us;" "Multi qui non sunt ex nobis accipiunt nobiscum sacramenta, accipiunt nobiscum baptismum, . . . et quidquid in sacramentis sanctis est; ipsius altaris communicationem accipiunt nobiscum; et non sunt ex nobis." Again De Correp. et Grat. c. 21, 22 (Vol. xiii. 1297); "Fuerunt ergo isti ex multitudine vocatorum; ex paucitate electorum non fuerunt." Also Epis. 93, Vol. ii. 366; &c. &c.

⁵ C. D. xiv. 28; "Fecerunt civitates duas amores duo: *terrenam* scilicet amor sui, usque ad contemptum Dei; *celestem* vere amor Dei, usque ad contemptum sui."

So too on Psalm lxiv. § 2: "Duas istas civitates faciunt duo amores: Jerusalem facit amor Dei; Babyloniam facit amor seculi." And, again, in the Treatise De Genesi ad Litt. xi. 20. (Vol. iii. 452.)

by the same divine grace, even to the end; their *state in this world* that of pilgrims and strangers, with warfare and tribulation here appointed them; but with the assured *hope* of being all gathered at length to their heavenly *home*, in the Saviour's presence. In short it was the *very embodiment of the idea of the 144,000 elect sealed ones of the Apocalyptic vision into a corporate form*; and both historically with regard to the past, and prophetically with regard to the future, the tracing out of their fortunes in this world and also in the next, contradistinctively to those of the kingdom of *this world*, and its citizens.

Even in regard of *details*, it will be found, his description of this body of the elect agrees most exactly with that in the symbolic visions under consideration. He speaks of them as not merely *elect Israelites*,¹ but specifically as God's twelve tribes of election out of Israel's twelve professing tribes; ² and, further too, as of the constituency of the New Jerusalem.³ He asserts their *inviolability*, as *God's sealed ones*, from real injury by the Devil, or any of his instruments.⁴ He notes the *number* as a number *definite*,⁵

¹ So C. D. xx. 21, "Fratres electorum Israelitarum, adducturos ex omnibus gentibus." Again on Psalm xlix. § 14: "*Israel nomen electionis est*;" Psalm cxiii. § 2, "Nullus Christianorum se à nomine Israel arbitretur alienum."

² On Psalm cxxi, "Thither the tribes go up," § 8; "Duodecim tribus erant populi Israel; sed erant ibi mali, et erant ibi boni. . . Quid est *tribus Domini*? Quæ cognoverunt Dominum. Ex ipsis enim duodecim tribubus malis erant ibi boni de bonis tribubus; . . et ipsa erant grana inter illas tribus, quæ inter paleas commixta sunt. *Ascenderunt autem non cum paleis, sed tribus purgatæ, electæ, quasi tribus Domini.*" Again on Psalm cxxxiv. § 7, he distinguishes the "*Israel Dei*," or "*Israel pertinentem ad Deum.*"

³ "Civitatem sanctam Jerusalem, quæ nunc in sanctis fidelibus est diffusa per terras:" C. D. xx. 21. 3:—including, as another part of its citizens, the saints and angels above; "Est in cælo æterna nostra Jerusalem, ubi sunt cives nostri angeli," &c. Ps. cxxi. § 2. So too in his early work on the Epistle to the Galatians, c. 24.

⁴ C. D. xviii. 51. 1; "Diabolus, princeps impiæ civitatis, adversus peregrinantem in hoc mundo Civitatem Dei, vasa propria commovendo, nihil ei nocere permittitur:" and in C. D. i. 10 he particularizes; stating that the good had lost nothing of a Christian's real wealth in the taking of Rome.

Again in Tract. 50 on John xi. 55, he says; "Signum Christi à nobis repellit exterminatorem, si cor nostrum habeat Christum habitatorem," with allusion to the destroying angel of Exod. xii.: contrasting this with the mere *outward* signature in baptism; "Multi facillè habent in *fronte* signum Christi, et *corde* non recipiunt verbum Christi."—In Sermon 156. 16 (vii. 1092, &c.) he dwells on the Spirit of adoption, sealing true Christians, as their *arrhabo* or *pledge* of salvation:—*his* being the "*unctio spiritalis*," (Vol. iv. 2509) ejus sacramentum est in unctione *visibili*."

⁵ E. g. Epist. 186. 25; "Certus est ergo Dei præscientiæ definitus numerus, et multitudo sanctorum: quibus diligentibus Deum, quod eis donavit per diffusum in cordibus eorum Spiritum Sanctum, omnia co-operantur in bonum. Quos enim prædestinavit," &c. Also De Corrept. et Gratiâ, 40; "Numerus sanctorum per Dei

and answering, while on earth, to the Apocalyptic 144,000 :¹ moreover as one, though small in comparison at any given period with the number of the reprobate, yet in itself and in the aggregate very large ; indeed, (for more than once he quotes in proof the very words of the *palm-bearing vision*), as *a number numberless*.² He speaks of them as to be gathered out of *all nations and kindreds and tribes* ;³ and of the remaining time consequently of the Church's pilgrimage and tribulation, including specially that of Antichrist's predicted persecution,⁴ as probably by no means so short or near its ending, as Hesychius and others, like many of the Fathers before them, had been led to expect.⁵ He describes them, moreover, as washed and made white

gratiam Dei regno prædestinatus, donatâ sibi etiam usque in finem perseverantiâ, ille integer perducetur ; et illic integerrimus jam sine fine beatissimus servabitur : adherente sibi misericordiâ Salvatoris sui, sive cum convertuntur, sive cum præliantur, sive cum coronantur."

¹ De Doctr. Christ. iii. 51 ; "Centum quadraginta quatuor (mille), quo numero significatur universitas sanctorum in Apocalypsi."

² E. g. in his Sermons, 249, 250, on the narrative of the disciples fishing, given in John xxi. 3—11 ; Vol. vii. pp. 1500, 1506. In this world, he says, speaking of the mixed number of fish through which the ship was nearly sinking, the Church (the visible Church) has in it many bad ; "Turba turbavit ecclesiam :"—then, with regard to the 153 fish drawn to land, that it represents the collective body of the *true* saints, gathered together at the resurrection. "Tunc congregatio sanctorum erit ; divisiones hereticorum non erunt. Pax erit, et perfecta unitas. Nemo minus, nemo plus erit. Integer numerus erit. Sed valde pauci sunt, si 153 tantum sunt. Absit a nobis ut tot soli sint in hâc plebe : quanto magis in universâ ecclesiâ Dei ! Apocalypsis ipsius Johannis Evangelistæ ostendit visam fuisse tantam multitudinem sanctorum, et in illâ æternitate felicium, quantum numerare nemo possit. . . Et tamen omnes ad numerum istum pertinet, 153."—So too Epist. 93. 30 ; where also (after noting the paucity of the saints, as compared with the reprobate) he refers to the palm-bearing vision as making their ultimate congregated number numberless ; "Millia que numerare nemo potest videntur in Apocalypsi, ex omni tribu et linguâ, in stolis albis palmisque victricibus."

³ C. D. xix. 17 ; "Hæc cœlestis civitas (vel potius pars ejus quæ in hâc mortalitate peregrinatur) . . . dum peregrinatur in terrâ, ex omnibus gentibus cives evocat, atque in omnibus linguis peregrinam colligit societatem."—So too in his early comment on the Epist. ad Galat. c. 24 ; noting the ingathering as going on "usque in finem sæculi."

⁴ C. D. xxi. 26. 4.—Also, very similarly, on Psalm xlix. 22 ; "Cujus tribulationis ? Nostræ peregrinationis :"—including the many usual trials of mortal life, the trial of persecution, and crowning tribulation of *Antichrist's persecutions and reign*, at the close. "Martyrum numerus complebitur Antichristi temporibus," says Augustine : (Contra Gaudent. i. 31 ; Vol. xii. 999 :) these martyrs being the *final* complement, he adds, of the number *afterwards to be killed*, referred to by the *souls under the altar*.

⁵ So Epist. 93. 31 ; "Ecclesia, quæ per omnes gentes crescit, in frumentis Dominicis conservata est ; et usque in finem, donec omnino gentes omnes etiam barbaras teneat, conservabitur." Also Epist. 197—199, referred to by me in a later Chapter ; (see Part ii. ch. iii. infra :) expressing his conviction of the world not being then very near its end, because the Gospel had not then by any means been preached to all nations. See too his observations on Luke xii. 45, and Matt. xxiv. 42.

through the alone cleansing blood of Jesus :¹ and, yet once more, as in their heavenly blessedness destined to realize, like the Apocalyptic palm-bearers, alike the type of Israel's rest and festival-keeping in Canaan, after its long and weary wilderness wandering,² and also the Paradisiacal emblems in the Old Testament and Apocalyptic prefigurations of heaven ;³ there to see God,⁴ to drink of God's own foun-

¹ "In Apocalypsi, revelante Angelo, Joannes vidit turbam multam quam dinumerare nemo poterat. Hanc requirens quænam esset, responsum accepit, Hi sunt qui laverunt stolas eorum, et candidas eas fecerunt in sanguine Agni. Jam agnoscis, anima Christiana, quemadmodum et tu ex illo sanguine efficiaris candida : " &c. So in the De Culturâ Agri Dom. Vol. ix. p. 1004.

The Benedictine Editors doubt this Treatise being Augustine's. If not, it was the treatise of an early Augustinian ; and agreeable with Augustine's own doctrine. So in his Speculum, Vol. iii. p. 1238, in illustration of the statement, "There shall enter into the city nothing that is defiled," (coinquinatum,) he cites Apoc. xxii. 14, as with the reading *μακαριοι οι πλυνοντες τας στολας αυτων*, "Blessed are they that wash their robes in the blood of the Lamb, that they may have right to the tree of life, and to enter the holy city." And on Joh. xix. 34, (Vol. iv. 2443,) "They pierced his side, and forthwith came thereout blood and water," he exclaims, "Quid isto sanguine mundius? [in the active sense evidently of more cleansing:] Quid vulnere isto salubrius?" So again on Psalm cxxx. 4, (Vol. vi. 2074,) "There is mercy (*propitiatio*, Aug.) with thee," "Quæ est ista propitiatio nisi sacrificium . . . quod pro nobis oblatum est? Sanguis innocens fusus delevit omnia peccata nocentium." See too his remarks in C. D. x. 22, 24; and the application of the blessed truth to his own case in his Confessions, x. 43, cited p. 342 infra.

With all this contrast Tertullian's explanation of the Apocalyptic cleansing. After the question, "Quinam isti tam beati victores nisi propriè martyres?" he proceeds thus: "Innumera multitudo albat, et palmis victoriæ insignes, revelantur, sc. de Antichristo triumphales; sicut unus de Presbyteris, 'Hi sunt qui veniunt ex illâ pressurâ magnâ, &c.' . . . Vestitus enim animæ caro: sordes quidem *baptismate* abluuntur; maculæ vero *martyrio* candidantur." Scorp. adv. Gnostic, c. 12.—Compare too Ephrem Syrus, cited p. 280 Note ¹ supra. Also Ambros. de Myst. cap. 7. and Apol. David. cap. 12, to the same effect.

² In the C. D. God's Church is continually spoken of as peregrinans, like Israel in this world. In Tract xxviii, on John vii. § 9, "The Jews' feast of tabernacles was at hand," Augustine similarly compares the Christian's pilgrimage through this world to Israel's through the wilderness; and observes that as Christ's time, so the Church's time for celebrating that commemorative festival, is not till its arrival in a better world. Vol. iv. pp. 2002, 2003. So again Psalm lxxii. 5; "Quidquid in eremo passus est ille populus, et quidquid eis Deus largitus est, . . . significationes sunt rerum quas in solitudine hujus vitæ ambulantes in Christo, quærentes patriam, accipimus ad consolationem, et patimur ad probationem."

³ C. D. xx. 26. 1; "Illud tempus, quantum attinet ad non habere peccatum, nulli temporî comparandum est nisi quando primi homines in Paradiso ante prævaricationem innocentissimâ felicitate vixerunt." This of their freedom from sin. Then he applies to it Isaiah's prophecies about the new heaven and earth, Isa. lxy, lxi; "Per Isaiam, inter cætera quæ ibi de sanctorum beatitudine per allegorias et ænigmata exsequitur," &c. So again, C. D. xxii. 3.

See too the exquisite passage in his De Cantico Novo, Vol. ix. 1000; "patria ejus cives angeli sunt, ejus templum Deus, ejus splendor Filius, ejus charitas Spiritus Sanctus: civitas sancta, civitas beata! . . . Cum illic venerimus non ibi esuriemus, aut sitiemus. Visio ipsa satiætas nostra erit. . . Videre Deum! vivere cum Deo! &c."

⁴ "Locus qui promittitur tam pacatæ ac securæ habitationis æternus est . . . ubi erit veraciter populus *Israel*. Hoc enim nomen interpretatur *Videns Deum*."

tain of life and knowledge,¹ and to have all tears wiped by Him from their eyes.²

Such were Augustine's *doctrinal views of divine grace*; such of *Christ's true Church* of the election of grace; doctrines learnt not from patristic doctors, but, as he tells us, from the teaching of an apostle, (even as from one of the enthroned presbyters in vision,) under the immediate revelation of the Holy Ghost:³ and to prefigure which revelation,—regarding as it did the *future* as well as *present*, the saints' *final perseverance to salvation*, as well as their *election by grace*,—there was needed, we now see, not the saints' *sealing* vision alone, but the prospective vision of the *palm-bearing* saints also, in their final triumph.—Indeed I must beg the reader, ere he passes onward, just to pause and think with himself, whether he can possibly imagine any two symbolic figurations that would more exactly symbolize the doctrinal revelations made to Augustine, than these two that were exhibited, at the exactly correspondent epoch in the Patmos visions, to the representative man St. John.

3. Finally, I have to observe on the manner in which, through the divine overruling providence, it was both suitable and effectual, even beyond Augustine's own intentions,

¹ "In illo regno quæ bona accepturi sumus! . . Rerum ibi omnium quanta, quàm speciosa, quàm certa scientia! ubi Dei sapientia de ipso suo fonte potabitur." &c. C. D. xxii. 24. 5.

² C. D. xx. 17; "In Libro Apocalypsis obscurè multa dicuntur. . . Verùm in his verbis, 'Absterget Deus omnem lachrymam ab oculis eorum, et mors jam non erit, neque luctus, &c., tantâ luce dicta sunt de seculo futuro, et immortalitate sanctorum, . . ut nulla debeamus in litteris sacris quærere vel legere manifesta, si hæc putaverimus obscura.'"

³ While faintly referring to three of the Fathers as having held the doctrine before him, he rests on the apostolic Scriptures as his true authority; and especially on *St. Paul*. Moreover, in singular accordance with the form of the visions before us, he speaks of it as made by a kind of revelation to him. So in the *Treatise on Predestination*, Tom. xiii. Col. 1353, speaking of the primary battling in his own mind in favour of the doctrine of man's free will, and manner in which he was forced by *St. Paul's* saying, 1 Cor. iv. 7, "What hast thou which thou hast not received, &c." to recognise the doctrines of grace, he speaks of this as *a revelation to him through the apostle's testimony*:—"Dixi hoc apostolico præcipuè testimonio me esse convictum; cum de hæc re aliter saperem, quàm mihi Deus in hæc quæstione solvendâ revelavit." On which the *Benedictine* Editor thus comments: "Revelatum id sibi à Deo dicit, quia non ingenio et sagacitati suæ, sed divinæ gratiæ adjutorio tribuendum censet quòd hoc ipsum de quo aliter sapiebat, considerato attentius Apostoli testimonio, tandem intellexerit."—Writing to *Prosper* and *Hilary*, he recommends prayer that God would be pleased to *reveal* the doctrine to them. Ib. i. 2. See *Faber* on *Election*, p. 128.

as an antidote with the faithful against the *baptismal*, as well as other, corruptions of the age.—In so far as controversy in the matter was concerned, Augustine's direct object was not correction of the baptismal and ritualistic errors, now more and more prevailing, but of the Pelagian doctrines of man's free-will, merit, and inherent inborn power for working out his salvation. Indeed, though he distinguished carefully, as may be seen, between *baptismal* regeneration and the regeneration or conversion of *the heart*,¹—to which last change *personal faith in Christ* was deemed by him essential,²—though conscious, from observation of men around him, that the baptized did not in the majority of cases profit unto spiritual life,³ as well as of their abuse of the baptismal rite, and on the other hand conscious *from his own experience*,⁴ (as well as from the examples of the

¹ "In baptizatis infantibus præcedit regenerationis sacramentum: et, si Christianam tenuerint pietatem, sequetur etiam in corde conversio; cujus mysterium præcessit in corpore. . . Quibus rebus ostenditur aliud esse sacramentum baptismi, aliud conversionem cordis." Adding; "Illud (sacramentum baptismi) sine isto (conversione cordis) potest esse in infante, et hoc sine illo potuit esse in latrone;" &c. *Contrà Donat.* iv. 31, 32.—See on this Faber on Election, pp. 82—89. "Nothing is more evident," says Mr. Faber, p. 89, "than that what *Augustine* in the case of baptized infants styles *conversion*, is precisely that *moral change of disposition* which *Calvin* universally, and in all cases, denominates *regeneration*." The same is illustrated in Mr. Faber's Work on Regeneration, pp. 67, 209, &c.

Compare what Augustine says in his earliest Treatise, *De Mor. Cath. Eccl.* c. 80. "Illo sacrosancto lavacro inchoatur innovatio novi hominis, ut proficiendo perficiatur, in aliis citius, in aliis tardius: à multis tamen proceditur in novam vitam, si quisquam non inimicè, sed diligenter intendat."—Also in his next Treatise on the Epistle to the Romans: "Many," says he, c. 16, negligently educated, after baptism "per ignorantie tenebras vitam turpissimam ducunt: nescientes omnino quid Christiana disciplina jubeat aut vetet, quid polliceatur et quid minetur, quid credendum, quid sperandum, quid diligendum."

² "Sic enim caro nostra regenerabitur per incorruptionem, quemadmodum est anima nostra regenerata per *fidem*." *C. D.* xx. 5. 3. Also *Epist.* 217. 10: "Veracissima Scriptura dixit, omne quod non est *ex fide* peccatum est:" &c. Adding; "Nihil sic agit Princeps tenebrarum ut non *eredatur* in Deum, nec ad Mediatorem credendo veniatur." To which effect our Homily on Faith also cites Augustine.

³ "Si non nascitur ex Spiritu nisi qui veraci conversione mutatur, omnes qui sæculo verbis et non factis renunciant non utique de Spiritu, sed ex aquâ solâ nascuntur." And again; "In illis sunt concupiscentiæ tales quos Apostolus, *jam per sacramentum Novi Testamenti natos*, adhuc tamen dicit animales non posse percipere quæ sunt Spiritus Dei." *Contrà Donat.* i. 24. See too the extract given Note ⁴ p. 310; and others in Faber on Regeneration, 57, &c.

⁴ Here we may mark the importance of the fact of his conversion taking place before baptism. So he describes it distinctly in his Confessions, ix. 1. "Was it my will, or words, or deeds that have done it? No, but thou, Lord, good and merciful, and thy right hand, looking at the depth of my death, and exhausting the abyss of corruption from the bottom of my heart. In a moment my natural evil will was changed; so that I bowed my neck to thy easy yoke, Christ Jesus my helper and Redeemer! Thou ejectedst those delightful vanities, O my true delight, and enteredst in their room. I communed with thee, my light, my riches, my Saviour, my

Ethiopian eunuch and others,¹) that spiritual life might be begun before and independent of baptism, yet did he entertain a high opinion of the benefits often conferred by baptism, or rather by the Divine Spirit *in* baptism; that is, if rightly performed, and followed by faith in the recipient.² And thus it was that his doctrine of electing preserving grace obtained a general sanction and credence in the professing Church, Rome itself assenting,³ (and this indeed the rather, because pure Pelagianism tended to make men independent of the *ecclesiastical* system of salvation, which Rome fondly cherished, as well as of Augustine's more *spiritual* and *scriptural* system,) such as the eloquence, talents, episcopal authority, and weight of character, with which God had endowed this his eminent servant and instrument, influential as they were, would by themselves doubtless have failed to obtain.—But who does not see the contrariety of this system of salvation by grace,—God's own individual, direct, electing, and saving grace,—to a system of salvation *ecclesiastical*, begun by the *opus operatum* of the priest in baptism, and carried on simply, or

God. . . . I had tasted the internal eternal life." (I have here a little abridged.) Afterwards follows an account of his *baptism*, but with *no particular remarks on it*.

¹ Acts viii. 37, x. 47.

² On *infants* he considered that it conferred *justification from the birth-sin* derived from Adam, its guilt and its condemnation. So C. D. xxi. 16. (In which sense, I presume, our Augustinian Homily also speaks of *justification in baptism*, not in any other.) With regard to other sins, Augustine adds that, so soon as the child may be of age to understand God's commands, the conflict must begin: and that sins are not really overcome "*nisi veræ delectatione justitiæ; hæc est autem in fide Christi.*" *ibid.*—In the case of *adults* he considered that not only did *this* justification from original sin accompany the sacrament, but much *inward spiritual grace*, provided the recipient came *in faith*.

Mr. Faber in his *Work on Election*, p. 90, observes on this distinction by Augustine between the cases of *infants* and *adults*.—And would it not be well, let me ask, in questions concerning the saving efficacy of baptism, and its necessary prerequisites, to argue rather from the case of *adults* to that of *infants*, than vice versa,—from the more plain to the more obscure?—For example, (if I may be allowed the illustration,) in Geometry we reason from the *rectilinear* to the *curvilinear*. What holds true *always* of inscribed rectilinear figures, however its bounding right lines may in *length* be diminished, in *number* increased, until at length approximation is made to the curve,—that we argue must hold in the curve itself. Similarly since, in the case of *adults*, faith (*personal faith*) must needs accompany baptism to make it effectual, and this holds of the *youngest* adults, if only the age be rational,—the same, we may argue, must hold proportionally in the baptism of *still younger children*, and *infants* also, in order to its being effectual to spiritual life and salvation;—i. e. that faith must be then so implanted *in the germ*, if the child become at that moment in the *largest* sense of the word *spiritually* regenerate, that, in proportion as *reason* is developed, *faith* shall be developed also.

³ So Pope Zosimus. See Augustine's Life. Also afterwards Pope Celestine.

mainly, by the saving virtue of church ceremonies and church observances?—In fact the contrariety of the two systems was quickly felt: and Rome (though still professedly reckoning Augustine in its list of saints) eschewed very soon its former direct approval of his doctrine; and substituted virtually, in its place, a mongrel system of *ecclesiastical semi-Pelagianism*.¹

And so, after the barbarian tempests from the North had been let loose on the Roman world, a twofold stream of doctrine was perpetuated in the Church visible through the ages following; the one the *ritualistic ecclesiastical* doctrine of religion, the other the *Augustinian spiritual* doctrine of *saving grace*:—and a twofold view also, correspondently, of *Christ's Church of the promises*: the one regarding it as the earthly corporation of the Church visible and Catholic, under a vice-Christian priesthood; the other as being the little flock, simply and alone, of those that were united by living faith to Christ the living head. In chapters that are to follow I shall have to note, on the one hand, the names of many in the middle ages, professedly of the Romish Church, who fed upon this spiritual doctrine as on heavenly food,² and found in it a blessed antidote to the ritualistic formalism in vogue, down even to the Reformation; and, on the other, to observe how Rome more and more shrunk from, and hated, and opposed it.³ Indeed I might trace both Rome's opposition to it, and God's blessing on it, even beyond the Reformation. Witness the histories of Huss,⁴ of Luther,⁵ of the Jansenists;⁶ and in-

¹ Take for example the extract following from Pope Gregory III's *Judicia Congrua Pœnitentibus*, written about the middle of the eighth century. Hard. iii. 1871.

"*Prima est remissio quâ baptizamus in aquâ, secunda caritatis effectus, tertia eleemosynarum fructus, quarta perfusio lachrymarum, quinta afflictio cordis et corporis, sexta emendatio morum, . . . septima intercessio sauctorum, octava misericordiæ et fidei meritum, nona conversio et salus aliorum, decima indulgentia et remissio nostra!*"

² In my Chapters on the Western Line of Witnesses.

³ E. g. in the case of Gottshalk, which will be noted subsequently.

⁴ See Luther's dispute with Eck in Merle D'Aubigné's History of the Reformation, B. v. c. 5.

⁵ He was an *Augustinian* monk; and Augustine's writings united with the Bible to help him to the discovery of evangelic truth.

⁶ See in Harduin, xi. 1634, Pope Clement XI's condemnation, A.D. 1713, of the 101 Propositions of Jansen, mostly taken from Augustine: from which, as being eminently illustrative of my subject, though in respect of *chronology* long subsequent, I must here beg to extract.

deed of our own Anglican Church also:—a Church in its doctrines (we might almost say) half Augustinian,¹ as well as half Lutheran; though with an Augustinianism moderate as the Apocalyptic figuration which I suppose to have symbolized it: omitting, as it does, all deeper mysteries of the doctrine; and asserting simply its grand spiritual truth of the Lord's marking out from amidst the professing Church of an *individual election of grace*;² to be preserved,

The Pope selects for condemnation, from among other propositions of Jansen, the following:

1. Quid aliud remanet animæ quæ Deum atque ipsius gratiam amisit, nisi peccatum et peccati consecutiones, superba paupertas, et segnis indigentia; hoc est generalis impotentia ad laborem, ad orationem, et ad omne opus bonum.

2. Christi gratia, principium efficax boni cujuscunque generis, necessaria est ad omne opus bonum: absque illâ non solùm nihil fit, sed nec fieri potest.

5. Quando Deus non emollit cor per interiorem unctionem gratiæ suæ, exhortationes et gratiæ exteriores non inserviunt nisi ad illud magis obdurandum.

8. Nos non pertinemus ad novum fœdus, nisi in quantum participes sumus ipsius novæ gratiæ, quæ operatur in nobis id quod Deus nobis præcipit.

14. Quantumcumque remotus à salute sit peccator obstinatus, quando Jesus se ei videndum exhibet lumine salutari suæ gratiæ, oportet ut se dedat, accurrat, sese humiliet, et adoret Salvatorem suum.

25. Deus illuminat animam, et eam sanat, æquè ac corpus, solâ suâ voluntate.

26. Nullæ dantur gratiæ nisi per fidem.

27. Fides est prima gratia, et fons omnium aliarum.

28. Prima gratia quam Deus concedit peccatori, est peccatorum remissio.

29. Extrâ ecclesiam nulla conceditur gratia.

72. Nota ecclesiæ Christianæ est quòd sit catholica, comprehendens et omnes angelos cœli, et omnes electos et justos terræ, omnium sæculorum.

73. Quid est ecclesia nisi cœtus filiorum Dei, manentium in ejus sinu, adoptatorum in Christo, . . . redemptorum ejus sanguine, viventium ejus Spiritu, agentium per ejus gratiam, et expectantium gratiam futuri sæculi.

75. Ecclesia est unus solus homo, compositus ex pluribus membris, quorum Christus est caput, vita, subsistentia; unus solus Christus, compositus ex pluribus sanctis, quorum est sanctificator.

80. Lectio sacræ Scripturæ est pro omnibus.

This enumeration ended, the Bull condemns them as—"falsas, perniciosas, impias, blasphemias, hæresim ipsam sapientes," &c. &c.—So, says Ranke, iii. 199, speaking of this Bull Unigenitus, "the Jansenist doctrines of sin, grace, justification, and the Church, even in their mitigated expression, and sometimes as they were thought to be literally taught by *Augustine*, were denounced as heretical."

Gibbon, vi. 24, when observing on the affinity between Augustine and Calvin, remarks justly also on the secret repugnance of Rome to the former. And Mr. Newman, in his work on Romanism, p. 93, notes that in an Edition of Augustine published at Venice, the publishers speak of having "taken care to remove whatever might affect the minds of the faithful with heretical pravity."

¹ So I see the author of the *Life of Savanarola*, p. 384, observes that the Roman Catholic Church has been for a long time Pelagian; that the Church of the Reformation is Augustinian; while the Greek Church may perhaps be called Cassianist.

² I refer specially to its Art. xvii, On Predestination and Election. "They which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God (predestination to life) be called, according to God's purpose, by his Spirit working in due season: they through grace obey the calling: they be justified freely: they be made sons of God by adoption: they walk religiously in good works; and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity."

Compare the Collect for All Saints' Day; "O Almighty God, who hast knit to-

through the Spirit's sanctification, and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus, unto everlasting life.

Which being so, and the Augustinian light the chief that still, long time after its first brighter orient beams,¹ glimmered through the dark ages,² down to the outburst of gospel-sunlight at the *Reformation*, I cannot but pray the reader, in conclusion, to mark the admirable prophetic truth and propriety, wherewith the Apocalyptic Revelation, ere passing onward to figure the Gothic tempests' irruption into, and desolation of, the Roman world, paused at this precise æra to depict it, with its two light-shedding visions from heaven of the *sealing* and the *palm-bearing*. The peculiarity and distinctiveness of the figuration will appear to us yet more remarkable, on finding, as we go forward, that there was depicted for some time afterwards before the Evangelist no other figuring of light from heaven; but only figurations of tempests, and woes, and sins, and of Christ's two witnesses witnessing in sackcloth: until at length, just in the midst of the second or Turkish woe, the same divine Angel, in yet more glorious vision,

gether *thine elect* in one communion and fellowship, in the *mystical body of thy Son Christ our Lord*:" where the sense of the word *elect*, as meant by our Church, is fixt by its choice of the very passage under consideration for the Gospel, I mean Apoc. vii. 2, &c.; with its 144,000 sealed ones, and its palm-bearing company.

Mark too the Augustinianism of the Anglican Church doctrine in its Articles ix, x, on Original Sin and Free-will. In Art. xxix, on the inefficiency of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in case of wicked partakers, Augustine is expressly cited.—The writings of Cranmer, Hooper, and others of the *real* founders of our Reformed Church, abound with references to Augustine.

¹ Augustine's contemporary *Paulus Orosius*, in the Preface to his History, speaks of the light shed on the Church and Christendom by the first ten Books just then published of the *De Civitate Dei*, in figurative language very correspondent with the Apocalyptic symbol; "*Quorum jam decem orientes radii mox, ut de speculâ ecclesiasticæ claritatis elati sunt, toto orbe fulserunt.*"

Now I conceive that the light-bearing of the angel from the east in the Apocalyptic vision may have been intended to denote the general doctrinal light thereby shed upon the scene, as well as the heart-illumining of each real heart-recipient of the light: just as in the similar figure about Christ's first advent in Luke i. 78, "The day-spring from on high hath visited us; &c."

² "It is evident that real Christianity, notwithstanding its nominal increase under Christian emperors, must soon have been extinct, if God had not interposed with a second great effusion of his Spirit. . . This involves the private life of Augustine. He was the great instrument for reviving the knowledge of evangelic truth.—The effects of this diffusion of the Spirit were solid, though never brilliant. . . The light [from Augustine's writings] never broke out into a vivid extensive flame; but shone with a moderate brightness at first, and afterwards glimmered through many ages, down even to the Reformation." Milner v. 2, 3: also v. 9. See too Gieseler E. II. i. 216, 218, &c.

appeared descending to illuminate the scene, with the sunlight beaming from his face, and a rainbow encircling his head: which vision will be shown to have designated with equal, or even greater accuracy of delineation, the outburst, and successive epochs and events, of the glorious *Reformation*.—The one picture is in fact the sister, or fellow, (so to say,) of the other. Nor can either the evidence of their meaning respectively what I have expounded them to mean be fully appreciated, (satisfactory as it may have already appeared in the present case,) nor the admirable suitableness of the two symbolized revelations of gospel truth themselves,—to combat the *one* the *incipient* antichristian apostasy, with its seemly yet earthly Church-scheme of mere ecclesiastical salvation, the *other* the *perfected* antichristian apostasy, with its worse than earthly terrors for enthralling a timid conscience,—and by consequence their suitableness to preserve to the Lord a true Church in Christendom, unless they be considered and compared together; each with its own proper comment and illustration in history.—Let him who would understand *God's philosophy of history*, as sketched in this wonderful Book, well ponder on them, both the one and the other.

PART II.

APOC. VIII. 1.—IX. 20.

THE FIRST SIX TRUMPETS.

THE DESTRUCTION OF THE WESTERN EMPIRE BY
THE GOTHS : AND THE EASTERN EMPIRE BY
THE SARACENS AND TURKS.

A. D. 395 TO 1453.

CHAPTER I.

THE HALF-HOUR'S SILENCE IN HEAVEN, AND INCENSE-
OFFERING BY THE SAINTS, OR SEALED ONES.

“AND when he opened the seventh Seal, there was silence in heaven¹ about the space of half an hour.—And I saw the seven angels which stood before God : and to them were given seven trumpets.—And another angel came, and stood at the altar, having a golden censer : and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer it, with the prayers of all the saints,² upon the golden altar which was before the throne. And the smoke of the incense ascended up, with the prayers of the saints, out of the angel's hand before God.—And the angel took the censer, and filled it with fire of the altar, and cast it upon³ the

¹ εγενετο σιγη εν τη ουρανῳ ὡς ἡμωριόν.

² των ἁγιων παντων, with the article.

³ εις την γην. I prefer to render the preposition by *upon*, rather than *into*.

earth. And there were thunders, and lightnings, and voices, and an earthquake. And the seven angels, which had the seven trumpets, prepared themselves to sound.”—Apoc. viii. 1—6.

So began the SECOND PART, or ACT, of the great Apocalyptic Drama.—In the sealing Vision, just preceding, intimation had been given to St. John that almost immediately after the dissolution of the Roman *Pagan Empire*, and its conversion into one professedly *Christian*, there would appear in it the rapid development of an antichristian apostasy. But could it so be without *judgments from heaven* following? To this question the associated figuration of threatening *tempest-angels*, prepared to desolate the Roman earth, even then gave answer. It is the evolution of that figuration of the tempest-angels, the symbol of barbarian invading hosts, that constitutes the Act of the Drama now opening. The scenic representation which heads the present chapter was its introduction.

I. “And when he opened the seventh Seal, there was *silence in heaven* for about the space of half an hour.”

What might be the meaning of this *half-hour's silence in heaven*, is here the inquirer's primary question.

Of course, noticed as it is in connexion with the *seventh* or *last Seal's opening*, Expositors have regard to their own several theories of the *structure of the Apocalypse*, in the explanations that they offer of it.—Of those who suppose the Book to consist of a *triple series* of prefigurative visions, (chronologically parallel with each other, and each reaching to the consummation,) correspondently with the three septenaries of the Seals, the Trumpets, and the Vials,—the one class, viewing the seventh Seal and its figuration of the half-hour's silence as the ending of the first series, expound this silence to signify the *millennial rest of the Church*, following on the final convulsions and revolution designated, as they presume, by the earthquake, &c. of the preceding *sixth Seal*. So, for example, *Vitringa*.¹ But how

¹ Somewhat similarly the ancient expositor *Tichonius* makes it signify the com-

can we suppose a repetition, *after* the seventh Seal's opening, of that which had been depicted, as they judge, in the palm-bearing vision *before* its opening? Or, again, how can we suppose a half-hour's *silence in heaven* to figure the joyous active rest of the Church on earth in the Millennium? ~~X~~ Another class of the advocates of a triple parallelism of structure,—who, however, make the first series to end with the visions of the *sixth* Seal, those of the sealing and palm-bearing inclusive, and the *seventh Seal* to comprehend the seven Trumpets, and so, with its opening vision, to begin a new and second series,—these, I say, explain the silence as *a pause in the heavenly representations*; a pause simply significative of this break of separation between the two parallel series of prophecies. So *Dean Woodhouse, Mr. Cuninghame, and others.*¹ But surely in such case the silence ought to have occurred *before*, not *after*, the opening of the seventh Seal; *before*, not *after*, the commencement of the new series: besides that, in that case, there ought to have been a similar pause of silence elsewhere also, to mark the break between the second and the third series.

I pass to those expositors (as *Mede, Daubuz, and Bishop Newton*) who adopt what I conceive to be the correcter view of the Apocalyptic structure; i. e. who not only regard the Trumpet-septenary of visions as included in the seventh Seal, but also regard this new septenary as *chronologically consecutive on that of the six Seals preceding*. Their view is to the effect that the half-hour's silence in heaven figured the *Church's silence in prayer* before the 1st Trumpet's sounding, during the incense-offering by the angel-priest, noticed in a verse that follows: stating, in support of this view, that the Jews were wont to pray silently in the court without, while the priest (like Zechariah, Luke i. 10) went within the temple to offer incense. But the silence is not represented as distinctively accompanying, and connected with, the angel-priest's offering the incense. It is represented as begun at least before that latter action; there being de-

mencement of the saints' eternal rest; and *Bede*, the peace of the Church, in some brief interval between Antichrist's destruction and Christ's second coming.

¹ Somewhat similarly *Chytræus, Arctius, and Bullinger* explain it, (so *Foxe* says in his *Eicasm*.) to be a mark of transition from the Seals to the Trumpets.

picted the act of the seven angels that stood before God having the seven Trumpets given them, as one to intervene. Besides that the expression “silence *in heaven*,” if used with reference to what past in the Apocalyptic Temple, ought rather surely to signify a silence in the Holy of Holies, which here distinctively figured the heaven of God’s presence; not a silence in the *temple-court*, simply and alone.¹

And what then the meaning of the symbol?—As regards the *silence in heaven*, it really does not seem to me that we need have much difficulty. The word *heaven* (*ουρανός*) is a word often used in Scripture, and elsewhere, of the *aerial firmament*;² as well as of the *invisible heaven*, the seat of God’s manifestation. Indeed, in the immediately preceding vision of the sixth seal it had been so used by St. John.³—Again, *silence* is a word used often also to designate the *stillness of inanimate nature*.⁴ Which being so, the complex phrase *silence in heaven* might fitly, should the context suit, be interpreted to mean *stillness from storms* in that firmamental region. In fact Pliny, St. John’s contemporary, so uses the self-same phrase “*silente cælo*;⁵” nor does the usage of the Hebrew Scriptures dis-

¹ As to *Daubuz’s* peculiar notion that this silence signified the *peace of the worshipping Church* after Constantine’s establishment of Christianity, the same inconsistency attaches to it as to the millennial explanation before noted. For there would be then a repetition, under this new emblem, of what Mr. D. himself strangely considers as the subject also of the palm-bearing vision, just preceding.

Heinrichs, let me add, makes it the heavenly company’s silence of astonishment and fear at what was to happen: *M. Stuart* that of “deep and fearful sympathy with the expected sequel.” But, were this *all*, why so only here?

² So in the Old Testament, Gen. i. 7, 8; “And God made the firmament, and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament. And God called the firmament *heaven*.” So again in the New Testament, Matt. vi. 26, “the fowls of *heaven* :” ib. xvi. 2, “The *sky* (or *heaven*, *ουρανός*) is red :” James v. 18, “the *heaven* gave rain :” &c.

³ Apoc. vi. 14, “The *heaven* (or *firmament*) departed like a scroll.” So again ib. xi. 6, “These have power to shut *heaven*, that it should not rain :” &c.

⁴ E. g. in Psalm cvii. 29, “He maketh the storm a *calm*, so that the waves thereof are still ;” where the Hebrew word for *calm* is literally *silence* : and again in Jonah i. 11, “that the sea may be *calm* unto us ;” where the literal Hebrew is, “that the sea may be *silent* to us.”—Similarly write the *Greek* classical authors, as Theoc. ii. 38 ;—

Ἡνίδε σιγᾷ μὲν ποντος, σιγῶντι δ’ ἀηται.

And *Latin* ; as Virgil. Eclog. ix. 57,

Et nunc omne tibi stratum *silet* æquor.

On which last Heyne observes, “*Silere* solenne de ventis cessantibus.”

⁵ Nat. Hist. xviii. 69.—So Ovid, “*Silet* humidus aer.” Metam. vii. 187.

agree.¹—And does not this idea of the thing suit with the firmamental state of things, as figured and left in the preceding vision? Precisely so. For in it we were told of *the four winds being authoritatively restrained from blowing*; in other words, (to use Pliny's phrase,) of there ensuing thereon *silence*, though but for a brief interval, *in the firmamental heaven*? Surely then this may without hesitation be here taken as the simple natural meaning of the symbol.² To use the words of our own great poet,

'Twas, as we often see against some storm,
A *silence in the heavens*; the rack stand still,
The bold winds speechless, and the orb below
As hush as death: anon the dreadful thunder
Doth rend the region.³

It was the stillness before the storm.

But what the *half-hour's* predicated *duration* of the silence, or rather the "*as it were half-an-hour's*?" I incline to consider St. John's "*as it were*," as meaning that it appeared to, and affected him, as the half-hour's stillness before a storm might do in common life.—At the same time the alternative seems open to him who prefers it,—while explaining the *silence* to mean stillness from the threatened tempests, as before,—yet to interpret the *half-hour* on the *prophetic year-day scale*, as but a *very short interval*, even as of a few days.⁴—So that in any case the interval between the opening of the 7th Seal, and the first outbreak of the tempest of barbarian invasion, was indicated as but very small. For on the half-hour's ending, the previous check upon the threatened tempests, and the spirits riding them, was evidently to be withdrawn. Not unaccordant with which (if I may anticipate for a moment) is the record of history. Theodosius died Jan. 17, 395; the epoch, I conceive, of the 7th Seal's opening: and "before the winter

¹ Compare Psalm lxxvii. 17, 18; "The *sky* sent forth a sound: the voice of thy thunder was in the *heaven*."

² Since thus writing I see that Grotius explains the figure similarly: "Factum est silentium in cœlo: id est venti illi, de quibus actum suprâ vii. 1, quievêre."

³ Hamlet, Act ii. Sc. 2.

⁴ A half-hour, on the *year-day scale*, equals $7\frac{1}{2}$ days, if we allow 24 hours to the day. But, as Christ says, "Are there not twelve hours to the day," it has been reasonably suggested that a prophetic hour might more fitly be regarded as the 12th part of a prophetic day; and consequently half-an-hour as answering to a fortnight.

Grotius, *ibid.*, (and Heinrichs after him,) says that Menander, according to Pollux, uses the word ἡμιωριον "pro minimo tempore:" which would suit my general view.

ended," says Gibbon, "the Gothic nation was in arms:"—that "tempest of barbarians," as he elsewhere calls it, "that was to subvert the foundations of the Roman empire." And so too Mr. Hallam: "*The fourth century set in storms.*"¹

But why the specification of so minute an interval of respite? Just, I conceive, in order to the exhibition of a scene of temple-worship, characteristic of the precise epoch that answered to it: a scene such as to suggest the reason of God's proceeding to *execution* of the previously *threatened* judgments of the tempest-angels; even as against an empire in which that last term of respite was unimproved, and the already hinted sin of apostasy unrepented of, and in progress.² Besides that occasion was given thereby at once to note prominently that distinction in Roman Christendom between the *sealed* and the *unsealed*, the *saints* and the *men of this earth*, which would exist and be recognised by God throughout all the coming Trumpet-judgments; the Sealing Angel himself, we shall see reason to suppose, having in the mean while just given in his report.—This temple-scene then is the *next* point to consider, and a most important one. And, as before, we must, in order to its right understanding, first analyze *the vision itself*, then trace *the fulfilment in history*.

II. 1. The *scenic vision*, then, was as follows. "And another Angel came,"—i. e. after the delivery of the seven trumpets to the seven trumpet-angels,—"and stood at the altar, having a golden censer. And there was given to him much incense, that he should offer it with the prayers of all the saints upon the golden altar before the throne. And the smoke of the incense ascended up before God, with the prayers of the saints, out of the Angel's hand." After which follows:—"And the Angel took the censer, and filled it with fire of the altar, and cast it upon the earth: and

¹ Middle Ages, iii. 307. (3rd Ed.) "Storms," he adds, "sufficiently destructive in themselves; and ominous of those calamities which humbled the majesty of Rome at the commencement of the ensuing period, and overwhelmed the Western empire in ruin before its termination."

² So in Ezekiel ix was the temple-vision of Judah's idolatries shown to the prophet, in justification of God's impending judgments. Verse 17; "Hast thou seen this, son of man?" Verse 18; "Therefore will I also deal in fury, &c."

there were voices, and thunderings, and lightnings, and an earthquake."—Such was the vision. And to understand that its significancy was to the purport that I stated, it only needs that we attend carefully to three points: viz. *the Angel-priest ministering*;—*his position at the altar ere receiving the incense*;—and *the persons described as offering incense through Him, in contrast with others who did it not.*

First, *the Angel-priest ministering.* And whom can we Scripturally suppose to be hereby intended but the *Lord Jesus*? For He is "the great High Priest over the house of God, passed into the heavens." In that character He was expressly represented as acting on the mystic temple-scene, at the opening of the Apocalyptic visions. Nor is the *angelic title* here ascribed to the ministering priest inconsistent with our supposition; seeing that this priesthood was but one of the functions of Christ as *Angel of the Covenant*.¹—An argument confirmatory of this interpretation is derived by Sir I. Newton² and others, from the specification of the censer as a *golden* one that was used by the angel-priest. For they state, I suppose from the Rabbins, that the High Priest alone used a golden censer in the Jewish ritual; the common priests using one of silver. And who but Christ is high priest in the Christian Church?³—Besides which there is yet another confirmatory argument, and which I cannot pass over in silence, deducible from the vision in Ezekiel ix:—a vision of which the *first* part was

¹ Compare what is here said of the incense ascending up out of the Angel's hand with the description of the Angel of the Covenant ascending in the flame of Man-oah's sacrifice; Judges xiii. 20.—In Apoc. x. 1, the "mighty Angel" that descended may be clearly shown to have been the Angel of the Covenant.

² "The custom was on other days for one of the *priests* to take fire from the great altar in a *silver* censer: but on the day of expiation for the *high priest* to take fire from the great altar in a *golden* censer."—Sir Isaac is referring this to the high priest's ministration on the great day of expiation only. But as no mention is made of the angel-priest going further than the altar of incense, entering the holy of holies, or performing other of the rites peculiar to that day, we seem hardly warranted in using the statement of the Jewish Rabbins further than I have done.

In 1 Kings vii. 50 Solomon is said to have made the censers for the temple *generally* of gold. In the second temple it is likely enough that censers of silver were also used; though in Ezra v. 14 the "vessels of gold and silver" taken out of the temple by Nebuchadnezzar are said to have been restored. And what is noted Heb. ix. 4 respecting the golden censer as left in the *holy of holies*, evidently after incensing there by the high priest on the great day of expiation, gives support to the Rabbinical statement.—See Macknight on Heb. ix. 4.

³ In the Apocalyptic temple created angels appeared often habited as priests, and officiating as priests; but, I think, nowhere as performing the functions of *high priest*, or the proper sacerdotal functions of *sacrificing* and *incense-offering*.

noted by me as strikingly parallel to the Apocalyptic vision of the *sealing*;¹ and of which the *concluding* part is as strikingly similar to that we are now considering. In Ezekiel it is the same person, clothed in the linen garb of the priesthood, that had been previously marking God's servants on their foreheads,² who is described as afterwards coming into the sanctuary, to make report of the fulfilment of his commission; and then taking the fire from between the cherubim, and scattering it over the apostatized city Jerusalem.³ What then the natural inference but that here, too, (immediately consequent as the present incense-offering vision is on that of the sealing,) the Angel who now goes into the Holy Place, and afterwards takes of the altar-fire to scatter over the apostatizing land of Roman Christendom, must be the same as the sealing Angel of the former vision, whom we saw reason to conclude was the *Lord Jesus*:—He having past into the sanctuary, we may suppose, from acting out *one* of his characters before St. John, in the illumination and sealing of his own people; and, ere he scatter fire on the earth, stopping in *another*, viz. in his priestly and mediatorial character, (still visibly to St. John,) to receive and present the prayers of his people.⁴

The next thing to be here noted and explained is the *Angel's representation*, at the opening of the vision, as *standing with his censer beside the altar*, to receive the incense of the people offering; i. e. beside the great brazen altar of sacrifice in the temple-court.⁵ “He *stood*,” it is

¹ See p. 277 *suprà*.

² From comparing Ezek. ix. 6, “Come not near any man upon whom is my mark,” with Ezek. xxi. 3, “I will cut off from thee (the land of Israel) *the righteous* and the wicked,” I infer that in *this* case, as in Apoc. vii, the guaranteed salvation of the sealed ones was from spiritual and *real* evil.

³ Ezek. ix. 11, x. 2.

⁴ I the rather beg attention to this important parallelism, as confirmatory evidence of the incense-receiving Angel being the Angel of the Covenant, because Professor M. Stuart and others of the German school explain him to have been a created angel. Added to that of the function and office being one so distinctly ascribed to Christ in Scripture, both elsewhere and in the Apocalypse itself, it seems to me to make out a strong case of evidence in favour of the view here given by me, in common with so many other expositors.

I should add that Professor Stuart accompanies his explanation with a statement that this view of the incense-bearing angel as a created angel does not at all justify the Papal doctrine of worshipping angels; a direct prohibition of this (and by implication of saint-worship, also) being, as he says, given Apoc. xix. 10, xxii. 9.

⁵ See p. 206, *suprà*; and my Paper vii. in the App. to Vol. ii.

said, “*at the altar*, and much incense was given him. The position was that of the officiating priest under the Levitical law, when about to exercise the same ministration: and it arose out of the divine ordinance, that forthwith, on receiving the incense of the worshippers, he should take burning coals from off the altar, place them on his censer, and carrying them at the same time as the incense into the sanctuary, apply the sacred fire to the incense to make it burn, after laying it on the golden altar before the veil.¹ The which particular in the ritual was insisted on as most important, indeed essential. Other fire than this in the ministration was called “strange fire:” and, for offering incense with such strange fire, Nadab and Abihu, though sons of Aaron, were struck dead by God upon the spot.² The true reason for all which particularity was that a deep and holy mystery was shadowed forth in this ordinance of the Mosaic ritual; viz. that except by association with the meritorious atoning sacrifice of the Lamb of God, and the application to them of its purifying and propitiatory virtue, the prayers and praises of his people could never rise up acceptably before the mercy-seat.—Now then in the symbolic vision before us the Angel’s standing by the altar, and receiving the incense of such as offered it, indicated that in *their* case this essential, in order to acceptableness, was attended to. There was the association of *Christ* with their offering, in his two-fold antitypical character and office,—of *sacrifice* and of *priest*. Just as the true Christian’s privilege is elsewhere stated; “We have an advocate (an intercessory priest) with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and He is the propitiation (the propitiatory sacrifice) for our sins.”³

And thus we are led to inquire, thirdly, who were, and who were not, *the offerers* that gave Him incense? This is a question soon answered. It was “*the saints*” that

¹ On the priest’s office on this head see Levit. xvi. 12, 13; on the people’s offering of the incense, Exod. xxxv. 21, 29, Numb. vii. 14, &c., and Jer. xli. 5.

² Levit. x. 1, 2. Compare Numb. xvi. 46, Isa. vi. 6, 7.

³ 1 John ii. 1, 2.—On the *ιασμος*, (propitiation,) compare Numb. v. 8, where the ram of the atonement is called *κριος του ιασμου*; and again Ezek. xliv. 27, *προσοισουσιν ιασμον*: passages which show that it was in his character of *an atoning sacrifice* that Christ has here the term applied to *him*. So too 1 John iv. 10, “He sent his Son to be a propitiation (*ιασμον*) for our sins.”

offered it; i. e. the 144,000, the sealed ones.—It was these,—“*all these*,” we read,—and (let this be marked) these *alone*. There is evidently an *allusive contrast* here, just as before in the sealing vision, to those that were *not* the Lord’s saints; that is, as pointedly not present, and not partaking in the action. Indeed the *inhabitants of the earth*, generally, (for “the earth,” mentioned in verse 5 as the object of God’s wrath and judgment, implies its inhabitants,) may be almost said to be *expressly noted* in contrast, as *not* participating.¹

But how not participating? Was it to be inferred that they had forsaken the typical altar-court, and virtually at least renounced the offered privileges of Christ’s atoning sacrifice, and Christ’s mediatorship? Such in truth seemed the meaning of the symbol;—a meaning confirmed by a subsequent and most notable use of a similar figuration, in the same sense, in a later chapter.² Indeed, as the vision depicted what passed in the *altar-court*, the scene of what used to be visible in the ancient Jewish public worship, it seemed implied that this forsaking of the altar-fire and the High Priest of the altar, by the mass of the inhabitants of Roman Christendom, would be characteristic, not of their *private* worship and devotions only at this time, but of their *public* worship also:—insomuch that, even publicly, Christ’s saints would be now peculiar in availing themselves simply and sincerely of his mediation, and of his propitiatory atoning sacrifice.

2. But how, and for what, we again ask, could they have thus forsaken Him?—For the answer to this question we must recur, as proposed *secondly* under this head, to *history*.

And indeed the history of the times at once answers the inquiry. For it tells how the *invocation of saints and martyrs*, and new means of *propitiating God*, had now come into vogue among the inhabitants of the Roman

¹ A similar contrast occurs in a later prefigured period of the apostasy, Apoc. xiii. 7, 8, between the inhabitants of the earth that worshipped the Beast, and the saints (*ἅγιοι*) against whom the Beast made deadly war.

² Viz. Apoc. xi. 1; “Rise, and measure the temple, and the altar, and them that worship in it: but the court without the temple (including its worshippers) cast out; for it has been given to the Gentiles.” See Part iii, Chap. vi, vii.

world: and how they were thus quick relapsing, though under the Christian name and profession, into a Christ-re-nouncing idolatry. This was in fact the *second great step* of the *anti-christian* APOSTASY: and it was one that specially deserved observation, as being that whereby the *invisible* world itself became allied with the *visible* in strengthening it.—Hear Dean Waddington's account of the strange lapse of the professing Church into it. The Christians of the *ante-Nicene* Church, he says, shunned with horror every approach to the abomination of idolatry. "So definite and broad was the space which in this point separated the two religions of Christianity and Paganism, that it seemed impossible that . . . a compromise could ever be effected between principles so fundamentally hostile. Yet the contrary result took place: and a reconciliation, which *in the beginning of the fourth century* could not easily have been imagined, was virtually accomplished *before its termination*.

. . . Enthusiasm [respecting *the martyrs*] easily passed into superstition. Those who had sealed a Christian's faith by a martyr's death were exalted above the condition of men, and enthroned among superior beings. Superstition gave birth to credulity. Those who sate among the powers of heaven might sustain by miraculous assistance their votaries on earth. . . . Hence the stupid veneration for bones and relics. It was inculcated that prayer was never so surely efficacious as when offered at the tomb of some saint."¹—And, as to the kind of *public worship* resulting, take the graphic sketch of Gibbon. "If *in the beginning of the fifth century* Tertullian or Lactantius had been suddenly raised from the dead, to assist at the festival of some popular saint or martyr, they would have gazed with astonishment and indignation on the profane spectacle, which had succeeded to the pure and spiritual worship of a Christian congregation. As soon as the doors of the Church were thrown open, they must have been offended by the smoke of incense,² the perfume of flowers, and the glare of lamps

¹ History of the Church i. 232. See too Gieseler Ch. v. § 96, 97; also Mosheim v. 2. 3. 2; and Le Bas' sketch of the Church of the latter part of the fourth century, illustrated from Chrysostom, in his Life of Wielif, pp. 6—13.

² Tertullian (Apol. 42) declared that even *trading in incense* was sinful; because it was a thing burnt on heathen altars.

and tapers, which diffused at noon-day a gaudy, superfluous, and in their opinion a sacrilegious light. If they approached the balustrade of the altar, they made their way through the prostrate crowd; consisting for the most part of strangers and pilgrims, who resorted to the city on the vigil of the feast, and who already felt the strong intoxication of fanaticism, and perhaps of wine. Their devout kisses were imprinted on the walls and pavement of the sacred edifice; and their fervent prayers were directed, whatever might be the language of their Church, to the bones, the blood, or the ashes of the saints, which were usually concealed by a linen or silken veil from the eyes of the vulgar. They frequented the tombs of the martyrs, in hope of obtaining from their powerful intercession every sort of spiritual, but more especially of temporal blessings. . . . [In case of the fulfilment of their wishes] they again hastened to the martyrs' tombs, to celebrate with grateful thanksgiving their obligations to the memory and relics of those heavenly patrons. The walls were hung round with symbols of the favours which they had received;—eyes and hands and feet of gold and silver: and edifying pictures, which could not long escape the abuse of indiscreet or idolatrous devotions, represented the image, the attributes, and the miracles of the tutelar saint.”¹

Such is Gibbon's graphic sketch. It occurs in a chapter thus significantly headed, “*Destruction of Paganism; Introduction of the worship of saints and relics among the Christians:*”² which chapter, let the reader observe, is placed (in exact chronological accordance with our explanation of the incense-vision) between the epoch of *Theodosius' death*, January, 395, with which epoch, I suppose, the seventh Apocalyptic Seal opened, and that of the Gothic revolt and first irruptions A.D. 395, 396, in fulfilment, as I further conceive, of the immediately-following earthquake, lightnings, &c., of the Apocalyptic vision.—Nor, I am persuaded, will he who candidly consults the most authentic memorials of the times³ fail to acknowledge, that

¹ v. 134.

² Ch. xxviii.

³ I would recommend the reader, who wishes thus to form his own judgment on the subject, to read Dr. Gilly's very interesting, picturesque, and instructive Volume,

whether as regards the main fact asserted of *saint and martyr-worship* having now come in, (even as of beings who both chiefly exercised the intercessorial office between man and God, and constituted moreover God's chief agency for helping the supplicants who addressed them,¹) or as regards the *relics* and *images* through which that worship was paid,² the *fictional miracles* that supported

entitled *Vigilantius and his Times*: a Volume in which certain illustrative documents of this nature are embodied; and the ecclesiastical spirit prevalent at the close of the fourth century as truly as strikingly set forth.

¹ See generally Dr. Gilly's Chapter on Paulinus; (Paulinus, Bishop of Nola, and "the delight of his age," as he was called;) and particularly the specimens inserted by him of the many natalial odes addressed by Paulinus to St. Felix, his avowed *patron saint*, and the *dominædus* of the church and monastery built by the former to him. The following from the first, second, and eighth odes, and of the dates A.D. 393, 394, 400, are fair samples, and sufficiently illustrative.

1. Vectus in æthereum sine sanguine Martyr honorem,
O pater, O domine, indignis licet annue servis. . . .
Sen placeat telluris iter, comes aggere tuto
Esto tuis; seu magna tui fiducia longo
Suadeat ire mari, da currere mollibus undis: &c.
2. Et maria intravi duce te, quia cura pericli
Cessit amore tui; nec te sine; nam tua sensi
Præsidia, in Domino superaus maris aspera Christo:
Semper eo et terris te propter tutus, et undis.
3. Sanete, precor, succurre tuo! scio proximus adstas;
Et de contiguâ missis hunc auribus æde
Audisti, Felix, fletum infelicis alumni.

And the same in prose as poetry. Indeed the worship of St. Felix was a matter of all earnestness with him, the very business of his life. So that the Romanists (Baronius and others) may well cite Paulinus as an authority for saint-worship. (Gilly, pp. 80—83.)

Pope *Damasus*, who died A.D. 384, had however preceded *Paulinus* in this invocation of St. Felix. In the B. P. M. xxvii. 84, among some of his *Carmina*, I find the following.

De Sancto Felice.

Corpore, mente, animo, pariter de nomine felix,
Sanctorum in numero Christi sacrate triumphis,
Qui ad te sollicitè venientibus omnia præstas,
Nec quendam pateris tristem repedare viantem,
Te duce servatus, mortis quòd vincula rupi,
Versibus his Damasus supplex tibi vota rependo.

And I must add in the same category the well-known name also of *Sulpitius Severus*. In his *Epist.* 2, after speaking of the death of Martin of Tours, he thus refers to the departed monk as his ever-present guardian, intercessor, and hope. "Non deerit nobis ille; non, non deerit. Intererit de se sermocinantibus, adstabit orantibus; quodque jam hodiè præstare dignatus est, videndum se in gloriâ suâ sæpe præbebit, et . . . assiduâ benedictione nos proteget. . . . Spes superest illa sola, illa postrema, ut quod per nos obtinere non possumus, pro nobis orante Martino mereamur." B. P. M. vi. 356. Also *Ep.* 3; "Illine (from Abraham's bosom) nos, ut spero, (Martinus) custodiens, ne hæc scribentem respicit, te legentem." *Ib.* 357.—So too *Gregory Nyssen*, of *Meletius*; *Gregory Nazianzen*, of *Basil*; (*Op.* Vol. i. 372, Ed. Colon. 1690;) *Theodoret* (*Op.* iii. 1136), of *St. James of Nisibis* and *St. Julian*; &c. &c.

² Saints' relics were so in demand that monks hawked them for gain. *August. Oper. Monach.* 36. Hence the saint-worshippers were called *einerarii* by *Vigilantius* and others.—Of course what were *saints'* bones, what those of persons less

it,¹ or the *pilgrimages* and the *revellings* with which it was accompanied,²—I say, in respect of all these points, the candid investigator will, I am persuaded, be forced to acknowledge that Gibbon's historic sketch is here, as usual, literally correct.

And, let it be observed, it was not a mere few of the

holy, was often doubtful. In one case Martin extorted, it is said, a confession from the spirit of the dead man, that the bones adored were those of an *executed malefactor*, not a *saint*. See Gilly 53, 146, 210; and compare Mosheim iv. 2. 4. 5.—Pompous translations of the bodies or bones of supposed saints formed another visible variety in the actings of the same superstition at this time. Theodoret (*ibid.* 1119) relates the removal of St. James' body as their patron saint by the migrating Nisibenes, when Nisibis, A.D. 363, was by treaty surrendered to the Persians. We have Gregory Nyssen's funeral oration on the translation of Meletius' body to Antioch, ("ecclesiam vectus ad suam, *thesaurus ingens*," A.D. 381. Jerome, in his book against Vigilantius, alludes to Constantius' translation to Constantinople of the relics of Andrew, Luke, and Timothy, "before which *dæmons* roar;" and the yet more celebrated transfer of Samuel's bones thither, A.D. 406, by the Emp. Arcadius. "Episcopi . . . cineres in serico et vase portaverunt: . . . omnium ecclesiarum populi occurrerunt sanctis reliquiis, et tantâ lætitiâ, &c." And in 416 followed that of St. Stephen's to Africa.

Pictures of saints too were now introduced. Paulinus introduced them at Nola; Sulpitius at Primuliac; these latter being pictures of St. Martin and Paulinus. Gilly 52, 86.—A picture of Christ was destroyed on the hanging veil before a church-door by their contemporary Epiphanius; as tending to idolatry.

¹ See Gilly, pp. 187—191, for specimens of the reported miracles of St. Felix: also p. 443. See too, p. 62, Paulinus' account of the manner in which, among the three crosses found buried in the earth of Mount Calvary, the true one was discovered to Helena by the miracle of its raising a dead man to life.

² In the year 395, the year when Vigilantius visited Paulinus at Nola, there was a grand feast in honour of St. Felix. "The people," says Paulinus, "assembled in such crowds that there was no counting them. It was a dense multitude, urged on by one vow and object. Lucania, Apulia, Calabria, Campania, Latium, poured in their population: worshippers came from Capua, Naples, and even Rome. You might suppose it was Rome itself rising before you, not Nola." Then, on the manner of keeping the feast; "Oh that they would offer up their vows of joy with more sobriety; that they would not be quaffing cups of wine within the sacred precincts. Yet some allowance must be made. . . Simple piety fancies that the saints will be pleased with the offerings of fragrant wine poured on their tombs," &c. Gilly, pp. 215, 216.—See too Augustine's Ep. 22, 29, written A.D. 392, 395, describing and denouncing such excesses.

I add an earlier example from Gregory Nyssen's Life of Gregory Thaumaturgus, a celebrated bishop of the middle of the third century. "When Gregory perceived that the ignorant multitude persisted in their idolatry on account of the pleasures and sensual gratifications (*corporeas delectationes et voluptates*) which they enjoyed at the Pagan festivals, he granted them permission to indulge themselves in the like pleasures, in celebrating the memory of the holy martyrs; hoping that in process of time they would return of their own accord to a more virtuous and regular course of life."—I quote from a Note in Mosheim's *Eccles. History*, ii. 2. 4. 2; who adds that, by this permission, Gregory must be supposed to have allowed the Christians to dance, sport, and feast at the tombs of the martyrs; and to do everything at *their* festivals which the *Pagans* were accustomed to do in their temples, during the feasts celebrated in honour of their gods.—The same policy was pursued afterwards by Pope Gregory I; and it is to be traced in the later missions of the Romish Church in Japan, China, India, &c., even to the present time. See this illustrated in the Abbé Dubois' recent work on the Indian Mission.

The Rev. H. Wilberforce, in a Prize Essay, (p. 2,) alludes to Gregory's success in the conversion of the Pagans of his diocese to Christianity. The above extract will show that his example is not exactly one to be either admired, or followed.

population, or simply the lower and less instructed, who thus deserted Christ Jesus, the one only appointed Mediator between God and man, for other and imaginary mediators and intercessors. The highest and most influential of their bishops and doctors, Pope Damasus, Gregory Nyssen, Paulinus, Sulpitius,¹ (may I not add Jerome?) these led, and the multitudes followed.² And when (not to speak of certain discerning and Scriptural Christians, of whom more presently,) alike the Manichæan heretic, and the Pagan sophist, of which latter class still a few remained, objected and ridiculed the heathenish character of the new worship,—when, in sequence of the apostate Julian somewhat earlier,³ Eunapius the Pagan exclaimed in A. D. 396, “These are the gods the earth now-a-days brings forth,—these the intercessors with the gods,—men called *martyrs*; before whose bones and skulls, pickled and salted,⁴ the monks kneel, and lay prostrate, covered with filth and dust,”⁵—and the Manichæan Faustus, A. D. 400, “You have but exchanged the old idols for martyrs, and offer to the latter the same prayers as once to the former,”⁶—what was the defence put forth for the Church by its chief and most influential champions, such as the monk *Jerome*?⁷ While most loudly disclaiming the charge of *idolatry*, he did but both admit, and indeed contend for, just such a veneration and view of dead saints and martyrs as was essentially *anti-christian*. For throughout the whole of his two treatises, in answer to the charge of saint-worship and martyr-worship,—while *not one word was said about*

¹ See the Notes pp. 333, 334.

² Compare Mosheim v. 2. 3. 2.

³ When emperor, Julian thus expressed himself against the Christian superstitions: “At what you have done in adding new dead to your first dead man who can express sufficient disgust! You have filled every place with sepulchres and monuments.” (Cyril adv. Jul. vi. vii.)—On Jovian’s accession the Christians were characterized by another as *απο Θεων επι τους νεκρους μετατετραμμενους*, turned away to dead men and their relics. A similar charge is found in the contemporary historian Ammianus Marcellinus xxvii. 7.

⁴ “Condita et salita martyrum capita.” Eunap. ap. Baronium ad ann. 389.

⁵ Abridged from Lardner, viii. 66. The year 396 is *his* date of Eunapius’ Lives of the Sophists, whence the extract is borrowed.—Similarly wrote Maximus the Grammarian of the saint-worship prevalent, A. D. 390. See Augustine, Epist. 16.

⁶ “Sacrificia Gentilium vertistis in agapes; idola in martyres, quos votis similibus colitis: defunctorum umbras vino placatis et dapibus: &c.” Ap. Augustin. contra Faust. xx. 4.

⁷ Both Jerome’s Letter and Treatise against Vigilantius, the one of the date A. D. 404, the other 406, are given in full by Dr. Gilly in chapters xvii and xviii.

Christ's being our great Mediator and High Priest, not one word expressive of jealousy for *his* honour, or to show that *He* was not to be superseded in the office,¹—the whole strength of this Church-advocate's oratory was expended in magnifying the dead saints and martyrs in question: asserting, as he did, their transcendent merits and consequent influence with God,² their ubiquity too,³ and power to hear and answer supplicants, even to the extent of miracle-working in their behalf;⁴ as also to punish neglecters, and torture demons.⁵ In short he asserted a relation between men and them which, if not that of worshippers and the worshipped, was yet that of clients and patrons;⁶—patrons invested with the chief intercessory

¹ I pray the reader to mark this. The contrast with *Augustine* when speaking on the same subject, as will soon appear, is most striking.

² Moses, he argues, obtained pardon for 600,000 men, while alive; and Stephen besought forgiveness for his persecutors. How much the rather shall they prevail after obtaining their crowns of triumph and victory, and being with the Lord! Gilly, 399.

So Paulinus of the merits of St. Felix, and the consequent prevalency of prayers offered by him, and as mixt up with the memorial of his virtues. Gilly, p. 53.

Saucta sub æternis altaribus ossa quiescunt;
Ut, dum casta pio referantur munera Christo,
Divinis sacris animæ jungantur odores.

Or, as the French translators;

Les os sont enfermés sous l'enclos de l'autel;
Ou, quand s'offre au Seigneur l'holocauste immortel,
L'odeur de ses vertus, en tous lieux reverées,
Se joint au doux parfum des offrandes sacrées.

³ "Do you put them in bonds?" says he to Vigilantius, in reply to his assertion that they had a fixed place appointed them. "Are they not with the Lord, of whom it is written, They follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth? If the Lamb is everywhere, they who are with the Lamb must be believed to be everywhere. And since the devil and his angels wander over the whole world, . . . shall martyrs be cooped up under the altar?" Gilly, p. 398.—*Omniscience* too was of course another of the martyr's attributes. So Paulinus Natal. vi; (B. P. M. vi. 280:)

. . . qui lumine Christi
Cuneta et operta vides, longèque absentia cernis.

⁴ "Answer me this, How is there such efficacy of signs and miracles in this most worthless dust and ashes?" &c. Gilly, p. 408.

⁵ "The unclean spirit, which compels you to write these things, has often been racked by this trashy dust. I give you my advice:—enter the churches of the martyrs: . . . and you will then be burnt, not with the tapers of the martyrs which displease you, but with invisible flames; and will confess what you now deny." Ib. 409.

⁶ I add an illustration from Prudentius, *Περὶ Στεφανῶν*, Hymn 6; written about A.D. 405, with the precise title of *patrons* given to the saints: in which hymn, however, *Christ* is just mentioned, though not as the *intercessor*;—indeed distinctly as *not* one to be addressed by sinners. (Lardner, v. 5.)

Indignus, agnosco et scio,
Quem Christus ipse exaudiat;
Sed per patronos martyres
Potest medelam consequi.

and mediatorial, as well as chief ministering functions, between God and man. A view this which could not but involve practically the supersession of Christ, in his character of *the one Mediator* to whom was given all power for the help of his saints, alike in heaven and earth:—as well as that too, which was also most unequivocally noted in the Apocalyptic vision, of *the propitiatory meritorious sacrifice*; whereby alone sinful man's incense-offering could be purified, and made acceptable before God. For his character in this latter point of view could not be separated from the former. How came he to be a prevailing *Advocate* with the Father, except as being Jesus Christ *the righteous*, who had made *atonement* for our sins?¹—So was God's altar, and the ashes of his typical altar-fire, as well as his own appointed High Priest, forsaken by the mass in Roman Christendom, just according to the Apocalyptic figuration. Yea, God himself was practically forsaken as the object of prayer. Says Gieseler (§ 97); “Christians were now but seldom called upon to address their prayers to God; the usual mode being only to pray to some saint for his intercession.”

Oh! sad apostasy of the Church from that which was its proper and glorious office, I mean that of directing each sinner's soul to personal communion with Christ as its Mediator, atonement, righteousness, and way to the Father; and change into a system whereby it became more and more the instrument of *interposing* itself, and each sacred thing connected with it, between Christ and the soul: whether the sacraments,² or church-ritual, or tradition;³ whether the departed saints, or the living priests!—Surely! had but God's holy written word, construed in the simple unpervverted sense,⁴ been taken for its guide and rule, neither the examples of the high ones of the earth, nor Church-

¹ 1 John ii. 1, 2. Compare Is. liii. 11, 12.

² See the third Section of my Chapter on the Sealing Vision. ³ Ibid. p. 293.

⁴ See, for an example of the perversions of Scripture by Jerome, that which has been already noted of the Apocalyptic passage about “the 144,000 that follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth.” In its true meaning we shall hereafter see, I doubt not, that it has no reference whatsoever to dead saints after death, but to saints while still living. But Jerome held the *falsitas dispensativa*, spoken of p. 293 *suprà*. See for specimens Gilly, 199, 267.

authority,¹ nor traditional observances,² would have availed so to lead it wrong.—No doubt the seeds of martyr-worship were early sown. They were sown as innocently as unconsciously. What more allowable, as well as natural, than that when the early martyrs fell under the enemies of the faith, their remains should be regarded as precious, and their remembrance be kept up annually, on the returns of those their birthdays into eternal life?³ Again, what more innocent, as well as natural, than the solemn commemorative services at their tombs?⁴ And then what more natural than the inquisitive searchings into their actual state in the world of spirits; and the persuasion that they were not only still living and conscious, but with the same knowledge and affectionate interest about surviving friends, which erewhile on earth prompted them to intercessory prayer on their behalf?⁵ Once more, what more natural (but ah! here appeared the danger of speculating on things secret, here a trenching on the great Mediator's office) than the speaking to them, and asking their prayers?—Alas! fallen nature's was no safe guiding. What said holy Scripture? Had not just

¹ Jerome urges this: "Was the emperor Constantius guilty, and the emperor Arcadius, and all the bishops sacrilegious and fools, who carried the ashes in silk and in a golden vessel? Does the Bishop of Rome act amiss, &c., and the Bishops of the whole world?" &c. Ib. 397.

² This consideration hampered even Augustine. See p. 342 *infra*.

³ Acts viii. 2; "And devout men carried Stephen to his burial, and made great lamentation over him."—As yet nothing more. But even as early as *Ignatius'* martyrdom we see the tendency in Christians to an undue estimate of the value of the martyr's relics. "Parts of his holy remains," it is said in the Acts of his Martyrdom, "were taken and laid up at Antioch; a treasure *past price* to the Church:" *θησαυρος ατιμητος, ὑπο της εν τῃ μαρτυρι χαριτος τῇ ἁγίᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ καταλειφθεντα.*

So too in a very illustrative passage in the Acts of *Polycarp's* martyrdom, ch. 18; *Ἡμεῖς τε ἀνελομενοὶ τὰ τιμιώτερα λίθων πολυτελών, καὶ δοκιμώτερα ὑπερ χρυσιῶν, ὅσπερ αὐτοῦ, ἀπεθεμεθα ὅπου καὶ ἀκολουθοῦν ἡν' ἐνθα, ὡς ἔδυνάτο, ἡμῖν συναγομενοῖς, ἐν ἀγαλλίᾳ καὶ χαρᾷ παρέξει ὁ Κύριος ἐπιτελεῖν τὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου αὐτοῦ ἡμέραν γενεθλιαίαν, εἰς τὴν τῶν ἠθληκοτῶν μνημῆν, καὶ τῶν μέλλοντων ἀσκήσῃν τε καὶ ἐτοιμασίαν.* In ch. 17 the Narrative speaks of holding fellowship with his holy flesh, *κοινωνῆσαι τῷ ἁγίῳ αὐτοῦ σαρκικῶν.* Yet not in the way of *worship*, it is said, but commemoration. *Τούτου μὲν (Χριστοῦ) προσκυνῶμεν τοὺς δε μαρτυροῦσας, ὡς μαθητὰς καὶ μμητὰς τῷ Κυρίῳ, ἀγαπῶμεν.*

⁴ So Cyprian Ep. xxxiv; "Palmas à Domino et coronas illustri passione meruerunt. Sacrificia pro eis semper offerimus, quoties martyrum passionem et dies anniversariâ commemoratione celebramus." So too Ep. xxxvii.

⁵ So Origen, Exhort. ad Martyr. ch. 30; "The souls of martyrs slain for the witness of Jesus *διακονοῦσι τοῖς ἐνχομοῖς ἀφῆσιν ἁμαρτημάτων.* See Wetstein's Note.

How easy the step from this to the general idea of departed saints' mediatorship, so largely unfolded, as we have seen (*vid.* p. 333), ere the close of the 4th century. e. g. Gregory Nazianzen on Basil's death, A. D. 378:—*Καὶ νῦν ὁ μὲν ἐστὶν ἐν θρανοῖς, κἀκεῖ τὰς ὑπερ ἡμῶν, ὡς οἶμαι, προσφερῶν θυσίας, καὶ τὰ λαὸν προερχομενός: ἴδε γὰρ ἀπολιπῶν ἡμᾶς πανταπασιῶν ἀπολελοιπέν.* (Vol. i. p. 372. Ed. Colon. 1690.)

such a *stealthy* rise and growth, from earliest beginnings, been there predicted of the great apostasy? "The *mystery* of iniquity," said St. Paul, "doth even now work."¹ And were not ominous words spoken by him about *the worship of demons*, or *deified dead men*, as one marked feature that would characterize the unfolded apostasy?²—As it was, these holy warnings were neglected; and, as was to be expected, whatever other and human checks might be put forth to the grosser excesses of the incoming superstition proved also vain. Perhaps there might seem to some a grave check in the canon of the Council of Laodicea, which forbade *the worship of angels*.³ But in truth this was almost beside the mark, and quite ineffectual: for those whom the people now chiefly invoked as intercessors were *departed saints*, not *angels*.⁴

And herein indeed appeared the master-hand of *Him* that was from the first, and ever after, directing the course of man's corruption, though under a Christian profession, into the great apostasy. The *angels*, having nothing material about them, could not be so well visibly connected with certain particular ecclesiastical localities,⁵ as the *dead saints*, whose bodies must needs have each its own place of sepulture; nor consequently so associated with the *priestly functionaries* of the *martyrium*, or *church built over the martyr's relics* or *tomb*.⁶ On the other hand, in the latter case, and supposing the *saint* to be the effectual intercessor with God, who so effectual a helper to the saint's favour as the

¹ It was not the *gospel-doctrine* and *Church* that was to be a thing of gradual *development*, so as some would now have it at Oxford, as well as at Rome; but *the great predicted apostasy*.

² 1 Tim. iv. 1, "Doctrines of *demons*:" Apoc. ix. 20; "They repented not of *worshipping demons*;"—in my comment on which latter clause the sense of the word *demons* will be amply discussed, and that which is here given justified. See especially Paper 1 in the Appendix to Vol. II.

³ Canon 35: ου δει Χριστιανους εγκαταλειπειν την εκκλησιαν του Θεου, και απιεναι, και αγγελους ονομαζειν, και συναξεις ποιειν. This Council was held A.D. 372. Harduin i. 787.

⁴ Says Gieseler (§ 97); "After Ambrose (who first recommended the worship of *angels*) we find many marks of adoration paid them; but much fewer than to the *saints*."

⁵ It will be observed, in regard of the angel-worship forbidden in the Laodicean Council, that Christians *left the Church* for it.

⁶ Not only above-ground were churches built over martyrs' tombs, so as to be *martyria*, but even in the catacombs the altars of the chapels seem often to have been so built. See Dr. C. Maitland's *Catacombs*, p. 216.

Let me add an illustration from Prudentius, *Peristeph.* Hymn xi, (B. P. M. v.

priest that was guardian of the saint's relics? Hence a *copartnership* in the anti-christianism of the apostasy, as now unfolded at the closing in of the fourth century;—a copartnership between the visible world and the invisible, the earthly priest and the heavenly martyr. So that indeed the *priests* came even thus early, as well as the departed saints, to be viewed as and entitled *mediators*.¹—And hence too more and more among the people a superstitious awe of the clerical body; and a regard to them and to the monks, not only as the specially holy and elect,² but as those who had the dispensing of the favour and the wrath of heaven.³ Not to add, what could not but follow also, an awful increase of pride,⁴ superstition, and worldliness too, among the clerics;⁵ of pride altogether the most contrary to their Master's spirit; of worldliness and covetous-

1034,) describing the discovery of Hippolytus's remains, and transference of them from Ostia * to a subterranean crypt in Rome.

Talibus Hippolyti corpus mandatur opertis,
Propter ubi apposita est ara dicata Deo.
Illa sacramenti donatrix mensa, eademque
Custos fida sui martyris, apposita
Servat ad æterni spem judicis ossa sepulchro,
Pascit item sanctis Tibricolas dapibus.

¹ *μεισται*; a term used not infrequently by the Greek fathers of the latter half of the fourth century. See Waddington H. E. Vol. iii. p. 336; Ch. xxviii.

² So Paulinus called his monastic associates, "*fraternitatem electorum Dei*." And Jerome, comparing his own monastics at Bethlehem, and their poverty, fasts, celibacy, and self-mortifying austerities, intimates even to Paulinus that these only, and such as these, were the *elect*; saying, "Many are called, but few chosen." Gilly, Vigil. pp. 175, 248, 417.

Compare *God's* definition of the *elect*, as the *chosen*, *quicken*ed, *illuminated* by divine grace. See p. 275, &c. *suprà*. Also observe how at the end of the fourth century these very doctors, however otherwise erring, did thus confess that the evidence of being made *holy*, *elect*, and *faithful*, simply through the baptismal rite, was insufficient and untrue.

³ So Chrysostom, *De Sacerdotio*, iii. 6.—The emperor Theodosius II, when excommunicated by a monk for refusing him a favour, dared not taste a morsel till the excommunication was removed. Theodoret H. E. v. 37.

⁴ Gilly (p. 23), in his sketch of Martin of Tours, taken from Sulpitius, mentions how, in presence of the emperor Maximus, he passed his drinking cup to a presbyter, before handing it to the emperor: thereby marking that Church officers ought to take precedence of all the highest secular dignitaries. The Romish Editor of Sulpitius' *Life of St. Martin* notes in the margin of the passage; "*Dignitas sacerdotalis regis dignior*."—See too in Sulpitius' *Dialogue* i. 14, a lively sketch in detail of the foolish vanity and pride of the Gallic clergy generally:—a sketch that might perhaps apply to other and later ages also. Also Gieseler vi. § 101.

⁵ *All* Christians were called by St. Peter *κληροιοι* (1 Pet. v. 3), as being the Lord's *κληρονομοια*, or inheritance: but the term was now appropriated distinctively by the *clergy*. Jerome Ep. 2 ad Nepot., cited by Bingham i. 5. 9.

* See p. 219 *suprà*.

ness that would make gain of their own and the people's superstition! ¹

So had the *Apostasy* advanced, just as pre-intimated in the vision before us, yet another and a mighty step in its *anti-christian* course.—And here let the reader again stop and think whether he can imagine to himself an emblematic vision that could more exactly suggest by *allusive contrast* ² the characteristic error of the time, as well as more truly the contrasted faith of the saints, than this in the Apocalypse. Point by point the parallelism might be drawn out by us, just as before. ³ But indeed Gibbon has saved us the task. It needs but to put his lately cited picture of the *Christian professing world's* worship at this epoch, ⁴ and the Apocalyptic picture of the *saints'* worship, side by side, to be struck with the perfectness of the contrast.—So was this error now established: and, like the former, or baptismal error, it was *abiding*. ⁵ Well then might the prophecy speak henceforward of the mass of the inhabitants of Roman professing Christendom under the self-same title as of its heathen population previously,—“the *inhabitants of the earth*.” For heathenism had indeed now joined with Judaism, by its *idolatry*, as before by its *philosophy*, ⁶ in corrupting the Christianity that had overthrown it. Alike the infidel Gibbon, and the Christian Bishop Van Mildert, speak of heathenism as revived in the empire. And so too the philosopher Coleridge. “The pastors of the Church, says he, had gradually changed the life and light of the gospel into the very superstitions they were commissioned to disperse; and thus *paganized Christianity* in order to *christen Paganism*.” ⁷

But *all* had not thus become blinded to, and forsaken,

¹ See p. 333, Note ², on the priests' hawking supposed relics of saints and martyrs for sale. Gieseler *ibid.*, Note ¹³, gives a significant law of Theodosius of the date 386 A. D. against this. “*Humatum corpus nemo ad alterum locum transferat; nemo martyrem distrahat; nemo mercetur.*”—In § 101 Gieseler says; “A worldly spirit pervaded the whole order, which was manifested in the prostitution of the clerical character to the most selfish objects.” And, in illustration, he cites the following from Ambrose: “*Si clericus non contentus stipendiis fuerit quæ de altario consequitur, sed exercet mercimonia, intercessionem vendit, &c.*”

² See p. 272, &c., *suprà*.

³ See p. 282 et seq.

⁴ See p. 331.

⁵ See p. 286 *suprà*.

⁶ See pp. 293, 296, *suprà*.

⁷ Quoted by Gilly, p. 269, from Coleridge's 5th Essay in “The Friend.”

their only true and divine High Priest and Intercessor. Far from it. "There was given to the Angel much incense, that he should offer it with the prayers of *all the saints* upon the golden altar before the throne." So the prefiguration. And does not history verify this its direct picture, as well as its allusion? "Whom shall I look to as my Mediator," said *Augustine*, A. D. 400, just when all this forsaking of Christ was manifested at Rome and Nola, at Primuliac and Bethlehem; "Whom shall I look to as my Mediator? Shall I go to Angels? Many have tried this, and deserved to be the sport of the illusions that they loved. A mediator between God and man must have the nature of both. The true Mediator, *whom in thy secret mercy thou hast shown to the humble*,¹ the man Christ Jesus, hath appeared a mediator between mortal sinners and the immortal Holy One; that by his divine righteousness he might justify the ungodly. He was shown to ancient saints, that they might be saved by faith in his future sufferings; and we by faith in the same sufferings already past.² How hast thou loved us, O Father, delivering up thy only Son for us ungodly: for whom He, our priest and sacrifice, was subjected to death. Well may my hope be strong in such an Intercessor. . . He has redeemed me with his blood."³

Yes! it is no doubt true that *Augustine* was not altogether uninfected with the prevalent superstitions about departed saints: for he credulously believed in miracles wrought sometimes by their relics;⁴ and even joined in the established commemorative services, in which mention was made of their praying for the living.⁵ Alike his humility and his charity made him credulous. The living authority of the Church, the opinions and practices of friends, and ritualistic tradition handed down even from men like

¹ I of course suppose this vision of Christ as High Priest to have been seen by St. John in his *representative* character; and so as impersonating in the present case the faithful ones of the Augustinian era.

² Observe *Augustine's* view of the intent of the Levitical altar, sacrifices, priest, and ritual;—the precise symbols in the Apocalyptic vision.

³ Confessions, x. 42, 43.—Compare a beautiful passage, to much the same effect, in the earlier Ep. to Diognetus, ch. 9.

⁴ C. D. xxii. 8, 10, &c.

⁵ Cyril thus notices the prayer then offered after consecration of the holy communion: "Then we commemorate those that have fallen asleep before us; that God, at their prayers and intercessions, may receive our supplications." Lect. xxiii. 9.

Cyprian,¹ so far swayed him. But what he did was with such views, and such explanations to his people and the public, as showed his regard to Christ, in his character of the only and all-perfect mediator, to be just as clear, direct, and influential as our own. When consulted by Paulinus on the state of the departed saints, their knowledge, and the functions they might exercise in behalf of those they had left behind, while modestly stating that the subject was one quite beyond his depth, he expressed his doubt of their being present at their shrines, or knowing what might be passing on earth at the time; save only what they might hear from other souls more recently departed from earth, or by communication from God: moreover, as to miracles said to be done by them, that these might probably be by angelic ministrations, even though under the martyr's semblance.² Between which confessedly doubtful and restricted views, as to the saints knowing, hearing, and acting, and the views of Paulinus and Jerome, what a contrast! And how comparatively innocuous in such case the belief that, whilst in the separate state, departed saints pray for men; I mean innocuous as to diverting the eye from Christ!—And thus, when any question arose about the Mediator and High Priest that was to make man's offerings acceptable to God, we have seen how clear he was, and how strong. In his sermons on the martyrs' and saints' commemorations he still as expressly stated the same opinion.³ In his answer to Faustus the Manichæan, (while allowing much evil in the matter which the Church

¹ See Cyprian, quoted before, Note ⁴ p. 338. Also Note ¹ p. 344 *infra*.

Cyprian, writing in 251, allows the *possible* efficacy of martyrs' intercession, but in a guarded manner. "We are willing to admit the merits of the martyrs, and their interest with our righteous Judge; but this *not till the day of judgment*." Till then the answer to such prayers of the martyrs, as well as to other of their prayers, was deferred; as intimated in the Apocalyptic vision of the souls under the altar. Moreover he would have none of the lapsed to presume on the martyrs' prayers; "lest the unhappy sinner should have added to his other misfortunes that of the curse denounced by God on such as trust in man." *De Lapsis*.—His contemporary Origen was not so guarded. See p. 338 Note ⁵.

² See his *Treatise De Curâ Gerendâ pro Mortuis*, 19, 20, &c., from which *Treatise* Dr. Gilly has briefly abstracted, pp. 87—90. (*Tom. ix.* 884.)

³ *Tom. viii.* 1625; "Nos martyres nostros pro diis non habemus; non tanquam Deos colimus. Non martyribus sacerdotes offerunt. Absit. . . Deo offerunt." Again, 1685; "Pro martyribus non oratur: tam enim perfecti exierunt ut non sint suscepti nostri, sed advocati: neque hoc in *se*, sed in *illo cui capiti perfecta membra coheserunt*. Ille est enim verè *advocatus unus*, qui interpellat pro nobis sedens ad dextram Patris." (*Serm.* 273, 285.)

unwillingly tolerated,)¹ he added with regard to the *honour* judged due by him to departed saints, that it was but of the same nature as was paid to them *when alive*, though warmer in degree ;² and that the saints themselves would repudiate any higher worship, as more hateful to them than even drunkenness itself at their feasts.³—So that in this, as in every other point, the holy Augustine was as eminently and essentially *Christian*,—as eminently with the eye and heart directed to Christ, as the alone Mediator, propitiatory sacrifice, and High Priest,—as the prevailing system was eminently and essentially *anti-christian*. It was a subject indeed which he delighted to dwell on.⁴ And he declared that whosoever directed men to another mediator might be considered *Antichrist*.⁵

Nor was Augustine as yet so singular in his views and feelings. “There was *much* incense given to the Angel.” Multitudes doubtless under his influence, as well as others

¹ In Faustum B. xx. c. 21 ; “Aliud est quod docemus, aliud quod sustinemus; aliud quod præcipere jubemur, aliud quod emendare præcipimur, et donec emendemus tolerare compellimur.”

In an Epistle to Januarius he says; “I cannot approve many new practices; neither dare I censure them too freely, lest I should give offence. But it grieves me that so many salutary *precepts of Scripture* should be held cheap, and so many *inventions of men* held sacred. Therefore as to all such observances as are not contained in Scripture, ordained by Councils, or sanctioned by the custom of the universal Church, they ought to be laid aside. They burden our religion, which God intended to be free, with servile burdens heavier than those which oppress the Jews. However, the Church, surrounded as she is with chaff and tares, endures many things; though, as regards what is contrary to Christian faith and practice, she neither does it, nor approves it, nor is silent as to her disapprobation.”—He adds that the votaries of superstition silenced and neutralized the efforts of true reformers. Ep. 55. 35.

The same spirit and views appear in his earliest Treatise, that written early in 388, De Mor. Cath. Eccl. 75. “Follow not the crowds of the unwary; who in their very religion are superstitious, . . so as to forget what they have promised to God. For I know that there are many adorers (adoratores) of sepulchres and pictures of saints;” &c.

² “Colimus martyres eo cultu dilectionis et societatis quo et in hâc vitâ coluntur sancti homines Dei; . . sed illos tanto devotius, quanto securius post certamina superata.” Contra Faustum xx. 21.

³ “Oderunt martyres lagenas vestras; oderunt ebrietates vestras; . . sed multo plus oderunt si colantur.” Serm. 273. 8. So too in the context of the passage quoted in the preceding Note.

⁴ So the heading of C. D. ix. 17; “Ad consequendam vitam beatam . . non tali mediatore indigere hominem qualis est dæmon [sc. bonus], sed tali qualis est unus Christus.” And so elsewhere in this ixth Book of the C. D. copiously; and, again, in the C. D. x. 22, 24.

⁵ So Tom. xii. p. 93, on 1 John ii. 1, (“We have an advocate with the Father, &c.”) he says; “If John had said, ‘If any man sin I will pray for him,’ (as Parmenianus in one place makes the Bishop the mediator between the people and God,) where is the faithful Christian that would tolerate it? Who not view him rather as *Antichrist* than as an apostle?” (“Quis sicut apostolum Christi, et non sicut antichristum, intueretur?”)

elsewhere under other teaching, united in offering the incense of their prayer and praise simply through the mediation and propitiatory atonement of Jesus. May we not trust that the promoters of the Laodicean Council, however timid and partial in their restriction of the crying evil, were yet influenced by sincere regard to Christ? Again, of *Jovinian* may we not hope the same? ¹ Ay, and even of not a few who were intellectually clouded on this point, and superstitious?—Most of all we must note “the Protestant of his age” *Vigilantius*: ² one that was more prominent than Augustine himself in the direct act of protesting against the prevalent superstitions; and whom we may well believe with Dr. Gilly to have done this, not in the mere way of protesting against false mediators, but as himself seeing, and worshipping through, the true one. ³

¹ “Dicit virgines viduas et maritatas, quæ semel in Christo lotæ sunt, si non discrepent cæteris operibus, ejusdem esse meriti. Nititur approbare eos qui plenâ fide in baptismate renati sunt a Diabolo non posse subverti. Tertium proponit inter abstinentiam ciborum, et cum gratiarum actione perceptionem eorum, nullam esse distantiam. Quartum, quod et extremum, esse omnium qui suum baptismum servaverint unam in regno cælorum remunerationem.” So his vituperator Jerome, (as cited by Gieseler, c. vii. § 104,) of Jovinian’s heretical doctrine. What he chiefly reprehends are Jovinian’s anti-ascetic views. But Jovinian seems to have formed these on the *Bible*; and his opposition to one superstitious error, on the ground of its variation from *Scripture* doctrine, must have involved opposition also to others. See Milner’s remarks on him, Cent. v. ch. x.

² Gibbon v. 126.

³ *Vigilantius* was so remarkably the *Protestant* of the times when he wrote, that it would be wrong not to quote what is recorded by a bitter enemy concerning his protestation.

In his Letter then to Riparius, Jerome says that *Vigilantius* called those who received the martyrs’ relics *cinder-gatherers* and *idolaters* (*cinerarios et idolatras*); also that *Vigilantius* abominated the *vigils*, or *night-watchings*, kept by pilgrims at the shrines of the saints on their festivals.

In his Book against *Vigilantius*, written after receiving copies of his writings, he again states him to have denied that the sepulchres of the martyrs were to be venerated, and to have condemned the vigils. Also he quotes him as having written thus: “What need is there for you with so much respect not only to honour, but even to adore, and in your adoration to kiss, dust folded up in a linen cloth?” Again: “Under the pretext of religion we see a custom introduced into the churches which approximates to the rites of the Gentiles; viz. the lighting of multitudes of tapers, even while the sun is yet shining. And everywhere men kiss in their adoration a small quantity of dust folded up in a little cloth, and deposited in a little vessel. Men of this stamp give great honour forsooth to the most blessed martyrs: thinking with a few insignificant wax-tapers to glorify those whom the Lamb, who is in the midst of the throne, enlightens with all the brightness of his majesty.”

Again; “The souls of the apostles and martyrs have settled themselves either in Abraham’s bosom, or in a place of refreshment, or under the altar of God; and they cannot escape from their tombs, and present themselves where they please.” And; “So long as we are alive we can mutually pray for each other: but after we are dead the prayer of none for another can be heard; especially since the martyrs pray ineffectually to obtain vengeance for the shedding of their blood.” Again; “Do

And what the result of their so offering? It was indicated in the vision. The Covenant-Angel received their offering: "and the smoke of the incense," we read, "which came with the prayers of the saints, ascended up (accepted) before God out of the Angel's hand." Yes! they might, some at least, like Vigilantius,¹ be cast out as *heretics* by their fellow-men: but they were accepted before God. As to the rest, the *earthly* ones in Roman so-called Christendom, and neglecters of Christ the Saviour, on them judgment must follow.² "The Angel took the censer, and filled it with fire of the altar, and cast it (the fire) upon the earth: and there were thunderings, and lightnings, and voices, and an earthquake.—And (then) the seven angels that had the seven trumpets prepared themselves to sound."

CHAPTER II.

INTENT OF THE TRUMPET-SOUNDINGS, AND EXPOSITORY PRINCIPLES OF THE FOUR FIRST TRUMPETS.

I. PRELIMINARILY to our inquiry into the principles to be followed in our exposition more particularly of the four first Trumpets, it may be well to premise a few remarks on

the souls of martyrs love their ashes, and hover round them, and be always present; lest, if any suppliant should perchance happen to draw near, they might not hear him in consequence of their absence? Finally, it was his saying, "that the miracles said to be done in the churches of the martyrs were profitable for the *misbelievers*, not for the *faithful*."*

Besides which Vigilantius protested against the system of *celibacy* and *monachism*: against the *former* by asserting that it led to incontinence; against the *latter* by saying, "If all should shut themselves up, and live in solitude, who will serve the churches? Who will win the men of the world? Who will exhort sinners to virtue?" Further, he deprecated sending money to the monks at Jerusalem, &c.; deeming it better to attend to the poor of his own neighbourhood. See Gilly, pp. 375—382 and 389 et seq.

¹ Vigilantius is still in the Roman list of heretics.

² Compare again Ezek. viii. 11, x. 2.

* Dr. Gilly thinks Vigilantius' meaning in this to be, that when true faith was in the heart, the internal evidences of the truth were sufficiently convincing, and there was no need of a show of miracles (p. 443). But might he not rather mean that it furnished occasion to the heathens against Christianity, seeing that *they* could not but see the falsehood? Just such was the case of *Eunapius*, the Pagan sophist quoted p. 335 *suprà*.

the *general* significancy of the Apocalyptic symbol of the Trumpets, and the septenary number of the soundings on which the judgments foredoomed were now about successively to be poured out on the Roman earth. An inquiry this that cannot but be useful and interesting. For, since we are told that it was by God's own appointment that trumpets were made and used in the ancient Israel,¹ as also that their uses were all expressly defined by Him, and these uses of them to be made in the Jewish temple, by priests that "stood before God,"²—and since in the visions of Patmos the Apocalyptic temple was similarly the locality of the trumpet-blasts, and the trumpet-angels similarly designated as those that stood before God,—therefore we seem warranted in supposing an analogy between the two cases; and that a significancy attached to the trumpets in the latter case not dissimilar from what attached to them in the former.

Now under the Levitical law the uses of the priestly trumpet may be classed as twofold. 1st, and as regarded *the Israelites*, its use was to proclaim to them the epochs of advancing time,—the sabbaths, the new moons, the new years, and annual or other festivals; on these summoning the congregations for praise and prayer: besides that it served also, whilst they sojourned in the wilderness, to proclaim each forward movement of the camp, and thus to note their advancing steps towards the end of their pilgrimage.³—2ndly, during *war-time*, and as regarded *their enemies*, its use was to proclaim war against those enemies, as from God Himself: the trumpets blown by his priests against them being a declaration that the LORD had taken up Israel's cause as his own cause, and that He would fight for Israel.⁴

And it seems to me that of these two kinds of uses, we may apply not the *one* only, but *both*, to the emblematic trumpet-soundings in the Apocalypse.—To his own Israel, to the 144,000,—emerged indeed out of the Egypt of Pagan oppression, but having still the tribulation and long

¹ Numb. x. 1—10.

² Deut. x. 8.

³ See besides Numb. x. 1—10, already referred to, Levit. xxv. 9; Ps. lxxxii. 3; &c. Also 1 Cor. xiv. 7, 8.

⁴ Jer. li. 27, &c.

pilgrimage of the wilderness to pass through,—each trumpet-angel's sounding, like the hour-strikings on a chronometer, might be regarded as a chronological epoch in the prophecy, a note of advance towards the promised blessed consummation. Such, for instance, is the chronometrical use made of them in the vision of Apoc. x: in which vision the sun-beaming Angel, that descended and stood with his feet on land and sea, when he would distinguish the true time of the consummation from the wrong, thus expressed his meaning; "He sware by Him that liveth for ever and ever, that,"—not in the days of the *sixth* Trumpet-angel, under which his descent took place,—but "in the days of the *seventh*, the mystery of God should be finished." This, I say, was *one* thing signified to St. John by the successive trumpet-soundings. And as to him by the *figurative trumpet-clangs*, so similarly was it signified to the saints from time to time living, (in so far as understanding on the subject might be given them,) by the voices of the *actual events prefigured*; as one, and then another, pealed upon a startled world.¹—Further, since during all this time there was a state and a people in open opposition to the truth and the true Israel, therefore the successive trumpet-soundings might be considered, also, as the repeated proclamations of war from the Lord Himself against them. Indeed this is the meaning most prominently marked in the trumpet-soundings of the Apocalypse; as it is the use most frequent of the figure in other Scriptures.—And let me add that, supposing the trumpets to have been blown in the temple of vision, like those in the ancient temple of Jerusalem, "over the burnt-

¹ Isa. xviii. 3; "All ye inhabitants of the world and dwellers on the earth, . . when he bloweth a trumpet, hear ye."—So Vitringa; "Clangores tubæ, qui præcedunt Dei judicia in Romanum imperium, significant illa Dei judicia fore notabilia, magnum in mundo editura esse sonum, omnium . . suscitatura attentionem, et per universum mundum per famam vulganda, &c." p. 440.

It is observable, as Mede has appositely remarked, that Ammianus Marcellinus, the most eminent historian of the times we speak of, adopts the very same figure of *trumpet-soundings* to mark certain threatenings of universal war (which however did then only very partially fulfil themselves) in the reigns of Valentinian and Valens. "Hoc tempore, *velut* per universum orbem Romanum *bellicum canentibus buccinis*, excite gentes sævissimæ limites sibi proximos persultabant." Lib. xxvi. 4. This was with reference to the invasions of the empire by the Northern barbarians, A.D. 364. But it was not yet God's time for *his* trumpet's sounding. The invasions were all repulsed.

offerings and peace-offerings" on the great altar,¹ then it must have looked like an intimation that the cause, thus espoused by God, was espoused as the cause of those who had made a covenant with Him by sacrifice; and as against them specially that had forsaken the holy covenant associated with that mystic altar, and its one great sacrificial offering.

There were to be *seven Trumpets* sounded, and under the seventh Trumpet *seven Vials* poured out. The numeral resemblance of these to the seven trumpet-blasts sounded on seven successive days against the ancient *Jericho*, and which were followed on the seventh day by seven compassings of its wall, till on the last the wall fell down, and entrance was given to Israel into that first city of the promised Canaan,²—this interesting resemblance, I say, has been noted by Ambrose Ansbert in old times, and in more modern times by Vitringa, and other Apocalyptic commentators after him. It almost seemed as if some power were marked out hereby as the New Testament *Jericho*; whose domination opposed, and whose overthrow would introduce, the saints' enjoyment of the heavenly Canaan. And if so, what power but that of the now nearly dominant anti-christian apostasy?—It is observable, and perhaps confirmatory of this view, that in the ancient Jewish *Feast of Tabernacles* there was kept up a constant commemoration of the above-noted manner of the fall of the ancient *Jericho*; and this with a certain reference to the *future*, in the ritual, as well as to the *past*. On seven successive days, (according to the divine ordinance,) a palm-bearing procession, with trumpets blowing, were then wont to visit the Temple; and, on the last of the seven, seven times to compass the altar, still sounding the trumpets, and chanting *Hosanna!*³ Now, as the cry *Hosanna* was *supplicatory*, signifying *Save now*, that is in address (so as in Ps. cxviii. 25) to Jehovah, it seemed to refer to some enemy *yet to be conquered* by Messiah for his people, some *Jericho yet to be*

¹ Numb. x. 10.

² Joshua vi. 3—16.

³ See Godwyn's *Moses and Aaron*, iii. 6, and Horne's *Introduction*, Vol. iii. P. iii. 4. 7, on this Festival. In the text I have followed Horne in counting the 8th day of Lev. xxiii. 39 as the 7th, according to the well-known Jewish inclusive mode of reckoning. Compare Joh. xx. 26, Matt. xvi. 21, &c.

overthrown.—Many a time must St. John himself have witnessed the celebration of this ceremonial. And thus when he saw prefigured the rising up and reign of an earthly anti-christian power, to which the duration meted out was that of the seven trumpet-soundings, and under the seventh trumpet of the seven vials out-pouring, the remembrance of it, and the application, could scarce fail to strike him. Of the fall of the first, or Canaanitish Jericho, the commemoration was in that Jewish Feast of Tabernacles of which I was just speaking. Of the fall of the second the celebration was to be in the anti-typical Christian Feast of Tabernacles, yet future :—that same festival that St. John had just a little while before seen figured anticipatively in the Palm-bearing vision ; and to which the eyes of the saints have ever since been directed, as the destined term to all the evils, and all the enemies, of the wilderness.

II. But now as to the interpretative principles, more particularly, of the *four first Trumpets*.

The sacred narrative respecting them, and the figurations that ensued on their several soundings, are as follows.

“And the angel took the censer, and filled it with fire of the altar, and cast it upon the earth : and there were thunderings, and lightnings, and voices, and an earthquake. And the seven angels which had the seven trumpets prepared themselves to sound.

“And the first sounded, and there followed hail and fire mingled with blood, and they were cast upon the earth ; and the third part of the land was burnt up, and the third part of the trees was burnt up, and all green grass was burnt up.—And the second angel sounded : and as it were a great mountain burning with fire was cast into the sea : and the third part of the sea became blood ; and the third part of the creatures that were in the sea which had life, died ; and the third part of the ships were destroyed.—And the third angel sounded : and there fell a great star from heaven, burning as it were a lamp ; and it fell upon the third part of the rivers, and upon the fountains of water ; and the name of the star is called Wormwood : and the third part of the waters became wormwood ; and

many men died of the waters, because they were made bitter.—And the fourth angel sounded: and the third part of the sun was smitten, and the third part of the moon, and the third part of the stars; so that the third part of them was darkened, and the day shone not for a third part of it, and the night likewise.”¹

The four first Trumpet-visions, it will be seen, like those of the four first Seals, are connected together by certain strongly marked features of resemblance; and which are here of such a nature as to make it desirable to consider the four visions together. They depict the destructive action of a series of tempests, successively affecting the third part of the Roman earth, third part of the sea, third part of the rivers, and third part of the firmamental luminaries. By English Protestant interpreters they have been generally explained, and I doubt not truly, of those successive invasions and ravages of the GOTHs, chiefly in the fifth century, which ended in the subversion of the Western empire. At the same time there has been as to the *details*, and the apportionment of its part in the Gothic ravages to each one of the four Trumpet-visions distinctively, such a remarkable difference of opinion,—scarcely two commentators, I believe, explaining them alike,—as to have thrown discredit, in the opinion of not a few, on the Gothic application altogether. Nor is the want of distinctness less marked in the expositions of German or other expositors, who take quite a different general view of the prophecy.² Hence a necessity, evidently, that the principles, on which we are to form a distinctive and particular application of the several figures, should be carefully inquired into and established.

¹ Apoc. viii. 5—12.—There is here no variation in the critical editions from the received text of the least importance; except the insertion in verse 7 of the clause *καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῆς γῆς κατέκαη*, “and the third part of the earth was burnt up:” which I have accordingly inserted.

² In the copious notices of other expositors’ views which will be found in my Appendices, especially in the Appendix to the 4th volume of this work, the reader will have ample means of testing the truth of this remark. For an example take *Eichorn*, *Heinrichs*, or *M. Stuart*, all of the common modern German School, which expounds the first part of this prophecy of the fall of Jerusalem, the second of that of Nero. The “third part,” says each one, is put for a considerable part: (“*exquisitè*” so put, observes *Eichorn*!) the hail, volcanic mountain, star of bitterness, and heavenly luminaries obscured, were signs of coming calamities on Jerusalem. But, says *Heinrichs*; “*Sedulo cavendum erit interpreti ne ad singula descendat, et quid eis indicatum sit conquirat curiosius. Nil continetur vv. 7—12 quàm omnis generis calamitas publica*”!!

I said that of the general truth of the Gothic application of these four Trumpet-visions I had myself no doubt. And on the question whether they were so intended, or not, the reader, whosoever may thus far have followed and agreed with me, will I think soon see reason not to hesitate. Considering that we were brought by the visions of the six first Seals to that period of the Roman history when Paganism fell, and Christianity was established under Constantine and his successors,—and that the sixth Seal's closing figurations of the four threatening but temporarily arrested tempest-angels, and the sealing and palm-bearers, fixed our position at Theodosius' arrest of the Gothic insurrection under Valens, and the contemporary Augustinian revelation,—an arrest of which the sudden ending at Theodosius' death might seem to mark a new and fateful epoch, just such as to answer to the seventh Seal's opening,—considering, I say, that in comparing the parallel course of the prophecy and the history, we were thus brought by the apocalyptic visions to the precise epoch of the commencement of the great Gothic irruptions into the Roman empire, and that then (after a preliminary figuration which seemed not obscurely indicative of that æra's crowning sin of saint and martyr-worship) the symbols in vision next following were such as well to suit those Gothic devastations, — being the symbols of thunderings, lightnings, and an earthquake, then, after trumpet-soundings from on high, those of tempests, volcanoes, and meteors, successively bursting on the Roman earth,—it seems to me almost impossible to doubt but that the latter were intended as a prefiguration of the former.—There are two further coincidences that must not be omitted, as furnishing corroborative evidence of the truth of this conclusion. The *one* is, that as the Gothic ravages terminated in the extinction of the Western emperors and empire, so the fourth Trumpet-vision, the last of the series, depicted the partial darkening of what were the well-known symbols of rulers,¹—the sun and the heavenly luminaries. The *other*, that as the Gothic desolations were succeeded, after a half century's in-

¹ See my observations on these symbols, under the sixth Seal, p. 247 *suprà*.

terval, or rather more, by the Saracen invasions, so the fourth Trumpet-vision was succeeded, after a forewarning notice which might well correspond with that interval, by the fifth Trumpet-vision;—a vision almost demonstrably prefigurative, as I hope to prove, of that very Saracenic woe.

Which point being settled to our satisfaction, we come next to the question of the right *particular* application of each one of the four visions to the one particular irruption of the Goths really corresponding. For that some such particular application is intended, and that distinctive marks are given in the visions to fix it, I cannot doubt. The divine selection of the symbols, being the best possible, must needs, we might feel assured *à priori*, be precise and distinct: and their precision and appropriateness in every one of the Apocalyptic visions that we have hitherto considered, has very strikingly illustrated and confirmed the fact. The only doubtful question is as to the distinctive mark intended.—The question is narrowed by the important fact, to which notice has been called already, of the fourth vision of the series almost obviously prefiguring (if the *general* reference be admitted) the extinction of the Western Cæsars. So that it is only in the cases of the former three that we have need to seek out the distinctive characteristics.

And now then, as with this view the reader considers the three Trumpet-visions in question, this will, I think, very soon strike him;—that though there may be, and probably is, something *partially* characteristic of each particular invasion in those of the symbols, respectively, that prefigure *the powers invading*, I mean the hailstorm, the volcano, and the blazing meteor,—yet that the measure of similarity of character between them, as being all alike figures of hostile and desolating armies, is such as to preclude *them* from furnishing any *decisive* distinction.¹ And thus he finds himself forced to look to other stated particulars in the several visions, for the marks he is in search of; especially to their designations of the *locality* or *geographical*

¹ Thus Vitringa observes in his Preface, that “*the burning mountain cast into the sea might, of itself, indicate either the evils which the Jews suffered from the Romans,—those which the Western Romans suffered from the Goths,—or the Eastern Romans from the Turks.*” p. v.

division in each case *invaded*:¹—the which indeed, from the singular and marked character of the phraseology that defines them, appear expressly intended to fix the attention of the reader; “*the third part of the land,*² *and of the trees,*” “*the third part of the sea,*” “*the third part of the rivers.*”

But behold Commentators of high name interpose; and tell us that there is nothing of local or geographical meaning in these expressions;—that they are all mere figures. “The Roman universe,” says Mede, (and he is followed in the spirit of his exposition by many subsequent English expositors,)³ “is compared to the mundane system, which consists of earth, sea, rivers, heaven, stars; the system or constitution of the empire having as its *earth* that which is the base and foundation, as it were, of the whole polity; as its *sea*, that amplitude of rule which circumscribes its earth, as the natural land is circumscribed by the natural sea; its political *rivers* also which originate from and flow into the sea, viz. the provincial magistrates,” &c.⁴ And

¹ I say *the part invaded*. Mr. Faber has suggested a *geographical* distinction of quite a different kind; viz. with reference to the quarters (not on which the tempests were to fall, but) *from* which they were to blow. This is founded on the hypothesis of each one of these four *tempest-angels* (Apoc. vii. 1) corresponding (indeed being identical) with one of the four *trumpet-angels*; and of their blowing one by one singly in the first four trumpet-visions, then ceasing. But surely the idea of their identity ill consists with the respective positions of the tempest-angels and the trumpet-angels; the latter in the Apocalyptic temple “before God,” the former at each of the four cardinal points of the heaven. And, as to the notion of the separate actings and blasts of each of the tempest-angels, it takes for granted what should be proved; besides that the limitation of the tempest-angels’ action to but these four blasts is inconsistent with the much longer commission which, it seems probable, as will be seen hereafter, attached to them.—Further, even waiving these objections, how indistinct would be the distinction proposed; because there is nothing to fix the *order* in which, in such case, the winds should blow. Mr. Faber’s order of North, South, West, and East, is altogether arbitrary; as indeed would be any other. See his S. C. ii. 249, &c. (2nd Ed.)

² See Note ¹ p. 353, as to the insertion of this clause in the best critical Editions.

³ So *Mr. Cuninghame* (p. 49, Ed. 4); “All interpreters of note agree that this universe is to be considered symbolical.”

There is, however, much variety in the application. *Vitringa* in Trumpet 2 (p. 465) makes *the sea*, like *the earth*, to be the Roman empire: having just before, (p. 456,) with an inconsistency strange in his case, explained it to symbolize the barbarous nations separated from the Roman empire.—*Daubuz* says that *the sea* means “the greater part of the Roman subjects; the *rivers* the smaller remaining part.” p. 377.—*Faber* thinks that by the “allegorical *sea*” is to be understood “the people of the Roman empire, distracted by the wars and revolutions of the 1st Trumpet:” (S. C. ii. 263:) though elsewhere (ib. iii. 260) limiting it to “the largest nation of the divided Roman empire.” “The rivers and fountains” he explains to be the “numerous Gothic kingdoms of the divided Western Empire.” (ib. ii. 267.)—This may suffice.

⁴ Mede’s Works, p. 459.

then as to the *third part*, whether of land, sea, or rivers, he expounds it to mean the *whole Roman earth*; as constituting, he says, about one-third of the known world, at the time of the Evangelist.¹—Who can wonder that by interpreters who have adopted any such principle of interpretation the visions of the three first Trumpets should be applied with equal facility and plausibility to *one* as to *another* of the Gothic invasions? For the very distinctiveness of these symbols in the sacred text is annihilated by their interpretation: and a meaning so nearly common attached to them, that, whosoever or whensoever the invader, in so far as any one of the three designated objects might be disturbed by the invasion,—whether the figurative earth, figurative sea, or figurative rivers,—it must needs be that the two others would be thereby disturbed also.

1. Reserving the consideration of *the third part* for a separate inquiry, let me first ask what can be the reason for thus setting aside the natural geographical and topographical sense of these expressions, *land, sea, rivers*? It has arisen, I believe, from an opinion that, whenever any one prominent part of a prophecy is clearly symbolic in its language, the rest ought to be interpreted in a symbolical or figurative sense also; at any rate in such an example as that now before us. So that in the present instance the *land, sea, and rivers* mentioned ought to be construed symbolically, because such is clearly the case in regard to the *burning mountain, tempest, and meteoric* phænomena specified. This opinion, which seems to have prevailed widely among commentators, is evidently of too great importance, and if true, of too extensive application, not to demand an immediate inquiry into its correctness.²

¹ So also *Daubuz, Bp. Newton, &c.*—*Lowman* interprets it as to mean *a great part*. *Mr. Cuninghame*, after a lengthened discussion on the subject, candidly confesses (p. 62) that if the question were put to him, “why the proportion of *one third* of the symbolical universe should be the limit affixed to the effects of the four first Trumpets,” he cannot answer.

² Thus Archdeacon Woodhouse, when objecting to the usual interpretations of the fifth Trumpet, as having reference to the Saracens, says; “To make out the interpretation, Commentators are obliged to apply the prophetic characters sometimes in a *borrowed*, sometimes in a *literal* sense; *which I suppose is unwarranted*. They ought all to be applied in the same sense.”—So too, in a measure, the Reviewer of Keith’s Signs of the Times, in the Investigator, iii. 271.

I have put the question *restrictedly*, viz. as applicable to an example involving local terms, like that before us, because really as regards the *general* question, the mixture of the *literal* and the *symbolic* is so palpable and so frequent in prophetic Scripture, that it seems quite needless to detain the reader by citations to prove it. He can scarce open a page in the prophecies without seeing examples.¹ Would any man in his senses suppose that because in Psalm 22 the predictive words “All my bones are out of joint,” and those, “They parted my garments among them, &c.,” are to be taken literally, therefore the “fat bulls of Basan,” mentioned in connexion, are to be construed literally also? Or vice versâ? I believe not an Apocalyptic Commentator can be found, whatever his predilections in favour of taking all literally or all symbolically, that has been able fully to carry out the rule into practice.² It is indeed, in my opinion, all but an impossibility.—Thus it is the *limited* question of the admissibility of literal *localities*, and a literal *geography*, into prophecies generally symbolical, that seems alone to need investigation. Nor will it detain us long to furnish the proof requisite for an answer in the affirmative.

The best proof seems to be that of examples from other prophecies, where the mixture spoken of is unequivocal. Let me then cite a few.—My first shall be from Ezek. xxvii. 26; “The east wind hath broken thee in the midst of the seas.” In this passage Tyre is symbolized as a ship, and Nebuchadnezzar as the destroying wind that shipwrecked it:—yet, symbolical as is the general phraseology, the chorographic phrase, “in the midst of the seas,” designates the literal locality of the situation of Tyre; and “the East” that of the kingdom of Nebuchadnezzar with respect to it. I rather select this as a first example, because it illustrates the manner in which the locality *from whence* a threatened evil is to issue, is often, by the peculiar appro-

¹ Augustine, C. D. xx. 21. 2, suggests a reason: “Locutiones tropicæ propriis prophetico more miscentur; ut ad intellectum spirituales intentio sobria, cum quodam utili ac salubri labore, perveniat.”

² Woodhouse is probably one of the most consistent advocates of the *wholly figurative* principle, *Burgh* of the *literal*. Yet the *former* sometimes deviates into *literal* interpretation; and so too his follower *Dr. Park*; e. g. in regard to the prophetic numerals: the *latter* sometimes into *figurative*; e. g., in his explanation of the *horses* from the *Euphrates* of the sixth Trumpet.

priateness of the emblem, intimated in Scripture metaphors; as well as that *on which* the evil is to fall. That the meaning I have attached to the emblem, as thus significant, is not undesigned or fortuitous, will appear from its frequent and distinctive use elsewhere to the same effect.¹—A second example that I shall cite is from chap. xxxii of the same prophecy. Here Pharaoh, king of Egypt, and his people and power, are figured under the symbol of a crocodile. After which comes the clause following: “I will water with thy blood the *land* wherein thou swimmest, even to the *mountains*; and the *rivers* shall be full of thee.” Of which the meaning is plain. The waters of the Nile being wont to overflow from mountain-chain to mountain, which form the Egyptian valley, and, except at flood-time, to separate at the Delta into many different streams,—the prediction made was that these literal rivers, this literal land, should be tinged with the blood of Pharaoh and his people.—In which example observe that, though the land previously spoken of means the *literal* land of Egypt, and the rivers its *literal* rivers, yet the *sun*, *moon*, and *stars* are in the very next verse used *figuratively* of its governing authorities; just as in the case of the symbols of the fourth trumpet, as compared with those of the three former. For these are the words of verse 7; “And when I shall have put thee out,” (i. e. out of the water,) “I will cover the heaven, and make the stars thereof dark; and I will cover

¹ For instance in Ezek. xix. 12; “Thy mother (Judah) is like a vine, &c. But she was plucked up in fury; she was cast down to the ground: the *east wind* dried up her fruit.” And again in xvii. 10, a passage very similar. So also in Jer. xviii. 17, and Hosea xiii. 15. In all these cases the emblem that I speak of, *the east wind*, is appropriate both *figuratively*, (with reference to the general picture,) and *geographically*, with reference to the situation of Babylonia and Assyria as lying east of Judæa. So in Isaiah xli. 2 Abraham’s coming out from *Mesopotamia* or *Babylonia* to Canaan is spoken of as his coming from *the east*; and in Matt. ii. 1 the wise men from *Babylonia* are called the wise men *from the east*.

It is to be observed that the Babylonians, though east of *Palestine*, yet entered it from Damascus and the *north*. Hence they are sometimes spoken of as coming from the north. So Jer. i. 13, 14; “I said, I see a seething-pot, and its face is toward the *north*. Then the Lord said unto me, Out of the *north* shall an evil break forth upon all the inhabitants of the land.” But nowhere is such a figure as a whirlwind from *south*, or *west*, applied to Nebuchadnezzar or the Assyrians; though winds quite as suitable to cause shipwreck as the east wind. Compare Isa. xxi. 1 and Zech. ix. 14; in both which the whirlwind from the *south* is the figure: and it is used in the one case of Persia attacking Babylon, a city north-west of *it*; in the other of Judah attacking the Greeks, whose Asiatic cities (as Antioch, &c.,) were situated north-west of *them*.

the sun with a cloud, and the moon shall not give her light : all the bright lights of heaven will I make dark over thee ; and set darkness upon thy land, saith the Lord.”—Take a third example from Ps. lxxx. 8, 11 ; “Thou hast brought a vine out of *Egypt* : . . it sent out its boughs unto the *sea* and its branches unto *the river* :” where, though the vine is symbolic, yet the *Egypt*, *sea*, (Mediterranean Sea,) and *river*, (Euphrates,) are all notoriously literal.—Once more, for a case of minuter locality, we may refer to Jeremiah iii. 6. “Hast thou seen that which backsliding Israel hath done? She is gone up upon every high mountain, and under every green tree ; and there hath played the harlot.” Here the harlotry of Judah is figurative ; but the high mountains, and the green trees, indicated the literal localities, where that figurative harlotry was committed against God.¹

Thus much on the admixture of the geographically or locally literal with the figurative, in the phraseology of *other* Scripture prophecies. To which let me add, that in the *Apocalyptic* prophecy itself there are localities specified, as we shall see, both *general* and *particular*, which must necessarily be interpreted literally as localities. So, for example, in passages like that of Apoc. xii. 12, where it is said, “Woe to the inhabitants of the *earth* and of the *sea* !” For unless the land were the literal land, and the sea the literal island-studded sea, how could they have inhabitants? And so again in Apoc. ix. 14, where the *Euphrates* spoken of must needs mean the literal Assyrian river ; supposing only that proof can be given satisfactory, (of which I do not doubt,) that the judgments figured under the sixth trumpet were those of the *Turkish* woe.

2. It remains that we investigate the meaning of “*the third part* ;” a question certainly more difficult.—It has been mentioned that many commentators interpret the phrase as one designative of the whole Roman world, or perhaps of some large but indefinite portion of it. The unsatisfactoriness, however, of all such indefinite explana-

¹ Just the same image, and same mixture of literal and figurative, occurs Is. lviii. 5, &c.

tion is evident. To say nothing of other inconsistencies in it, it makes one of the most strongly-marked phrases of designation in the whole Apocalyptic prophecy,—one used seven times here, and twice elsewhere,—it makes this, I say, altogether unmeaning. No wonder therefore that they who thus interpret should be themselves dissatisfied with their interpretation; and show, like Mr. Cuninghame, that they have only given it, because of not perceiving any threefold division of the Roman world, such as in their opinion to answer to the conditions of the prophetic clauses. That the *earth*, or *world*, spoken of in the Apocalypse means the *Roman earth*, or *world*, cannot I think be doubted; it being a use of the term frequent in other Scriptures,¹ (not to say in the best profane writers also,²) and already proved I believe elsewhere to be the true Apocalyptic sense.³ Again, that some actual threefold division of the empire is intended by the phrase "third part," seems to me also indubitable; just as by that of "the *four* parts of the earth," in Seal 4, taking Jerome's reading. The only question is, what?—And, though it be a question confessedly difficult, yet, let it be remembered, it is one on which we do not enter without a hint to aid us. For (besides that the famous *quadripartite* division of the 4th Seal may perhaps help to throw light on it,) from the fourth trumpet-vision's exhibiting *the third of the sun* as eclipsed, in symbolization of an event which we saw reason anticipatively to regard as the extinction of the *Western emperors*, the inference follows that, whatever were *the other two* of the Apocalyptic thirds, *the Western empire* must needs have been *one*;—indeed *the one* intended all through the present four visions.

And this seems of itself sufficient reason why the *natural*

¹ E. g. Luke ii. 1; "A decree from Cæsar Augustus that *all the world* (οικουμένη) should be taxed."

² E. g. Dionysius Hal. Antiq. Rom. i. 3; 'Η δὲ Ῥωμαίων πόλις ἀπάσης μὲν ἀρχαίας γῆς, ὅση μὴ ἀνιμβάτος ἐστὶ, πάσης δὲ κρατεῖ θαλάσσης, &c. And Ovid Fasti ii. 683; Gentibus est aliis tellus data limite certo,

Romanæ spatium est urbis et orbis idem.

It would have been needless to quote authorities on a thing so notorious, except for Mede's suggestion as to the Roman empire being the *third part* of the earth.

³ See p. 121 *suprà*; where I have referred to the connexion of this earth, or γῆ, with *the seven-hilled city*, Apoc. xvii. And so the use of the word has been already exemplified in the 2nd, 4th, and 5th Seals: e. g. in those words of the last-mentioned Seal, "How long dost thou not avenge our blood on *them that dwell on the earth*."

tripartite division of the Roman world into *European, African, and Asiatic*,—the same that has been suggested as an alternative by Vitringa,¹ and subsequently adopted by Mr. Faber and others,—should be set aside. For, at the time we speak of, the Western empire,—that over which the Gothic and Vandal invaders extinguished the Roman Government,—instead of embracing the whole of the European provinces, agreeably with this natural division, and no more, comprehended in itself only four European provinces, I mean Britain, Gaul, Spain, Italy, (the addition of Noricum and Pannonia being, as I shall presently observe, doubtful,) and at the same time comprehended the province of Africa.—The same objection seems decisive against that *political* trisection of the empire which was made, on the death of Constantine, between his three sons Constans, Constantine, and Constantius; and which other expositors, as Messrs. Frere and Irving, have imagined to be here referred to.² For the western third then included the provinces of Britain, Gaul, and Spain only; both Italy and the African province being detached from it.—Supposing my presumption respecting the fourth trumpet-vision's meaning to be correct, it must be regarded as the first essential characteristic of the true trisection intended, that its Western third, like the Western empire overwhelmed by the Goths, should comprehend at once the African province, and the four provinces also that have been specified in Europe.

¹ “Nihil probabilius quàm per tertiam terræ partem vel esse intelligendam unam ex tribus majoribus terræ partibus, Asiâ, Africâ, vel Europâ, in quas olim non terram tantùm totam à geographis, sed Romanum quoque imperium, sub titulo orbis terrarum, divisum fuisse ex numis constat; . . . vel majorem aliquam Romani Imperii partem; &c.” Which *latter* alternative is that which he actually adopts.—Mr. Cuninghame justly objects against Mr. Faber, by reference to his *Vials*, the charge of inconsistency with himself in carrying out his theory of this natural trisection.

Dr. Keith's interpretation of the point in question I am unable to comprehend. He nowhere states clearly what threefold division he intends: and, when he does make a statement, seems soon after to contradict it. Thus at the commencement of his exposition of the fourth Trumpet, he speaks of *one third part* as “the transalpine provinces,” i. e. Britain, Gaul, Spain; of *another third* as the maritime province of Africa; and then of Italy as a *third third*. Afterwards, in the same chapter, he seems to speak of the Constantinopolitan empire as yet another third, or two-thirds. Yet, a little after, he thus marks in capitals an historical extract respecting the proceedings of Odoacer and the Heruli, after that the Western empire had been extinguished by them; “ONE-THIRD of those ample estates, to which the ruin of Italy is originally imputed, was extorted for the use of the conquerors.” *Signs of Times*, i. 273, 275, 279. (8th Ed.)

² And so too, more early, Bicheno in *his* “*Signs of Times*,” i. 222. (6th Ed.)

And thus we find ourselves forced on another and different *trisection* of the Roman world: ¹ one which we shall find to have existed *de facto* at the precise time to which I refer the first Trumpet-sounding; and which had been indeed regularly marked out, some 80 or 90 years before,

¹ It may be satisfactory to the reader to see here a statement of all the successive legitimate divisions of the Roman imperial world. I therefore subjoin it, arranged chronologically. It will be seen from it, that there were no *de jure tripartitions* except those specified in the text. Other divisions were into *four, two, and once six*.

A.D.
290 | Division into *four* Prefectures by *Diocletian*: the 1st, Italy and Africa; 2nd, Asia and Thrace; 3rd, the Rhine frontier, and three Western Provinces; 4th, the Danube frontier and Illyricum.

This quadripartition continued till the death of the 1st Constantius A.D. 306: when, *Constantine* having succeeded him in the West, *Maxentius* being emperor at Rome, *Maximian* (who *had* resigned) resuming the purple, and two subordinate emperors, instead of *one*, being made by the Eastern Augustus *Galerius*, (*viz. Licinius* for the government of Illyricum, and *Maximin* for the government of Syria.)—for the first and last time,

308 | The Roman world was divided between *six* emperors. This continued till
311 | the death of *Galerius*.—That same year war arising, the result was the *first tripartition* of the empire; *viz.* that between *Constantine, Licinius, and Maximin*, spoken of in my text above.

313 | On *Maximin's* defeat and death the Roman world was bipartitioned between *Constantine and Licinius*: *Licinius* having the East and Illyricum.

314 | On *Licinius's* first defeat Illyricum was transferred to *Constantine*.

324 | On *Licinius's* second defeat the whole Empire was reunited under *Constantine*.
337 | On *Constantine's* death there was a *tripartition* again; that between his three sons, *Constantine, Constans, Constantius*.

350 | After civil wars, and the death of the two other brothers, *Constantius* again reunited the Roman world. The *monarchy* continued after his death under *Julian*, and then *Jovian*.—On whose death,

364 | The celebrated *bipartition* into Eastern and Western was made by *Valentinian and Valens*: the Western Empire including the whole of *Illyricum*; the Eastern *Thrace and Mæsia*. (See *Gibbon* iv. 242.)

379 | On *Gratian's* appointing *Theodosius* Eastern Emperor, after the death of *Valens*, forasmuch as the Gothic war was to be *Theodosius's* special care, the Illyrian Prefecture was dismembered, and the Dioceses of *Dacia and Mædonia* added to *Thrace, Asia, and Egypt*, as *Theodosius's* portion. (*Gibbon* iv. 422.)

383 | On *Maximus* defeating and murdering *Gratian*, *Theodosius* arranged temporarily with that usurper that he should confine himself to the countries beyond the Alps; leaving to *Gratian's* brother, *Valentinian the 2nd*, Italy, Africa, and Western Illyricum. (*Gibbon* v. 13.) This was much the same *trisection* as between *Constantine's* three sons; and continued till *Maximus's* invasion of Italy, 387, and defeat and death, 388 A. D.

395 | For a year or two after *Valentinian's* death, 392, *Theodosius* reunited the Empire. Then, on his death, it was finally partitioned into Eastern and Western, under his two sons *Arcadius and Honorius*; the Illyrian Prefecture being divided between them, nearly as now between the Turks and Germans. *Noricum, Pannonia, and Dalmatia* belonged to the West; *Dacia and Mædonia*, (the other half of the Illyrian Prefecture,) to the East. (*Gibbon* v. 138.)

The result was very speedily a total separation of the two empires. *Gibbon* v. 161. He observes somewhere that, about 410 A. D., such was the absolute separation of the two monarchies, both in interest and affection, that *Constantinople* would rather have obeyed the orders of the Persian than those of the Latin Court.

as a *de jure* trisection, on an occasion passing, but most notable, alike in history and in the Apocalyptic drama.

The epoch I allude to was that memorable one when, Galerius having died, and Maxentius been drowned in the Tiber, the Roman world found itself under the dominion of the three emperors Constantine, Licinius, and Maximin. At which time what the partitionment of the provinces, which then fell to the three respectively? To *Constantine*, we read, there attached Britain, Gaul, Spain, Italy, Africa; to *Licinius* the vast Illyrian Præfecture, which coincided with, and embraced, the rest of Roman Europe; to *Maximin* the Asiatic provinces and Egypt:—a trisection this which, in so far as regards the Western third at least, precisely answers to that indicated by the 4th Trumpet vision of the Apocalypse. And there is a direct and striking reference to it at its first forming, (as I doubt not will appear,) in a vision the subject of which is chronologically anterior to the four Trumpets, though in the Apocalyptic arrangement placed supplementally after them; I mean that of the travailing woman and the dragon in the xiith chapter: where it is said of the dragon, that “he drew with his tail *the third part* of the stars of heaven;” in reference, if I mistake not, to the then sole representative and head of the Roman Pagan power, viz. in the first instance Maximin, then Licinius.—Hence altogether a presumption in favour of this, as the very trisection here intended.

No doubt it may be objected that other temporary divisions of the empire followed afterwards; and, more especially, that, just before the irruption of the Goths, there was made one too memorable on many accounts in history, and too permanent, to be overlooked in the prophecy:—I mean, of course, the *twofold* division into Eastern and Western, first made under Valentinian and Valens, then finally under Theodosius’ two sons Arcadius and Honorius.—But the truth is that, considering the matter merely on the *de jure* principle, the original intermediate Illyrian Præfecture will be found to have been so shifted from time to time, now to the Eastern, now to the Western empire, that it might seem almost needful for clearness’ sake, even on that ac-

count, to preserve a notice of the old tripartite division, in which Illyricum held a separate place.¹—And yet more, considering the matter *de facto*, it will appear that at the æra to which the 1st Trumpet is supposed by me to refer, (I mean the æra after Theodosius' death,) Illyricum was so detached by Gothic occupation from the rule of both Eastern and Western empire, that its fortunes could not be considered as involved in those either of the Western or Eastern empire; but, for distinctness' sake, needed (I may say absolutely needed) to be considered separately. Already Illyricum had been the scene of the earliest occupation and devastations of the Goths, after the battle of

¹ The apportionment of Illyricum was variable both *before*, and *after*, the bipartite division under the emperors Arcadius and Honorius.—*Before* the first war between Constantine and Licinius, the Illyrian Præfecture was attached to the *Eastern* empire; but, *after* the first war between them, it was taken from the *East*, and added to the *West*.—When a bipartition was next arranged between Valentinian and Valens, it was all again attached in the same manner to the *Western* empire.* But on Valens' death, and Theodosius' accession, the Præfecture was dismembered; and its Eastern half, including Dacia and Macedonia, added by Gratian to the *East*.†—It was this last that was the line of separation settled on in the bipartition between Arcadius and Honorius, to which our difficulty chiefly refers. Yet we find that, some ten years after, the *Western* emperor claimed jurisdiction over the *whole* of Illyricum, "according to its true and ancient limits:"‡—and about 20 years still later, a new arrangement was made between the two emperors, by which the whole of the *Western* Illyricum was ceded to the *Eastern* empire. This took place A. D. 425.§ It was the final line of dispartition, and one to which I shall again have to call the reader's special attention.—Thus the *staple*, if I may so say, or permanently legitimate territory appertaining to each respectively, was still *Constantine's original third* for the *Western* empire, and *Maximin's original third* for the *Eastern* empire.—In every case, I should observe, the latter included *Thrace*.

* See the tabular view p. 361.

† Gibbon iv. 422.

‡ Ib. v. 234.

§ Ib. vi. 7. This partition was made between Theodosius 2nd and Valentinian the 3rd. "The emperor of the East acquired the rich maritime Province of Dalmatia, and the dangerous sovereignty of Pannonia and Noricum; which had been filled and ravaged for above twenty years by a promiscuous crowd of Huns, Ostrogoths, Vandals, and Bavarians." Gibbon refers to Count Buat, a laborious investigator of the antiquities of those times, as his authority for this Treaty; and which he considers quite satisfactory.—Yet it would seem that still the Western emperor revived his claim to one of its provinces. For in an embassy to Attila he sent the civil and military governors of *Noricum* as his envoys. Gibbon vi. 92. So also Sismondi, Roman History, i. 160: who says indeed that the complaint of Attila had reference to things embezzled in a church at *Sirmium*; a town situated a little south of the modern Belgrade.—In A. D. 453, again, the emperor Marcian granted all Pannonia, as far as Vindobona (Vienna), to the Ostrogoths.

The *ecclesiastical* jurisdiction of the Eastern Illyricum was a point similarly disputed between the Roman and Byzantine Sees. Thus, in the year 451, the Council of Chalcedon adjudged that the Patriarchate of the Constantinopolitan Bishop extended over Eastern Illyricum. Yet in 490 we find that Pope Felix 2 (or 3) had his vicar in the Eastern Illyricum, resident at Thessalonica. See Mosheim, v. 2. 2. 1, vi. 2. 2. 1; and also the letters of certain Illyrian and Thessalian Bishops address to the Pope, as to the vicar of Peter and Christ, and their metropolitan, A. D. 531. They are given in Hard. ii. 1111, &c.

Adrianople. Nor did the peace that they made shortly after with Theodosius cause any effectual alteration in their *occupancy* of it. “The vast regions they had ravaged,” says Sismondi, “were abandoned to them, if not in absolute sovereignty, yet in terms little at variance with their independence.” Thus they already constituted, as it were, a living wall of separation between the two divisions of the empire which were most properly Roman in their population.¹—More especially such was the case after Alaric’s and the Goths’ first revolt on Theodosius’ death, and overrunning of the southern part of this same Præfecture; Alaric being thereupon constituted, (as I shall afterwards again have to mention,) *Master-General*, or in fact *independent Prince, of Illyricum*. And it was precisely at this epoch, as I conceive, not before, that the first Trumpet sounded.

Nor indeed was it at this time only that the *Illyrian*, or *intermediate third*, was thus separated in its history and fortunes from the other two-thirds. The same continued the case afterwards. In the 6th and 7th centuries the Bulgarian power was formed: and the result was that first the Avar, then the Bulgarian dominion, intruded into it: and “Mæsia, during the middle ages, was broken into the barbarian kingdoms of Servia and Bulgaria.”²—In the 9th century Macedonia and the eastern Illyricum were inundated by Slavonic hordes, by whom even the whole southern Peloponnesus is said to have been Slavonized;³ and which were thus not in language only, but also in government, very much separated from the Greek Empire.—Finally, and much later, the Franks in their crusading expeditions severed the southernmost of the Illyrian provinces from the Greeks, and long occupied them.—I the rather mention this last act, in tracing the distinct and separate

¹ So *Ambrose*, on Luke xxi. 9, writing A.D. 386, nine years before Theodosius’ death, says; “Nos quoque in *Illyrico* exules patriæ Gothorum exilia fecerunt:” with reference to the Gothic hordes driven through terror of the Huns across the Danube; and which, after conquering Valens, occupied, though as subjects to Theodosius, much of Illyricum. (The passage is cited by me more fully Ch. iv. *infra*.)—Again *Jerome*, Ep. xi. ad Ageruch. written A.D. 409, says that for thirty years the Goths had been occupying and desolating *Pannonia*.

² Gibbon i 37, viii. 194, x. 196, &c.

³ εσκληρωθη πασα η χωρη. Constantine Porph. Them. ii. 6.

history of the Illyrian Præfecture, because it carries us down to the times of the *Turks* : and shows how properly that self-same tripartite division of which we have spoken, was used even under the 6th Trumpet in the prophecy ; seeing that it was but “ the third of men,”¹—the *eastern* third,—against whom the slaying commission of the Euphratean horsemen could be properly said to be given.

Thus the result of our investigation has been to show that on *general grounds*, and with reference to *the general tenor* of Roman history, at and subsequent to the time of the Gothic invasions, instead of the *tripartite* division that I speak of being a division inappropriate to make use of, in the prophetic prefiguration of those events and times, because of the notable *bipartition* of the empire into Eastern and Western that had taken place a little previously, it was precisely the most appropriate that could be chosen. And this the rather because of its having been framed from Diocletian’s memorable *quadripartition*, noted in the 4th Seal, by the union in one of the Italian and Gallic imperial Præfectures. It only remains to see whether it will suit the *details* of the *three first trumpet visions*, as we have already by anticipation seen that it does those of the *fourth*. And when we shall have completed the comparison of these details with the details of the history corresponding, I trust that on this point also the reader will find himself equally satisfied.

CHAPTER III.

THE FOUR FIRST TRUMPET-VISIONS.

IN order to enter in this part on our comparison of the prophecy and the history to the best advantage, it will be peculiarly desirable that we should endeavour to place ourselves, as it were, in the situation of the Evangelist ; and to see the varied images of the successive visions, as far as possible, so as he saw them :—more particularly, I mean, as

¹ Apoc. ix. 15.

each locally affecting, and locally associated with, its assigned portion of the Roman world; that same Roman world which seems to have been extended in living though miniature landscape beneath and around him, with its triple divisions of territory marked therein, and their respective boundary lines, whether of river, sea, mountain, or desert. All this,—though the unassisted human eye could not comprehend it,—the prophetic eye might, as usual with the prophets, or indeed the natural eye, as with Christ in his temptation,¹ be strengthened to discern. And need I suggest what an advantage it must have afforded to St. John all through, towards the right understanding of the visions? Much of that to which a laborious train of reasoning has *already* thus far conducted us, would have been manifest to him, as I conceive, at a glance. And as in regard to what has *preceded*, so in regard to what is *to follow* also: above all in figurations such as we are now entering on; where distinctive symbolic details are comparatively scanty, and the most distinctive part of the symbol is its local origin, course, or destination. Hence the importance to those who have not had it given them to be eye-witnesses, of calling the imagination in aid, in the manner I suggested. To facilitate this a Map has been appended; with the *three* great divisions, which we have seen reason to suppose alluded to, distinguished upon it by different colours: and, in regard to which several territorial divisions, it may be well to remind the reader that each one included its *third* of the Mediterranean or Roman *sea*,² as well as its third of the *land*; and each one also its own characteristic stream of the *three* great frontier *rivers*, the Rhine, Danube,³ and Euphrates.—In order yet more to aid the imagination, I shall make the attempt, before entering on historical events and fulfilment, to describe the imagery of the successive visions, so as I conceive it to have passed over the landscape of the Roman world before the

¹ Matt. iv. 8; "The Devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and showeth him all the kingdoms of the world," &c. See p. 99 *suprà*.

² The Mediterranean was often spoken of by the Romans as *their* sea, "*mare nostrum*." Hence, when the word *sea* was used by itself, this would be the meaning attached to the word by them.

³ The higher third of the Danube indeed belonged to the Western division; but its whole lower stream to the Illyrian.

eye of the Evangelist:—always taking care that there shall be in this no unlicensed play of the fancy; and nothing inconsistent with that faithful adherence to the written descriptions which is due to every word of God's Holy Book.—I have already hinted that it is *one and the same Western third* of the Empire to which I apply alike all the four first Trumpet visions;—its *land* territory, its *maritime* dependencies, its frontier *river-valleys* and fountains, its *sun* and *stars*. This the unity of these four visions seems to me to require.

I. THE IMAGERY OF THE PRELIMINARY ALTAR-COURT ACTION IN THE APOCALYPTIC TEMPLE, AND OF THE FOUR FIRST TRUMPET-VISIONS CONSEQUENT.

Behold, then, the Angel-priest has come forth from offering the incense of his faithful ones in the inner temple: his censer still in hand; but emptied of the sacred embers of fire, with which that incense had been kindled by him before the Holy One. And see! he moves straight back again to the great altar in the altar-court, and takes again of the same burning embers, and fills the same censer with them;—only now not to bless, but to devote to destruction. For, having filled it, he scatters the fiery ashes from the temple-height, that they may fall on the despisers of his proffered mediation and atonement in the world below;—the world *professing* but *apostate*. Not an instant passes without signs of recognition in heaven and on earth, alike by the animate and the inanimate creation, of this devoting of the land to a curse. Forthwith from the cloud of glory there issue thunderings and lightnings. And see! they are responded to by the bursting of tempests (the four angel-forms seen darkly careering therein) over the central provinces of Illyricum, Greece, and Epirus; the first that selfsame district which they had already sometime before appeared to overhang, murky and threatening. The Roman earth quakes simultaneously through its vast extent; and he faces of men gather blackness: some from present suffering; all from forebodings of greater evil to come.

But look to the temple again. See! the trumpet-angels are preparing themselves to sound; and therewith the

more definite evolution of the divine judgments to be defined, and to proceed. Which is the first grand destined scene of suffering?

1st Trumpet.¹—The first Angel sounds his trumpet: and lo the same tremendous tempest as before, black with other clouds from the cold hail-generating countries beyond the Danube,² and charged with lightning and hail, appears driving westward. “*The third of the land,*” or *continental* provinces of the *Western* division of the Roman empire, is declared the fated scene of ravage. The Asiatic continent and maritime province of Africa are to remain unharmed by the storm: and the European provinces, too, of the *Eastern* Empire mostly to escape. The skirts of the storm discharge themselves, as it passes forward, on the Rhætian hill-country. Then quickly its course is towards Italy. As it sweeps across the Italian frontier, other terrific thunder-clouds from the distant north-west quarter of the heaven succeed, and intermingle with the first. Once and again the almost united tempests spread in desolating fury over Italy, beyond the Alps and Apennines. Then dividing, a part, impelled yet further south, bursts with terrific lightnings directly over the seven-hilled imperial city, and passes thence to the southernmost coast of Brutium beyond. A part, driven backward, takes a westerly course over the Rhine into Gaul, and far and wide devastates it; then, crossing over the Pyrenæan chain, pours its fury on the Spanish provinces: nor spends itself till it has reached the far shores, west and south, of the Atlantic and the Mediterranean.—Thus has the entire continental division of the western empire been involved in its ravages. Throughout the whole the lightning fire runs along the ground, even as in the plague of ancient Egypt; burning in wide-spreading conflagration country and town, trees and pasture. And there are signs too, not to be mistaken, of the destruction of life, as well as of vegetation: for blood appears mixed with the fire and hail. Slowly at

¹ Και ὁ πρῶτος [αγγελοῦ] ἐσαλπισέ· καὶ ἐγένετο χαλαζα καὶ πυρ μεμιγμένα ἐν αἵματι, καὶ ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν γῆν· καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῆς γῆς κατέκαη, καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῶν δένδρων κατέκαη, καὶ πᾶς χορτοῦς χλωροῦ κατέκαη. Tregelles' text, as before.

² On the cold of ancient Germany, see Gibbon i. 346.

length the storm subsides ; destroying, however, even in its subsidence. The desolation that it leaves is frightful. The land was as the garden of Eden before it. It remains a wasted wilderness.

2nd Trumpet.¹—A pause ensues. Then presently there is heard another trumpet-blast of judgment.—Now is the visitation of the *Western third of the Mediterranean sea*, and the *islands* and *trans-marine province* included in it ;² a part hitherto unscathed and safe. Behold yon giant mountain-rock, blazing with volcanic fires, that upheaved from the southernmost point of Spain near the Straits of Gades, and cast into the sea, looks like Etna in its raging ! Mark how the waters of the midland sea are agitated by it ! The lava pours down the mountain-sides. The igneous stones and ashes of the volcano are scattered for hundreds of miles all round, on sea and mainland, coasts and islands ;³ first on the coast of Africa, then on that of the opposite continent, from the Atlantic Straits, all along up to the head of the Adriatic. Ships appear set on fire by them, at sea and in the harbours, and light the water with their conflagrations. Blood marks the loss of life accompanying ; just as in the former vision. Over the whole maritime scene of its devastations whatever is habitable appears desolated ; whatever had life, destroyed. “ The third

¹ Και ὁ δευτερος αγγελος εσαλπισε· και ὡς ορος μεγα πυρι καιομενον εβληθη εις την θαλασσαν· και εγενετο το τριτον της θαλασσης αιμα· και απεθανε το τριτον των κτισματων των εν τη θαλασση τα εχοντα ψυχας· και το τριτον των πλοιων διεφθασαν.

² The sea was a word used by the Romans to include the islands and maritime coasts. So Facciolati ; “ *Mare* interdum est regio maritima et insule maris ;” quoting Nepos in Con. 4 ; “ Ad mare missus est, ut Cypriis et Phœnicibus naves longas imperaret ;” and Tacitus Hist. i. 2 ; “ Plenum exsiliis mare.”—So in Scripture “ the sea ” is used for “ the strength of the sea,” i. e. Tyre, Isaiah xxiii. 4.

³ This is no exaggeration of the extent of volcanic action, seen in nature. Dion Cassius (lxvi. 23) relates that in the eruption of Vesuvius, in which Pliny lost his life, the ashes reached Africa, Syria, and Egypt, and filled the air above Rome.—Cassiodorus, describing an eruption of the same volcanic mountain in the time of Theodoric, says ; “ Per totam pene Italiam cognoscitur quando illa indignatio commovetur. Volat per mare magnum cinis decoctus ; et, terrenis nubibus excitatis, transmarinas quoque provincias pulveris guttis compluit.” B. P. M. xi. 1157.

In more modern times, during one eruption of Etna, an area of 150 miles in circumference is said to have been covered with a stratum of volcanic sand and ashes twelve feet deep. In the year 1783 a current of lava sixty miles long, and twelve broad, was formed by a volcano in Iceland. And in 1815, as Mr. Bakewell states, in the eruption of the volcano of Sumbawa the clouds of smoke and ashes darkened the sky for 300 miles round ; and the sound of the explosions was heard in Sumatra, 970 miles distant. See Memoire sur les îles Poncees ; and Bakewell’s Introduction to Geology, pp. 342, 343.

part of the sea became blood; and the third part of living creatures¹ in the sea [i. e. those that were in the third part of the sea] died; and the third part of ships was destroyed.”

3rd Trumpet.²—The volcano has not yet fully spent itself, when another of the angels sounds his trumpet-clang. And what the new scene of judgment? “The (Western) third of the rivers,” it is said, “and the fountains of waters.”—It begins where yon mighty river to the North forms the ancient limit between barbarian Germany, and the *Illyrian* or *middle* Præfecture of the Roman empire. Mark the portentous meteor that glares over it; like a blazing torch trailing its long red line of light³ behind it in the Northern sky! And see! where the Teiss, pouring itself into the Danube, marks the central point of the base of the great Illyrian Præfecture; there suddenly it descends, and blazes, and taints with its sulphureous exhalations the downward course of that ancient river.—But it was the same *Western third* of the Empire, as before, that was in this case too to taste specially of the bitterness of the woe. And mark how, in fulfilment of its mission, the meteor, rising again, tracks the course of the *upper* Danube, and then reaches and moves along the *Rhenish frontier-river* of the Western Empire; blazing over and poisoning its waters, down even to the Belgic lowlands. Thence again unquenched it rises; shoots in rapid course westward; is repelled, as if by some counter-electric force, and as from a region on which it behoved not that it should permanently shed its malignant influences; then in southerly direction falls on the *foun-*

¹ κτισμα. Compare 1 Tim. iv. 4; παν κτισμα καλον' and James i. 18; ως απαρχη των αυτων κτισματων. Also, Apoc. v. 13; παν κτισμα ο εστιν εν τη ουρανω, και εν τη γη, και επι της θαλασσης α εστι, ηκουσα λεγοντας, &c. In St. James and the Apoc. the word is evidently used of intelligent creatures. Mark in the latter the word λεγοντας in the masculine agreeing with παν κτισμα.

² Και ο τριτος αγγελος εσαλπισε' και επεσεν εκ του ουρανου αστηρ μεγας και ομενος ως λαμπας' και επεσεν επι το τριτον των ποταμων, και επι τας πηγας υδατων' και το ονομα του αστερος λεγεται ο Αψινθος' και εγενετο το τριτον των υδατων εις αψινθον' και πολλοι των ανθρωπων απεθανον εκ των υδατων, οτι επικρανθησαν.—It is to be observed that the limiting epithet, a *third part*, applies to the *rivers only*, not to the *fountains of waters*.

³ “A great star blazing like a torch.” This designates a *meteor*, as distinguished from one of the starry luminaries. So Virgil, *Æn.* ii. 694.

tains of the European waters, there where the Alpine snows are dissolving from their eternal glaciers.—Wheresoever it has fallen, the rivers and their tributaries have been poisoned by it; and the dead and dying, of those that drink them, appear lying on the banks. “For the name of that star is Wormwood;¹ and many died of the waters because they were made bitter.”—Having thus done its part, it shoots back towards the Danube; there blazes for a moment longer, and is extinct.

4th Trumpet.²—The vision has past; the *fourth* angel sounds. Hitherto, though its land, its sea, and its frontier river and fountains of waters have been desolated, yet the *sun* has still continued shining on the Western empire, as before. But now at length this too is affected. To the extent of a third part of its orb, it suffers eclipse. The shadow falls over the Western empire. Then the night supervenes.—And see the eclipsing influences act on the luminaries of the night also. Presently the Western third of the moon becomes eclipsed; and of the stars scattered over the symbolic firmament, all that are in the third of the Roman sky, are darkened also.

So closes this fourth vision. And then another angel, diverse from the seven trumpet-angels, breaks upon the continuity of their succession. By his solemn and loud cry in mid-heaven of, “Woe, Woe, Woe, to the inhabitants of the earth, from the voices of the trumpet-angels that have yet to sound,” he occupies the seer’s attention for a while, with a warning voice of judgments yet to come; and seems to intimate also a certain break, and perhaps change of character, between the judgments gone before, and those that were to follow.

Such, I conceive, may have been the manner in which the phænomena of the successive visions passed before the

¹ Compare Jer. xxiii. 15; “I will feed them with wormwood, and make them drink the water of gall;” i. e. in the afflictions of the Babylonish captivity. Also Lam. iii. 15, 19.—The metaphor is not uncommon. In *Antar*, the Arabic Romance, we find it applied, as here, to death. “Death served them with a cup of *absinth* by my sword.” Hamilton’s Transl. iii. 129.

² Καὶ ὁ τέταρτος ἀγγέλως ἐσαλπισε· καὶ ἐπληγῆ το τρίτον του ἡλίου, καὶ τρίτον της σελήνης, καὶ τρίτον των ἀστέρων· ἵνα σκοτισθῆ το τρίτον αὐτων, καὶ ἡ ἡμέρα μὴ φανῆ το τρίτον αὐτης, καὶ ἡ νύξ ὁμοίως.

Evangelist : for I have stated nothing but what is consistent with, and (if we suppose the same to have been geographically represented before him) in no little measure implied in, the brief descriptions of the visions in the text. And what, let me ask, would be the natural, the almost necessary interpretation he would attach to them? Surely, considering the character of the symbolic figures, both in themselves, and as illustrated by their use in other prophetic Scriptures,¹ he would construe them as pre-figuring the ravages of some terrible invaders from Northern Germany :—invaders who would desolate first the European continental provinces of the Western empire; then its maritime provinces, islands, and fleets in the Mediterranean :—a fresh and dreadful scourge being super-added, commencing on the Illyrian Præfecture; but soon to ravage the Western provinces watered by the Rhine also, and the Alpine regions, the local source of the European waters :—followed, finally, by the extinction of the imperial dynasty of the West, and soon after of its subordinate rulers also.—Such, I conceive, must have been his interpretation. It remains to see how the figurations were fulfilled in the progress of the Gothic, Vandal, Hunnish, and Ostrogothic desolations. This was to be my *second* Head.

II. THE HISTORICAL FULFILMENT.

And, in demonstrating this, need I detail at any length

¹ 1st, the *tempest*.—So Is. xxviii. 2; “The Lord hath a mighty and strong one : which, as a tempest of hail and a destroying storm, as a flood of mighty waters overflowing, shall cast down to the earth with the hand.” This was said of *Shalman-ezer* and the *Assyrian* invasion.—And again of *Gog*, Ezek. xxxviii. 9; “Thou shalt ascend, and come like a storm : thou shalt be like a cloud to cover the land : thou, and all thy bands, and many people with thee.”

2. The *volcano* or *burning mountain*.—So Jeremiah li. 25; “Behold I am against thee, O destroying mountain, saith the Lord, which destroyest all the earth. And I will stretch out mine hand upon thee, and roll thee down from the rocks, and will make thee a burnt mountain.”—This was said of *Babylon*. It is compared, says Dr. A. Clarke, “to a burning mountain; which, by vomiting continual streams of burning lava, inundates and destroys all towns, villages, fields, &c. in its vicinity. . . . So had the Babylonish government set the nations on fire, deluging and destroying them by its troops : till at last exhausted, &c., it is extinguished;”—becomes an extinct volcano.

3. The *meteor*, or *star blazing as a lamp or torch*.—With this we may compare what is said of the invading kings of Syria and Israel in Is. vii. 4; “Fear not, neither be faint-hearted, for the two tails of these smoking fire-brands; for the fierce anger of Rezin with Syria, and of the son of Remaliah.”

4. The *eclipsed heavenly luminaries*. See my p. 247 *suprà*.

the history of the five great destroyers of the Western empire;—I mean of ALARIC and RHADAGAISUS, in the first instance; then of GENSERIC, ATTILA, ODOACER; the two earliest associated nearly as one, in the time and scene of their devastations under the first Trumpet?—The tale has been often repeated by expositors, as well as historians. So, after briefly noticing in Alaric's opening career and acts, in the character just assigned him, what will be found well to answer to the *introductory* earthquake thunderings and lightnings, (Apoc. vii. 5,) that followed instantly on the casting of the *altar-fire in vision on the Roman world*,—I shall proceed to show, as succinctly as may be, in the further history of those barbarian invaders of the empire, the fulfilment, severally and separately, of each of the *four Trumpet-visions* themselves.

As to the *introductory thunderings, lightnings, and earthquake*, it will be remembered that the seventh Seal's opening just before them answered in my view to the epoch of the *death of Theodosius*, Jan. 17, A. D. 395. And, as thereupon the figured *silence in the Apocalyptic firmamental heaven*, or stillness from the long-threatened tempests, continued but for one half-hour's duration, and then the seven war-trumpets against the Roman earth were given to the seven angels, and the altar-fire cast upon it, with the lightnings, thunderings and earthquake in response, so "*before the winter had ended*," says Gibbon, "the Gothic nation was in arms."¹ The interval in fact was one rather of days than weeks. For it needed but the circulation of the news of his death to rouse the Goths to revolt, among the farms already sometime occupied by them according to treaty, in the Illyrian and Mæsiian Provinces: and, having strengthened themselves by fresh hosts of their countrymen from the forests on the other side of the Danube,² forthwith they threatened war against the Roman empire.—Not however before there had been enacted in the empire, alike what might answer to the *saints'* incense-offering figured in the Apocalyptic temple, and to the implied Christ-renouncing counter-worship of *the men of the earth*. For then was

¹ Gibb. v. 176.

² Ibid.

precisely the æra to which our ecclesiastical sketch of the preceding chapter relates, the æra of 395, 396: when *Augustine*, just about entering on the Episcopate, was in doctrine and life setting forth Jesus as the propitiation and mediator, as well as life and light, of sinful men; and *Vigilantius* too (not to speak of other faithful ones) was preparing for his protestant stand against the saint-worship and other superstitions of the inrushing apostasy;—while *Sulpitius*, *Paulinus*, *Jerome*, *Gregory Nyssen*, *Martin of Tours*, and other such, were all too prominently countenancing and helping forward those superstitions of the mass of the people in Roman Christendom, to the neglect and forsaking of Jesus.

It was in 395, as I said, after the pious Theodosius, just like King Josiah, had been taken away from the coming evil, that the empire was shaken, as by an *earthquake*, with this Gothic revolt. Then, in 396, the *thunderings and lightnings* of the Gothic war burst on the central and hitherto unravaged provinces of Thessaly, Greece, Epirus, and the Peloponnese, under the direction of Alaric:—a lightning-storm this introductory to, as well as characteristic of, all that followed. The land trembled before the invading Goths in terror. “The deep and bloody traces of their march could be easily discovered,” we are told, “by travelers many years afterwards.”¹—It is observable that there had been portents of nature, both earthquakes, and eclipses, and a strange long-continued darkness, just before Theodosius’ death,—portents renewed in the selfsame year 396 of the invasion of Greece now spoken of,—such as to cause general forebodings of evil being at hand. So alike Ambrose from Milan, and Jerome from Bethlehem, tell us;² and the chronicles of the time confirm their statements.³ It was like nature’s own alarm, with men’s voices of alarm

¹ Gibb. v. 180.

² “Hoc nobis motus terrarum graves, hoc juges pluvie minabantur, et ultra solitum caligo tenebrosior denuntiabat quod elementissimus Imperator Theodosius excessurus esset è terris. Ipsa igitur excessum ejus elementa mærebant.” So *Ambrose*, De Obitu Theodos. ad init.

Jerome’s notice on the subject was when *Vigilantius* was with him, in 396. There was then an eclipse as well as earthquake: and Jerome says, “Obscurato sole omnis mundus jam jamque venturum judicem formidaret.” *Gilly’s Vigilantius*, 304, 305.

³ The Benedictine Editor of Ambrose notes on the former extract; “Marcellinus in *Chronico suo auctor est profigato Eugenio terram continuis motibus, à meuse*

answering in response; as well as the furnishing in the natural world of the very portents that were here used symbolically, to prefigure the events and the epoch, in the Apocalyptic vision.

Then in history, as in prophecy, came a brief pause. The *Trumpets* of doom were to be sounded specially, not against the already detached Illyrian Præfecture, including Macedonia and Greece, but against the Western Empire, against Italy, and Rome. It was a pause in which Alaric had to prepare himself for the mighty task. "The trumpet-angels *prepared* themselves to sound." And see the wonderful manner in which this was facilitated. By the infatuation of the Eastern emperor Arcadius, Alaric was made Master-General, after returning from the Greek invasion, of the Eastern Illyricum;¹ and so furnished with arms for their destruction from the Romans' own armouries. Four years he occupied himself in preparation for his great enterprise. Seated in authority in the centre of that vast Præfecture, which since the days of Valens had been very much occupied by the Goths and other barbaric tribes, he there, "on the verge as it were of the two empires,"² had but to meditate, like an eagle of prey, on which of the separated halves he should fall of the devoted carcase; then to seize, and to devour. The Gothic chieftains at this point of time elevated him on a shield, and solemnly proclaimed him *King of the Visigoths*.³ On their part, as well as otherwise, his preparation was complete.

1. Then at length the *first* Trumpet sounded. The object of doom marked out by it was Italy and Rome. Accordingly, as Alaric told an Italian hermit afterwards,⁴ "he felt a secret and præternatural impulse, which directed, and even compelled, his march to the gates of Rome."—As his trumpet sound-

Septembri ad Novembrem usque, in quibusdam Europæ regionibus quassatam fuisse, anno (A.D. 394) qui Theodosii mortem antecessit."

Marcellinus also, I observe, notes in his Chronicle the earthquake and portents of 396; "Terræ motus per dies plurimos fuit, cælumque ardere visum est:" i. e. in the year next after Theodosius' death. See the B. P. M. ix. 519.

¹ So Claudian, Eutrop. ii. 213;

Vastator Achivæ
Gentis, et Epirum nuper populatus inultam,
Præsides Illyrico.

² Gibbon v. 189.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ib. 254.

ed, and his march advanced, terrible omens and prognostications preceded him.¹ “The Christians however,” says Gibbon,² “still derived some comfort from the powerful intercession of the saints and martyrs.” So does he note again *the very cause that had been hinted in the Apocalypse* of the coming judgments. Thrice, in fulfilment of his destiny, Alaric descended from the Alps on the Italian plains; marking his course each step, as the awe-struck historians of the times tell us, in country and in town, with ravage, conflagration, and blood; till the gates of Rome itself were opened to the conqueror, and the Gothic fires blazed around the Capitol.³

In the mean time other destroyers, of a kindred race and origin, had extended their ravages to the trans-rhenane provinces. Between Alaric’s first and second invasions of Italy, RHADAGAISUS, from the far north of Germany, with a host of Vandals, Suevi, and Burgundians, burst, like a dark thunder-cloud from the Baltic, as Gibbon graphically describes it,⁴ on the Rhætian and Italian valleys. With slaughter, though with difficulty, they were repulsed by the Roman general from near Florence. But it was only to bend the course of the vast remnant westward; and overwhelm the provinces, till then flourishing and fertile, of Gaul and Spain. Blood and conflagration here marked each step of their track; just as that of Alaric in Greece

¹ On this subject, says Gibbon, (ib. 192,) “Claudian may seem prolix: but fear and superstition occupied as large a space in the minds of the Italians.” It is as a characteristic of the times that I too, here and elsewhere, notice the omens.

² Gibbon v. 193.

³ “At their entrance through the Salarian gate, they fired the adjacent houses to guide their march, and to distract the attention of the citizens. The flames, which encountered no obstacle in the disorder of the night, consumed many private and public buildings: and the ruins of the palace of Sallust remained in the age of Justinian a stately monument of the *Gothic conflagration*.” Gibbon v. 317.

⁴ Ib. 214.—The chronological intermingling of the invasions of Italy by Alaric and Rhadagaisus will appear from the following tabular sketch.

A.D.

396 Alaric’s invasion of Greece.

400—403 His first invasion of Italy. (Gibbon v. 190.)

406 Rhadagaisus with 200,000 Vandals, &c., from the Baltic, marching by way of the upper Danube, invades Italy.—On his being defeated and killed under the walls of Florence, the remains of his army retire from Italy, and cross the Rhine into France.

408 Alaric’s first siege of Rome.

409 Second siege.

410 Third siege and capture.—In the same year followed Alaric’s death.

and Italy. The burning of trees and herbage, as well as of cities, is pathetically particularized by the chronicles of the times. "The consuming flames of war," says Gibbon,¹ "spread from the banks of the Rhine over the greatest part of the seventeen provinces of Gaul. . . The scene of peace and plenty was suddenly changed into a desert ; and the prospect of the smoking ruins could alone distinguish the solitude of nature from the desolation of man." A similar description is given of the desolation of Spain.²—And the desolators entered never to retire. "This passage" of the Rhine, he adds, "by the Suevi, Vandals, Alani, and Burgundians, who never afterwards retreated, may be considered as *the fall of the Roman empire* in the countries beyond the Alps. The barriers which had so long separated the savage and the civilized nations of the earth, were, from that fatal moment, levelled with the ground."³

The era of Alaric and Rhadagaisus,—that is, of the first Trumpet,—is to be considered as *chiefly* embracing some ten or twelve years, from A. D. 400 to about A. D. 410 ; ✓ though, as the ravages of the provinces were not then discontinued, we may perhaps consider the vision before us to embrace a period somewhat longer. In that latter year the *Vandals* had extended their conquests to the Straits of Gades :⁴ and *Alaric*, who had accomplished his destiny, and reached in his desolating course the southernmost coast of Italy,—while meditating still further conquests in the islands and transmarine provinces,⁵ which were intended however for another hand and another Trumpet,—was arrested suddenly by the hand of death. His royal sepulchre, we are told, adorned with the spoils and trophies of Rome, was built in the midst of the bed of the river Consentia in Bruttium ; and the secret for ever concealed by the massacre of the prisoners employed in constructing it :—the

¹ Ib. 225.² Ib. 352.³ Ib. v. 224.—Daubuz (p. 368) notices Claudian's comparison of Alaric and his Goths to a *hail-storm*, (De Bel. Get. v. 173,) as in the Apocalypse :*Grandinis aut morbi [nimbi ?] ritu, per devia rerum
Præcipites, per clausa ruunt.*Schlegel too (Philos. of Hist. ii. 54) uses the same Apocalyptic figure. "To defend themselves from this people, [viz. the Goths,] the sons of Theodosius knew no other expedient than to let loose on Italy these barbarians, and to divert and point *the storm of invasion* towards that quarter."⁴ Gibbon v. 352.⁵ Ib. 329.

last Italian blood that mingled with the fire and the hail, under the judgments of the *first* Trumpet.

2. To the Vandal GENSERIC was allotted, under the *second* Trumpet, the conquest of the *maritime provinces* of Africa, and *the islands*: all in short that belonged to the Western empire in the Mediterranean; and which Alaric (as just alluded to) was prevented attempting by death. It belonged, I say, to *Genseric*; “a name,” observes Gibbon, “which, in the destruction of the Roman Empire, has deserved an equal rank with the names of *Alaric* and *Attila*.”¹ It was in the year 429 that he entered on it. In the course of the 18 years preceding, no new invasion had broken on the Western empire. The desolation of Gaul and Spain, and other districts, was indeed, as observed just before, not discontinued: but it was rather by the wars of Goths against Goths, than of Goths against Romans. Italy, meanwhile, having been evacuated soon after Alaric’s death by the Goths under Astolphus, had partially recovered from its ravages: and Africa, the granary of Rome and Italy, had continued to flourish intact, as before. But now its time was come. Invited by Count Boniface, governor of the province, under the influence of temporary infatuation, Genseric, in the year above-mentioned, transported thither his Vandals from under the high Gibraltar rock across the Afric sea: all prepared, like some burning volcanic mountain, upheaved and transported across the straits, for the work of destruction.²—Then, as under the former Trumpet, fire did indeed mingle with blood in the desolation of the unhappy province of Africa.³—In the second year of the invasion,

¹ Gibbon vi. 13.

² In a former Edition I referred to the volcanoes of Auvergne, which in their extinct state have become so celebrated among modern geologists, as having been in a state of active eruption during the time of this 2nd Trumpet, A.D. 458—460; the three Rogation Days, immediately before Ascension Day, and which still remain in our church ritual, having been instituted by Mamertus, Bishop of Vienne, on the occasion, with the view of deprecating God’s wrath.—The account I took from a letter of the contemporary writer Sidonius Apollinaris, and a Rogation Homily of Alcimus Avitus, the next Bishop of Vienne, still extant. See the B. P. M. vi. 1108, ix. 591.

In Dr. Pye Smith’s *Geology*, however, Note k, p. 407, it is observed that this story has been shown by Sir C. Lyall to be altogether untrue; the eruption of the volcanoes in question having occurred untold ages ago; and Sidonius’ report being only a proof of his credulity.

³ So Muller, *Univ. History*, ii. 110; (Hess’ transl. Paris, 1814;): “Genseric wasted

A. D. 430, the siege of Hippo was formed: and while it was advancing, (how can I omit noticing the event?) *Augustine*, its sainted Bishop, was gently released by death, and joined to the white-robed company before the throne. This was on the 28th of August, A. D. 430.¹ Then was Hippo taken, and *burnt*; and then in 439 Carthage. With the capture of which city resistance ended. The whole province was subjected to the Vandals, and finally severed from the Western empire.—Thus a part of the prefigurations of the second Trumpet had been fulfilled.—But its ships, and the insular provinces of Sicily and Sardinia, still remained to the Western empire: of the destruction of which the prophecy seemed to speak also. For it said, “The third part of the creatures which were in the sea, and had life, died; and the third part of ships was destroyed.” Was this too fulfilled by Genseric? Mark what followed after the capture of Carthage. Finding himself shut in to the south by the desert, Genseric, we are told, cast his eyes to the *sea*, and determined to create a *naval power*. And then “the fleets (the Vandal fleets) that issued from the port of Carthage again claimed the empire of the Mediterranean.” Sicily was conquered by them, and Sardinia, and the other Western isles;² all that was in the third part of the sea:—a division of it comprehending both that vast basin of the western Mediterranean included between the Straits of Gibraltar and Sicily, and the part which, expanding beyond, sweeps round the south-east of Italy to form the deep gulf of the Adriatic;—the *sea-third* answering to the land-third of the Western empire.—The coasts, moreover, of Spain, Gaul, and Italy, the latter as far up as the head of the Adriatic, were mercilessly ravaged by Genseric. When asked by his pilot what course to steer, “Leave the determination to the winds,” was his reply: “they will transport us to the guilty coast, whose inhabitants have provoked the divine justice.”³ Twice, on occa-

it all with fire and the sword.” And Gibbon vi. 181; Genseric determined to “reduce Mauritania to a desert. He burnt the villages, and poisoned the springs.”

¹ See p 306 *suprà*.

² Victor Vitensis expressly says that Genseric had *Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica, Majorca, Minorca*; B. P. M. viii. 676. See too Gibbon, vi. 146 and 205, and Sismondi, Roman History, i. 172, to much the same effect.

³ Gibbon vi. 187.

sions alike memorable, the Roman *navies* of the Western empire A. D. 457, and of the Eastern, 468, were sent, after vast preparations, to destroy the Vandal power. But suddenly and most disastrously, in the harbours of Carthage and Bona, when the eyes of the Romans were fixed on them with hopes raised to the highest, they were utterly destroyed;—in the latter case by fire-ships driven among them in the obscurity of night.¹ So that the remainder of the prediction was fulfilled also. The fire of the Vandal volcano might not exhaust itself, until not only what was habitable in the Western sea was destroyed, but “the third part of the ships” also;—those that constituted the Roman navy in the sea-third of the Western empire.

3. In the mean time, and long ere the extinction of the volcano, and death of the tyrant of the sea, Genseric, (which was not indeed till the year 477,) yet another plague was commissioned against the devoted empire; I mean “the scourge of God,” the king of the Huns, ATTILA. Alone of conquerors, ancient or modern, he united at this time under his sway the two mighty kingdoms of Germany and Scythia. For the Huns had advanced their course and their conquests, since the time when the Goths fled before them some 70 years before, in the days of Valens, to the furthest limits, West and North, of Germany. The kings of the Ostrogoths and Gepidæ were among Attila’s subject-princes; and a crowd of vulgar kings watched his nod. Superstitious awe concerning him added to his power. He was deemed something greater than human. “The barbaric princes could not presume to gaze with steady eye on [what they deemed] his *divine majesty*.”² How much less his enemies! He was in their eyes like the baleful meteor that even then blazed in the heavens, boding ruin and war.³ For the first eight years from his accession

¹ Gibbon, vi. pp. 181, 203:

² Ib. 44—46.

³ “Stella quæ crinita dicitur per plurimum tempus ardens apparuit. Bleda et Attila fratres, multarumque gentium reges, Illyricum Thraciamque depopulant.” So Marcellinus’ Chronicon, on A. D. 444, and the first mention of Attila. B. P. M. ix. 523.

Idatius (a learned Spanish bishop contemporary with Attila) in his Chronicle adds a notice of other meteoric portents; especially of *fiery northern lights, like flashing spears*, in the year of Attila’s invading Gaul: “signi ostensio quæ mox ingenti exitu perdoctetur.” B. P. M. vii. 1235.

(which was in A. D. 433) he had been occupied with other wars in Germany, Persia, Scythia. Then, descending on the Danube, he fixed the royal village near where it takes its great bend to the southward, not far from the modern Buda:¹ crossed it to attack the Eastern empire; and, after ravaging the provinces of Thrace and Mæsia, and tracing the river-course downwards in blood as far as the Euxine, retired not until the Eastern emperor (A. D. 446) had purchased peace by surrendering to him a slip of territory S. of the Danube, from Belgrade to Novæ. “*The Huns*,” says Gibbon,² *were acknowledged “masters (of this part of the lower half) of the great river.”*—But it is specially the river-frontier of the same *Western third* of the empire to which the other Trumpets refer, that I suppose to be chiefly intended in the present. Accordingly, about A. D. 450, in fulfilment of a treaty with Genseric, he moved against the *Western* provinces along the *upper Danube*: reached and crossed the *Rhine* at Basle; and thence, tracing the same great frontier stream of the West down to Belgium, made its valley one scene of desolation and woe; burning the cities, (of which *Strasburg, Spires, Worms, Mentz, Andernach, Treves, Tongres, Maastricht*, are specially particularized,) massacring the inhabitants, and laying the country waste:—until, at length, having left that valley, which had been marked out as *one* destined scene of his ravaging, and advanced farther into the interior, his course was arrested, and he was repulsed in the tremendous battle of Chalons.—And whither then, when thus forced to retrace his steps, did he direct them? Whither but to fall on another destined scene of ravage, “the European *fountains of waters*,” in the Alpine heights and Alpine valleys of Italy. Then *Aquileia, Padua, Verona, Mantua, Milan, Pavia, Turin*, felt his vengeance. “From the Alps to the Apennines,” says Sigonius, ‘all was flight, depopulation, slaughter, slavery, burning, and de-

¹ The village of Attila is still visited by visitors from Buda. See *Travels in Austria, &c.*, by Rev. C. B. Elliott, Vol. i. p. 61. “About four miles hence, (i. e. from Pest, or the modern Buda,) on some high ground, is Alt Buda, or old Buda, known to the ancients under the name of Aquincum, where Attila held his court. Few or no vestiges are now to be seen of that savage conqueror’s abode.”

² Gibbon, vi. 69.

spair.” Many fled to the low and marshy islands at the mouth of the Adige, Po, and Brenta, as their only safe refuge. And he who has seen the fair *Venice*, may do well to remember that he has seen in it a memorial of the terrors and ravages of that scourge of God, the Hun *Attila*.¹—But what further of his course of devastation? Surely, with Italy all defenceless before him, one might have expected that, like his predecessor Alaric, he would have continued it on to Rome and the far coast of Bruttium. Instead of this, behold, an embassy from the Western emperor Valentinian, accompanied by the venerable Romish bishop Leo the First, was successful at this point in deprecating his wrath: and, having granted them peace, he repassed the Alps, and retired; leaving bands only of Heruli and Ostrogoths in the Tyrolese country intermediate.—Wherefore a result, humanly speaking, so unlikely? Methinks we may see the reason. The prediction had expressly marked the term of Attila’s desolating progress;—“the third of the rivers, and the fountains of waters.” Already Attila had made bitter, besides the surplusage of more Eastern scenes,² the river-line of the upper Danube and Rhine, and the Alpine fountains of waters. Many had died, and still continued to die, that drank of the waters, through famine, disease, and pestilence. This being done, his course was to end. “Thus far thou shalt go, and no farther.” Returned from Italy, he recrossed the Danube; reached the royal village between it and the Teiss; and there, the very next year, was suddenly cut off by apoplexy. This occurred A. D. 453. So the meteor was extinct; the empire and power of the Huns broken. The woe of the third Trumpet had past away.

4. Thus was the final catastrophe preparing, by which the Western emperors and empire were to become extinct. The glory of Rome had long departed; its provinces one

¹ For authorities see the Univ. Hist. xvi, 567. See too Müller’s Hist. ii. 115. Gibbon is not so particular and detailed in this part of history as usual.

² Some object this surplusage to my reference of the Trumpet to Attila. Would they object to St. Matthew’s application of Isaiah’s prophecy, ix. 1, 2, about the light on Zabulon and Nephthali on account of a similar surplusage of light elsewhere from Christ’s ministry?

after another been rent from it ; the territory still attached to it become like a desert ; and its maritime possessions, and its fleets and commerce, been annihilated. Little remained to it but the vain titles and insignia of sovereignty. ✓ And now the time was come when these too were to be withdrawn. Some twenty years or more from the death of Attila, and much less from that of Genseric, (who, ere his death, had indeed visited and ravaged the eternal city, in one of his maritime marauding expeditions, and thus yet more prepared things for the coming consummation,) about this time, I say, ODOACER, chief of the Heruli,—a barbarian remnant of the host of Attila, left on the Alpine frontiers of Italy,—interposed with his command that the *name* and the *office of Roman emperor of the West* should be abolished. The authorities bowed in submission to him. The last phantom of an emperor,—one whose name, *Romulus Augustulus*, was singularly calculated to bring in contrast before the reflective mind the past glories of Rome and its present degradation,—abdicated : and the Senate sent away the imperial insignia to Constantinople ; professing to the Emperor of the East that one Emperor was sufficient for the whole of the empire.—Thus of the Roman imperial sun¹ that third which appertained to the Western empire was eclipsed, and shone no more. I say that *third* of its orb which appertained to the Western empire : for the Apocalyptic fraction is literally accurate. In the last arrangement between the two courts, the whole of the Illyrian third had been made over to the *Eastern* division.²

So in the West “the extinction of the empire” had taken place ;³ the night had fallen.—Notwithstanding this, however, it must be borne in mind that the authority of the Roman name had not yet entirely ceased. The Senate of Rome continued to assemble, as usual.⁴ The

¹ It should be remembered by the reader that, “on the division of the empire into East and West, an ideal unity was scrupulously preserved.” Gib. x. 152. The imperial sun was *one*.—The same is indeed implied in the Senate’s address to the Eastern Emperor, on Odoacer’s mandate.

² See above, p. 363.

³ The expression of Gibbon, vi. 226.

⁴ For example we find it assembling in 500 A.D. to welcome Theodoric ; in 536 sending deputies, in conjunction with those of the Pope, clergy, and people, to invite Belisarius to the deliverance of the city ; in 546 temporarily broken up by Totilas’ banishment of its members on his capture of Rome ; then restored, and at length in

Consuls were appointed yearly, one by the Eastern Emperor, one by Italy and Rome. Besides that Odoacer himself governed Italy under a title (that of *Patrician*) conferred on him by the Eastern Emperor.¹ And as regarded even the more distant Western provinces, the tie which had united them to the Roman Empire was not yet altogether severed. There was still a certain, though often faint, recognition of the supreme imperial authority.² The moon and the stars might seem still to shine on the West, with a dim reflected light. In the course of the events, however, which rapidly followed one on the other in the next half-century, these too were extinguished. Theodoric the Ostrogoth, on destroying the Heruli and their kingdom at Rome and Ravenna, ruled in Italy from A. D. 493 to 526, as an independent sovereign³: and, on Belisarius' and Narses' conquest of Italy from the Ostrogoths, (a conquest preceded by wars and desolations in which Italy, and above all its seven-hilled city, were for a time almost made desert,⁴) the consulship was abrogated, the Roman senate dissolved.⁵ Moreover, as regards the barbaric princes of the western provinces, their independence of the Roman imperial power became now more distinctly averred and understood.⁶ After above a century and half of calamities unexampled almost, as Dr. Robertson most truly represents it,⁷ in the

552 finally abolished, as a body exercising political functions, by Narses. Gibbon, vii. 30, 223, 368—370, 377, 389.

¹ Gibb. vi. 227, 228.

² E. g. the Emperor of the East conferred on *Clovis* the title of Consul and Patrician.—But see on this subject my notice of it in Part iv. ch. iv. § 2, with the very illustrative Plate as to the use of the diadem on the early Gothic coinage.

³ See Gibbon vii. 1—51. On the Lombard invasion of Italy, which followed soon after Belisarius' and Narses' conquests, A. D. 568, see *ibid.* viii. 126, &c.

⁴ See Gibbon, vii. 369, 370. Marcellinus (referred to by Gibbon) states in his *Chronicon* that after Totilas had taken, partly demolished, and then evacuated Rome, carrying off the senators with him, the city remained for forty days desolate; “quadraginta aut amplius dies Roma fuit desolata, ut nemo ibi hominum nisi bestię morarentur.”—Then occurred Belisarius' visit from Ostia; he having cut his way with 1000 horse through an interposing division of the Gothic army, “to visit with pity and reverence (as Gibbon says) the vacant space of the Eternal City.” Of which visit Dr. Miley, the Roman Catholic Priest, in his “*Rome Pagan and Papal*,” (i. 263—265, ii. 196,) has given a very picturesque description.

As being a very critical epoch in the history of Rome, introductory to the establishment of the Popes as its rulers, in their assumed character of Vicars of Christ, I shall have to recur to it more particularly in my Part iv. ch. iv. § 1, *ad fin.*

⁵ Gibb. vii. 152, 389.

⁶ See my Part iv. ch. iv. § 2, just before alluded to, Note ² *suprà*.

⁷ Charles V, pp. 11, 12: “If a man were called on to fix upon a period in the his-

history of nations, the statement of Jerome,—a statement couched under the very Apocalyptic figure of the text, but prematurely pronounced on the first taking of Rome by Alaric,—might be considered as at length accomplished, “Clarissimum terrarum *lumen* extinctum est,”¹ “The world’s glorious *sun* has been extinguished;” and that too which our own Poet has exprest, still under the same beautifully appropriate Apocalyptic imagery,

She saw her glories star by star expire :²

till not even a single star remained, to glimmer on the vacant and dark night.

So ended the history of the Gothic period. So did every point figured in the first four Trumpet-visions appear fulfilled in it.³ And with it ends this division of our subject.—For a while the prophetic scene shifts : and we shall be called presently to look *Eastward*, to see the judgments of God *there* fulfilling. On returning *West* again afterwards, it will be to contemplate the Roman empire revived in its old capital under a new aspect, and as it were a new head. And then a history and a fate will be found attaching to it, according to the sure word of prophecy, (in part fulfilled, in part still unfulfilled,) the one more remarkable, the other more awful, than even that which we have just been tracing in the history of the fall of the imperial Goth-subverted Rome.

tory of the world during which the condition of the human race was the most calamitous, he would without hesitation name that which elapsed from the death of Theodosius to the establishment of the Lombards in Italy.”

¹ Quoted Note 1, p. 393 *infra*.—In similar figure Eumenius, in his Panegyric to Constantius, c. 10, when speaking of the separation of the provinces from Rome under Gallienus’ disastrous reign, characterizes it as the “triste provinciarum à Romanâ luce discidium.”

² Childe Harold, Canto iv. Stanza 80.

³ Let me observe, in concluding, that the exposition of the four trumpet-visions here given resembles generally that of Whiston, Bicheno, and Dr. Keith : there being excepted my interpretation of the *third part*, of which mention has been made before : and the connexion of Attila with the river *Rhine* ; a point almost overlooked by Whiston and Keith, though not by Bicheno.

CHAPTER IV.

FOREWARNINGS OF COMING WOE.

“AND I beheld, and heard an angel¹ flying through the midst of heaven; and saying with a loud voice, Woe, Woe, Woe, to the inhabitants of the earth, by reason of the other voices of the trumpets of the three angels which are yet to sound!” Apoc. viii. 13.

This vision, occurring as it does between the fourth Trumpet-vision and the fifth, corresponds with that period of time which intervened between the extinction of the last rays of the old government at Rome, and the rise of Mahomet and the Saracens:—an interval of some 40 or 45 years, which we may date from Justinian’s death, or the Lombards’ establishment in Italy, A.D. 565 and 570; and which was chiefly memorable in Rome and Roman Christendom from the Pontificate which closed it, of Pope Gregory the Great.² It is a period of transition from what we may designate as the ancient, to the more modern division of Roman history; and this both as regards the West and the East. As such it is notable, and indeed noted by historians.³

¹ Griesbach and the other critical Editors read *αετου* instead of *αγγελου*; an *eagle*, instead of an *angel*. And the external evidence of Manuscripts is *decidedly* in favour of the former reading.—On the other hand the *internal* evidence of Scriptural analogy, with which Griesbach and the rest did not concern themselves, is as *decidedly*,—indeed, as it seems to me, even more so,—against it. For nowhere in the Apocalypse is the *proclaiming* function assigned to a *bird*, or indeed to any being but an *angel* or the *divine Spirit*. We may compare chap. xix. 17, and xiv. 6, 8, 9. In the *first* of these passages a proclamation is made not *by*, but *to*, the fowls that fly in mid-heaven: and for what? to fulfil their proper functions of *devouring flesh*. In the *second* the proclaiming agents in mid-heaven are thus described: “I saw an *angel* flying in the midst-heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach, and crying,” &c.: “And another *angel* followed, saying:” &c.—I therefore do not hesitate to retain the reading *αγγελου*.

(Since writing this I see that Dr. Züllig, in his Apocalyptic Commentary, ii. 108, argues for, and adopts, the reading *αγγελου* on much the same grounds as I do. He also mentions that the learned critic *Wolf* had similarly contended for the integrity of the *αγγελου*. 4th Ed.)

² Pope from A.D. 590 to 604.

³ So Hallam, with reference to the *Eastern* empire. “The appearance of Mahomet, and conquests of his disciples, present an epoch in the history of Asia even more important and more definite than the subversion of the Roman empire in

With regard to the vision before us, it is to be observed, that the warning-cry of the coming woe was made not by an angel in the inner temple,—the council-chamber of the Eternal One,—but by an angel flying through the midst of heaven. Hence we may infer, I conceive, agreeably with the analogy of other such Apocalyptic visions, that it was not a mere private intimation to the Evangelist of what yet remained to be foreshown respecting the coming future, but signified that which would have its fulfilment in some forwarning signs in real life, publicly observable by men at the time prefigured :—just, for example, as the very parallel proclaiming cry of the angel that appeared afterwards flying in mid-heaven,¹ may be shown to have had facts clearly answering to it in the correspondent historic æra. —So that we must not be satisfied to pass onward without looking into the history of the times here referred to, and seeing whether there was in them anything, and what, that might be regarded as a warning-voice that told of calamities impending :—a warning-voice audible, and fit to strike upon the minds of men, throughout the length and breadth of that which, from the professed christianization of the Romano-Gothic kingdoms, might in regard of the West, as well as East, be still called Roman Christendom.

Nor, as it seems to me, does it need more, in order to our perceiving the thing we seek for, than that we should throw ourselves, as it were, into the times spoken of; and identify our thoughts and our sympathies, for the moment, with those of the age.—I purpose, in what follows, to speak of the signs of the times, 1st, as they might strike foreboding and fear into the minds of reflective men generally: 2ndly, as they might affect the minds more particularly of the discerning among God's true servants; men such as St. John himself specially represented, who had the seal of God on their foreheads, and whose judgments of things were formed by the rule of God's written word.

I. 1. And let me begin with observing on the solemnity of

Europe. Hence the boundary line between the ancient and modern divisions of Byzantine history will intersect the reign of Heraclius." Middle Ages, ii. 162.

¹ Apoc. xiv. 6, 7.

the æra, and the solemn prognostications connected with it, from the circumstance of its following immediately on the close of that mighty revolution, *the fall of imperial Rome's proper empire*.—Escaped from so terrible a wreck, it might have been natural perhaps for the survivors, independently of any *peculiar* causes of apprehension, to look with awe into a dark and uncertain future.¹ But to regard *it* in this point of view merely will be altogether to under-rate the awfulness of the crisis. The reader has already seen how, on the sure warrant of Scripture, the destruction of the Roman empire had been all along looked forward to by the early Church as an event fraught with consequences most peculiar and most awful. He will not have forgotten the predictions of *Antichrist's* fated coming:—how his manifestation was understood to be connected with the dissolution of the Roman empire, its dissolution into ten kingdoms; and that persecutions, calamities, and judgments very fearful were to follow, and after them the *end of the world*. He will remember how the fathers of the second, and then those of the third century, construed the *καταχρον* of St. Paul,—the *let* and *hindrance* to Antichrist's manifestation,—as the then existing empire of Rome;² and the intense interest, consequently, with which its continuance was regarded by them, the alarm with which its apprehended fall. “We pray for the Roman emperors and empire,” said *Tertullian*, in a passage already long since in part cited; “for we know that convulsions and calamities threatening the whole world, and the end of the world itself, are kept back by the intervention of the Roman empire.”³ And so again, just after the termination of the third century, *Lactantius*: “The fact itself plainly assures us that the world will ere long totter and fall. Only, while the city of Rome is safe, there seems reason not to apprehend it. For that is the state which as yet props up

¹ So Dupin, v. 123, in speaking of the apprehensions of some, especially Pope Gregory (of whom more presently), at the time referred to, says; “Whenever there have been great revolutions, Christians have easily persuaded themselves that the end of the world was approaching.”

² See pp. 229, 230; where Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, and Hippolytus are quoted to this effect.

³ Apol. c. 32; quoted p. 230 Note 1, *suprà*.

all things.”¹—The same conviction continued afterwards through the fourth century, as we learn from the consenting statements of the Latin fathers and the Greek,—of *Cyril* and *Chrysostom*, *Ambrose*,² *Jerome*, and *Augustine*.³

¹ Div. Inst. vii. 25, and also 15; quoted more fully p. 234 Note ¹, supra.

² That is, if we may reckon on the Comment on the Epistles given under Ambrose's name, but which is rather the comment (in part at least) of a contemporary of Ambrose, perhaps Hilary of Rome, (see the Benedictine remarks,) as fairly representing his opinions. See my notice of Ambrose in the next Note.

³ It will be useful on more than one account, as well as interesting to the reader, to subjoin somewhat copious extracts of the opinions of these eminent fathers of the fourth century, on the great cognate prophecies respecting Antichrist of Daniel, St. Paul, and the Apocalypse; opinions involving the point alluded to, about the *Roman empire's dissolution* into a new decem-regal form, as the event that would be introductory to his manifestation.—Intermixed will occur notices also of their opinions as to the *nature of the predicted apostasy*, (whether in the professing Church, or out of it,) to which I may refer again at the close of this chapter.—This will be a sequel to that given at pp. 229, 230, 234, of the sentiments of the earlier fathers, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Hippolytus, Cyprian, Lactantius.

1. *Cyril*; ordained Bishop of Jerusalem A.D. 350, died 386.

He, like the fathers before him, explained the four wild Beasts of Dan. vii. to be the Babylonian, Persian, Macedonian, and Roman empires, and identified the fourth Beast's *little horn* with St. Paul's *Man of Sin* and St. John's *Antichrist*. Further he judged that the time of his coming was to be when the times of the then Roman empire were fulfilled, (*ὅταν πληρωθῶσιν οἱ καιροὶ τῆς τῶν Ῥωμαίων βασιλείας*;) and it was dissolved into ten kingdoms, kingdoms rising up contemporaneously, but in different places:—that then Antichrist, (“some great man raised up by the devil,”) falsely calling himself the Christ, and so seducing the Jews, would by magical arts and false miracles seize on, and usurp, the power of the Roman empire, eradicate three of the ten kings, and subjugate the other seven:—that at first mild in semblance, and prudent, and the abolisher of idols, (all with a view to self-exaltation,) he would afterwards show himself as God, sitting in the Jewish temple; (“for God forbid it should be *that in which we are*;”) and for three years and a half persecute the Church:—finally that the *apostasy*, of which St. Paul spoke as Antichrist's precursor, meant a *religious apostasy*, “from the right faith, from truth, and from right words.” (So Catech. Lect. xv.)

2. *Ambrose*; ordained Bishop of Milan A.D. 374, died 397.

The only prophetic notices on the point proposed in the *genuine* writings of this father, are those in his Comment on Luke xxi. 20; Book x. § 15—18. He there (like Cyril) explains the *apostasy* of St. Paul to mean an *apostasy from true religion*: (“à verâ religione plerique lapsi errore desciscunt:”)—that it would be the Jewish *inner* or *mental* temple in which Antichrist would sit: and that then, seizing on the kingdom, (I presume the *Roman* kingdom or supremacy,) he would claim for himself a throne of divine authority; “sibi divinæ vindicet solium potestatis.”

In the Comment on 2 Thess. ii. of the *Pseudo-Ambrose*, the *hindrance* to Antichrist's manifestation is explained to be the Roman empire; its defection (*ἀποστασία*), or abolition, being the occasion of his appearance; and that he would then *restore freedom to the Romans*, “*sub suo nomine*:”—that the *mystery of iniquity* spoken of by St. Paul was Nero's persecuting spirit against Christians, which still afterwards had continued to actuate succeeding Pagan emperors down to Diocletian and Julian; finally that he would, “in domo Domini, in sede sedeat Christi, et ipsum Deum se asserat.”

3. *Chrysostom*; ordained Presbyter A.D. 386, made Bishop of Constantinople 398, died 407.

He too (on Daniel) expounded Nebuchadnezzar's quadripartite Image, and Daniel's four Beasts, as the other fathers. “The days of those kings,” said of the time of the stone being cut out, he explains as the days of the *Romans*: and that, in smiting and destroying the Roman kingdom, it would destroy the others too, as included.—Also in his Hom. iv. on 2 Thess. ii. he made the Roman empire to be the *let* or *hin-*

and solemn thoughts as to the coming future crossed the minds even of the earlier of those fathers, as they watched

drance to Antichrist's manifestation meant by St. Paul: *τουτ' εστιν η αρχη η ρωμαικη* όταν αρθη εκ μεσου τότε εκεινος ηξει and again: *οταν αυτη καταλυθη επιθησεται (ο Αντιχριστος) τη αναρχια, και την των ανθρωπων και την τε Θεε επιχωρησει αρπασαι αρχην* and he explained the *temple* in which Antichrist would sit to be rather "the Christian Churches everywhere," than the Jewish temple.—The *mystery of iniquity* he thought might be Nero, as in spirit a type of Antichrist: *Νερωνα ωσανει τυπον οντα του Αντιχριστου και γαρ ουτος εβουλετο νομιζεσθαι Θεος* and that Antichrist was to be *αντιθεος τις*; overthrowing indeed the worship of idols and other gods, but only so as to enforce the worship of himself in the place of them and of God.—The *apostasy* Chrysostom identifies pretty much with Antichrist himself; *ως πολλους μελλοντα απολλυναι και αφισταν*. He adds that, as Rome succeeded Greece, so Rome would be succeeded by Antichrist, and Antichrist by Christ.

4. *Jerome*; ordained Presbyter A.D. 378, died 420.

On Dan. ii. he expounds the gold, silver, brass, and iron of the symbolic Image to be the same four kingdoms as the other fathers: the stone cut out of the mountain without hands being Christ born of a virgin; whose kingdom, upon the destruction of all the other kingdoms, was finally to fill the whole earth. The breaking of the iron legs into ten toes,—part iron, part clay,—he explained of the weakness of the Roman empire at the time he wrote,—about A.D. 407, according to the Benedictines: "Ut in principio nihil . . . durius fuit, ita in fine rerum nihil imbecillius; quando et in bellis civilibus, et adversum diversas nationes, aliarum gentium barbararum indigemus auxilio."—On Dan. vii. he explains the four Beasts of the same four empires; the four heads of the third or Macedonian Beast indicating its subdivisions, on Alexander's death, into the kingdoms of Ptolemy, Seleucus, Philip, Antigonus. On the divisions of the fourth, or Roman, he writes: "Ergo dicamus, quod omnes scriptores ecclesiastici tradiderunt, in consummatione mundi, quando regnum destruendum est Romanum, decem futuros reges qui orbem Romanum inter se dividant; et undecimum surrecturum esse regem parvulum, qui tres reges de decem regibus superaturus sit: quibus interfectis etiam septem alii reges victori colla submittent:"—adding that this eleventh king is to be a *man*, with Satan's spirit indwelling, the same as St. Paul's *man of sin*: also that the Roman empire is to be finally destroyed on account of this Antichrist's blasphemies, and with it all earthly kingdoms. "Idcirco Romanum debetur imperium quia cornu illud loquebatur grandia. In uno Romano imperio, propter Antichristum blasphemantem, omnia simul regna delenda sunt; et nequaquam terrenum imperium erit, sed sanctorum conversatio, et adventus Filii Dei triumphantis."—This was written between 407 and 410 A.D.

Further, on Dan. xi. 21, &c., he explains that Antichrist is to rise from the small nation of the Jews; at first to be low and despised, and not have royal honour: then through fraud, falsely pretending to be the chief of God's law and covenant, and falsely pretending to chastity also, to obtain supremacy, break and subdue "the arms" (brachia) of the Roman people opposing him, and gain (what no Jew ever gained before) the empire of the world: "Faciet quia simulabit se ducesse esse fœderis, hoc est legis et testamenti Dei:" and that he will then fight against the holy covenant.

Again, on Jer. xxv. 26, about Sheshach, who, last of the kings of the earth, was to drink of the cup of God's fury, (*Sheshach* being a mysterious name for *Antichrist*), he explains the *let* or *hindrance* in the way of Antichrist's manifestation (2 Thess. ii.) to be the then existing Roman empire: "Eum qui tenet Romanum Imperium ostendit: nisi enim hoc destructum fuerit sublatumque de medio, juxta prophetiam Danielis, Antichristus ante non veniet:" adding that St. Paul did not mention this, for fear of stirring up persecution against the then infant Christian Church.—Also, in his Answer to Questio xi, ad Algasiam, he says very similarly, as to the *let*, that "nisi prius Romanum deleatur imperium . . . nisi fuerit desolatum," Antichrist would not come. He explains the *mystery of iniquity*, even then working when St. Paul wrote, to be the evils and sins with which Nero then oppressed the Church, and prepared for Antichrist; and the *αποστασια*, or *apostasy*, to be a *political* apostasy or defection of the nations from the Roman empire, "ut omnes gentes quæ Romano Imperio subjacent recedant ab iis:" adding that Antichrist's self-exaltation over all that was

the premonitory signs of the times.¹ Much more when, as the fifth century opened, the Gothic inundation swept over the Western empire, and soon temporarily overwhelmed Rome itself, as well as the provinces, it could not be but that an unusual awe and apprehension should fill the minds of reflective men. "Judge ye," said *Sulpitius Severus*,

called god, &c., meant, "ut cunctarum gentium deos, sive probatam omnem et veram religionem, suo calcet pede:" and that the temple he would sit in would not be the temple at Jerusalem, but the Church: "in ecclesiâ, ut verius arbitramur."*

5. *Augustine*, C. D. xx. 19, 23, notices and agrees in Jerome's view of Daniel's four Beasts, and as to the identity of the fourth Beast's *little horn* with St. Paul's *man of sin* and St. John's *Antichrist*. He explains the *apostasy* in 2 Thess. ii. of a *religious* apostasy; indeed, (expounding the abstract of the concrete,) as the apostate Antichrist himself; "Nisi venerit *refuga* primùm, utique a Domino Deo:"—also as to the *temple* he would sit in, that it seemed to him dubious whether it might mean Solomon's ruined temple, or the Christian Church: that at any rate it could not be an *idol's* or *dæmon's* temple; because *that* would not be called *God's* temple:—further that the *let*, or *hindrance*, in Antichrist's way might not absurdly be taken to mean the Roman empire; though, not having been told by St. Paul like the Thessalonian Christians about it, he must profess his own ignorance in the matter:—that, as to the *ten kings*, the number might be perhaps *indefinitely* meant, ten for the totality, whatever their number:—that the *mystery of iniquity* might perhaps be said of Nero's spirit and actions; although the idea of his personal resurrection was absurd: or, as others thought, it might signify the *unsound and bad in the professing Church*, ("ficti et mali in ecclesiâ,") until grown to a number sufficient to make up a great people for Antichrist, and which then might openly apostatize:—finally, that it seemed to him doubtful whether Antichrist's miracles would be pretended only, or real through the help of Satan.

¹ *Cyril* (ubi suprâ) spoke of the wars *without*, and the religious schisms, animosities, and secret heretical sentiments of Christians *within*, (which last seemed to him to be the working of the *mystery of iniquity*,) as signs that Antichrist's manifestation was near at hand. He noted too the fact (or supposed fact) of the gospel having been then nearly preached over the whole world, as a further corroborative proof. This was about A.D. 350.

Ambrose too, writing about A.D. 386, (so the Benedictines date it,) on Luke xxi. 9, refers to the then recent wars, especially those of the Goths against the Romans in which Valens perished, and which had resulted in their occupation of Illyricum, as well as to the rumours of wars, pestilences, &c., as evidence that the world was near its end. "Verborum autem cœlestium (se. 'When ye hear of wars and rumours of wars,' &c.) nulli magis quàm nos testes sumus, quos mundi finis invenit. Quanta enim prœlia, et quas opiniones accepimus prœliorum! Chunnî in Alanos, Alani in Gothos, Gothi in Tayfalas et Sarmatas insurrexerunt. Nos quoque in Illyrico exsules patriæ Gothorum exsilia fecerant; et nondum est finis. Que omnium fames, lues pariter boum atque hominum, &c.! Ergo quia in *ocasu* seculi sumus, præcedunt quædam ægritudines mundi. Ægritudo mundi est fames, ægritudo mundi est pestilentia, ægritudo mundi est persecutio." Lib. x. § 10.—Again § 14, he refers to the then recent christianization of the Goths and Armenians, as proofs of the Gospel having been preached over the world. "Prædicetur evangelium ut sæculum destruat: sicut præcessit in orbem terræ Evàngeliî prædicatio, cui jam Gothi et Armenii crediderunt; et ideo mundi finem videmus."

* It should be observed in the above that Jerome makes a two-fold destruction of the Roman empire: the one its *desolation* and *dissolution* by a breaking up into ten kingdoms, introductory to Antichrist's manifestation; the other its *total and final destruction*, to take place on account of Antichrist's blasphemies at Christ's coming.—In the Comment on Jeremiah we have his last thoughts on the subject. It was written (see Pref.) the latest of his Comments on the Prophets. The reader may be interested in looking at the sketch of Jerome's life given in App. to Vol. iv.

from his retirement at the foot of the Gallic Pyrenees, "of the precipice that is before us!" This was said near about the time of the first Vandal irruption into Italy and Gaul; (an irruption which must still further have evidenced to him the truth of his previously-expressed conviction that the breaking up of the iron legs of the Roman empire into its ten toes of iron and clay had then begun;¹) and in connexion with his record of the solemn declaration of Martin of Tours, made some eight years before, that Antichrist was even then born, and in his nonage.² And when Alaric

¹ This occurs in the second Book of his Sacred History, written, as he tells us afterwards, fifteen years after Priscillian's execution, (an event of the year 385,) and consequently A.D. 400, or 401. The passage is a remarkable one. Speaking of the iron legs of Nebuchadnezzar's symbolic image, he says; "Crura ferrea imperium quartum idque Romanum intelligitur, omnibus ante regnis validissimum. Pedes vero partim ferrei, partim fictiles, dividendum esse Romanum regnum, ita ut nunquam inter se coeat, præfigurant. Quod æquè completum est: siquidem jam non ab uno imperatore, sed etiam à pluribus, semperque inter se armis aut studiis dissentientibus, res Romana administratur. Denique commiseri testum atque ferrum, nunquam inter se coeuntem materiam, commistiones humani generis futuræ à se invicem dissidentes significantur. Siquidem Romanum solum ab exteris gentibus, aut rebellibus occupatum, aut dedentibus semper pacis specie traditum, constat; * exercitibusque nostris, urbibus, atque provinciis permixtas barbaras nationes, et præcipuè Judæos inter nos degere, nec tamen in mores nostros transire, videamus. Atque hæc esse postrema tempora Prophetæ annuntiant." B. P. M. vi. 338.

² "Quòd autem hæc ab illo audivimus," says *Sulpitius*, i. e. that Antichrist was even then born, and in his boyhood, "annus octavus est. Vos autem æstimate quo in præcipitio consistent quæ futura sunt." Dialog. ii. 16.—Moreri gives the different opinions of learned men as to the time of Martin's death, with dates varying from 396 to 403; and concludes himself on Nov. 400 as the true date. Baronius' date is 402. So that, reckoning the time of Martin's expressing his opinion to have been near his death, the time of Sulpitius recording it would be about A.D. 409. With which date well agrees Jerome's mention of the work in his commentary on Ezekiel ch. xxxvi., as then recently published; "*Nuper* Severus noster in Dialogo cui Gallo nomen imposuit:" this commentary having been written about A.D. 410.—Sulpitius Severus, who was Martin's disciple and panegyrist, lived retired after his

* The allusion is evidently to the occupation of the Illyrian provinces by the Goths, begun under Valens, some by forcible seizure, some by surrender on the part of the Roman emperors: the same that Ambrose alludes to in the extract given in the Note preceding, and Jerome also some ten years later; see Note ¹, p. 393.—This being the commencement of that overflowing of the Roman empire by the Goths, whence the Gothico-Romano kingdoms afterwards rose, Bishop Newton was by no means so incorrect in quoting Sulpitius, by way of illustration to his exposition, as Dr. Sam. Maitland would make him; Second Enquiry, p. 140. Indeed when Dr. M. represents Sulp. Severus as "believing that he had seen the division of the empire predicted by Daniel, not in the multitude of foreigners . . . who came to settle (!) in it, but . . . in the government of the Roman empire by more than one emperor," I must beg to say that the critic seems to me very much more amenable to the charge of incorrect and unfair representation than the writer criticized. Daniel's division of the iron legs was into feet and toes of *mixt iron and clay*. And these S. S. palpably represents as realized in the barbarous nations, intermixt with the Romans, who occupied the soil (not as those who "*came to settle*" there peaceably, but) either as rebels seizing it, or as having it surrendered to them "*pacis specie*," under the guise, but really as the purchase-price of peace. See again Jerome cited on the next page.

threatened, and then attacked, and at length took Rome, the graver voice of *Jerome* cried once, and again, and again, from his monastery at Bethlehem; "The Roman world rushes to destruction, and we bend not our neck in humiliation:"—"The hindrance in Antichrist's way is removing, and we heed it not:"—"In that one city the whole world hath fallen."¹—But the impression at this time proved to be premature. As the inundation retired from central Italy both Rome and the Roman empire, though mutilated and broken, remained still standing: nor, moreover, amidst the flux and reflux of its agitated waters over the Western provinces, could the forms of the expected ten kingdoms be as yet seen clearly emergent.—Still events seemed hastening to the crisis. The Bishop of Salona, *Hesychius*, during the interval between the judgments of the first and second Trumpet, observing the signs of the times, according to the Lord Jesus Christ's direct command, express his deep conviction that the end of the world was near at hand; specially with reference to Daniel's and St. Paul's prophecies about the destruction of the fourth or Roman

death, as before, in Narbonensian Gaul. See the notice of him p. 333 *suprà*, and in Gilly's *Vigilantius*, ch. 3.

¹ First, A.D. 396, on Alaric and the Goths' revolting on Theodosius' death, and invading Greece, in his *Epist.* (3 or) 35 ad *Heliodor.* "Thraciam, Macedoniam, Dardaniam, Daciam, Achaiam, Epiros, Dalmatiam, cunctasque Pannonias Gothus Sarmata, Quadus, Alanus, Hunni, Vandali, Marcomanni, vastant trahunt rapiunt. . . Ubique luctus, ubique gemitus. Quid putas nunc animi habere Corinthios, Athenienses, Lacedæmonios, Arcadas, cunctamque Græciam, quibus imperant barbari. *Romanus orbis ruit*; et tamen cervix nostra erecta non flectitur."

Secondly, A.D. 409, after the great Vandal irruption into Gaul, in his *Epist.* (11 or) 91 ad *Ageruch.* "Verùm quid ago? Fractâ navi de mercibus disputo. Qui tenebat de medio fit; et non intelligimus Antichristum appropinquare, quem Dominus J. Christus interficiet spiritu oris sui." Then, after describing the barbarians' overrunning and desolation of all between the Alps and Pyrenees, Rhine and Ocean, ("Quadus, Vandalus, Sarmata, Halani, Gepides, Heruli, Saxones, Burgundiones, Alemanni, et, O lugenda republica, hostes Pannonii,") and the statement that, "fracto Danubii limite," the middle provinces of the Roman empire had then been ravaged for thirty years, the anticipatory warning cry follows, "Quid salvum erit si Roma perit?" (Mark the number *ten* in *Jerome's Gothic list.*)

Lastly, A.D. 411, in his *Prolog.* to *Ezekiel*; "Mihi Romanæ urbis obsidio . . . nunciata est. Atque ita consternatus obstupui, ut nihil aliud diebus ac noctibus nisi de salute omnium cogitarem. . . Postquam vero clarissimum terrarum omnium lumen extinctum est, imo Romani imperii truncatum caput, et, ut verius dicam, *in unâ urbe totus orbis interiit*, obmutui et humiliatus sum."

Let me add that as early as A.D. 398, in his exposition of *Matt.* xxiv. 14, "The gospel must first be preached, &c.," he had intimated, like Cyril and Ambrose before him, that he thought that predicted preliminary to the consummation nearly fulfilled. "Signum Dominici adventûs est evangelium in toto orbe prædicari, ut nullus sit excusabilis: quod aut *jam completum*, aut *in brevi cernimus complendum*. Non enim puto aliquam remansisse gentem quæ Christi nomen ignoret."

empire, and the commotions and distress of nations then apparent :¹ nor did the objections of Augustine weigh with him, any more than with Ambrose and Jerome before, against it.² Again *Evagrius* similarly, from his monastic retirement in Gaul, observed, and urged on others, those signs of the times : “The Roman emperors are driven from their kingdoms : wars rage : all is commotion : Antichrist must be at hand.”³ And *Theodoret*, from his distant bishopric at Cyrus in Syria,⁴ after long and studious consideration of the prophecies, confidently re-asserted that it needed but the resolution of the Roman empire into ten kingdoms ; and that then Antichrist would be revealed, and the fearful consequences apprehended follow.⁵—So when, at length, in the quick succession of events, and under the judgments of the fourth Trumpet, first the office and name of Roman emperor in the West had been extinguished by Odoacer, and then, about A.D. 550, those of Consul and Senate by Justinian and his generals,—when, in this manner, each final vestige of Rome’s ancient imperial ruling power had been swept away, and moreover barbaric king-

¹ See his epistle to Augustine (of the date 419 A.D.) numbered 198 in the Benedictine Edition. On “the signs in the sun and moon, and distress,” &c., he says : “Ea quæ patimur confiteri et pœna compellit, si forte non curet voluntas ; nam in uno tempore et signa in cœlo, et pressuram gentium in terris, ab hominibus videri et sustineri manifestum est. . . Nullam patriam, nullum locum nostris temporibus non affligi aut humiliari certum est ; sicut dictum est, Præ timore et expectatione quæ supervenient universo orbi,” &c.

² Augustine’s Letters are numbered 197, 199.—Augustine’s chief objection (besides that it was not for men to know the times and seasons) was that the gospel was not yet preached to all nations ; which Christ said must first be, and that then the end should come.—To which Hesy chius answered what St. Paul had said of the Gospel having been preached, even in *his* time, to every creature under heaven.

³ The Author, as would appear, of the *Consultatio Zachæi et Apollonii* ; a treatise of about the date 420. “Ardet bellandi furor : . . regna regnis confligunt : . . insuspiciabiles sceptris justarum sedium *Augustos* depellunt. Adde prodigiorum ineffabiles minas, &c. *Æstima, quæso, utrum hoc ferre diu sæculum possit.*” Hence his conclusion : “Adesse confestum suprema [et Antichristum] dignoscimus.” Dacherii Spicileg. i. 39.

On the author, and the date, see the Chronological Index prefixed to the Treatise, and “Monitum” preceding, by D’Achery’s later Editor : also the *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, Tom. ii. 252, referred to by Mosheim v. 2. 3. 7. D’Achery supposes him to have been a monk in *Africa*.

⁴ Not *Cyprus*, as Maclaine in his Translation of Mosheim makes him.

⁵ *Theodoret* explains the *four kingdoms* and the *little horn*, in Dan. ii. and vii., (q. v.) as the preceding fathers.—In St. Paul’s 2nd Ep. to the Thess. he expounds the *apostasy* as *Antichrist*, he being the great apostatizer from the truth ; the *let* as the *Pagan idolatry*, that was to be removed to make way for Antichrist’s worship ; the *mystery of iniquity* as the *heresies* of apostolic times, preparing for him ; the *temple* as *Christian Churches*, in which he would usurp the *προεδρεια*, as if God.—*Theodoret* wrote his Comment on St. Paul’s Epistles after 431 A.D. See Dupin, iv. 94.

doms had risen up out of its ruins in the provinces, perhaps to the very predicted number,—there seemed scarce room for doubting that the crisis had arrived, and that the awful events and judgments so long anticipated were indeed at hand.¹ From Rome prostrate and ruined, a voice seemed to issue unspeakably solemn, and which called on the whole world to hear it; “Woe to the inhabitants of the earth, by reason of the calamities and judgments even now impending!”

2. There was a chronological characteristic of the æra, that tended not a little, with some, to confirm these awful forebodings respecting the coming future. It was now between 500 and 600 years from the time of Christ’s birth: and, according to the chronology of the Septuagint, then generally received in Roman Christendom, either somewhat more, if the standard of the Alexandrine copy were taken, —or somewhat less, if that of certain other copies,²—than 6000 years had elapsed from the Creation. Now, not among the Jews only, but among the Christian Fathers also, the idea had been entertained, as already long since hinted,³ that the seventh millenary was to be the millennium of the triumph of the Church:—a consummation great and glorious; but to be preceded immediately by the last grand outbreak of evil under Antichrist, and the destruction of the world. It was under this conviction, and in reliance on the accuracy of the generally-received

¹ In the Oxford Tracts on Antichrist, (No. 83 of the Series, p. 24,) the following statement is made. “Another expectation of the early Church was that the Roman monster, *after remaining torpid for centuries*, would wake up at the end of the world and be restored: &c.” I presume the writer refers to the wild idea mooted by some, that *Nero* would rise again to act the part of Antichrist. (See my p. 68 Note ⁵ *suprà*.) But instead of “*the early Church*” embracing the idea, it was but a few individuals, and none of great eminence: the view of Chrysostom, and men like him, only referring to *Nero’s spirit*, not person. (See the abstract, pp. 389—391 *suprà*.) Moreover even the Sibyl’s wilder notion had to do with the *Beast’s head*, an individual; not the *beast* or *empire* collectively, so as the Oxford writer, in order to suit his argument, would represent it. The idea of *its* “lying torpid for many centuries,” was an idea the most alien, if I mistake not, from patristic expectations.

² See Hales’s Chronology, i. 211, 212; who gives 5508 A.M. as the epoch of Christ’s birth, according to the *Alexandrine* Septuagint, 5586 according to *Abulpharagî’s* Septuagint: also Gibbon ii. 302. See too the copious list of authorities in Malvenda de Antichristo, pp. 64—67.

³ See my p. 231 *suprà*.—For a full list of patristic authorities on this point, I may refer to Mr. Greswell’s work on the Parables, Vol. 1, p. 340. See also my Chap. vi, Part vi, on the First Resurrection.

Alexandrine Septuagint chronology, just observed on, that *Hippolytus*, bishop and martyr in the reign of Alexander Severus, had gone so far as to predict the year of the world's ending, and fix it at A.D. 500.¹ In precise accordance with whom the learned *Lactantius*, at the commencement of the fourth century, gave his opinion that the coming of Antichrist, and commencement of the millennium, would not be delayed much more than 200 years.² And *Eustathius* of Antioch, exiled soon after under Constantius, in writing on the *Hexaemeron* of the Creation, asserted that "there wanted but 469 years at the time of Christ's resurrection to the end of the 6000 years, and commencement of the Sabbath;"³ so fixing its commencing epoch still about A.D. 500. Once more *Hilarion*, in the year 402, thus wrote: "It now wants 101 years to the end of the sixth chiliad; about the closing of which the ten kings must arise, Babylon now reigning fall, Antichrist arise and be destroyed by Christ's coming, and so the saints' sabbath millenary begin."⁴—The opinion was recognised and sanctioned by *Jerome*, about the opening of the same century; and indeed as evidenced in part by yet another kind of proof. For, connecting that saying of St. John, "It is the last hour," with our Lord's parable of the labourers in the vineyard, hired each one, successively, at each of the twelve hours in the day, he inferred that the whole allotted period of man's probation, from the Creation to the world's end, might be resembled to the day's twelve hours; that, this period being otherwise known to be 6000 years, each mystic hour of the twelve must answer to 500 years; and consequently that St. John's *last* hour, including of course the whole time of the gospel-preaching to the Gentiles, from Christ's birth or ministry to the consummation,

¹ So Photius informs us. See the Note ¹ p. 231 *suprà*.

² Div. Inst. vii. 25. See p. 234 *suprà*. ³ B. P. M. xxvii. 34.

⁴ De Mundi Duratione, B. P. M. vi. 376. "A fabrica mundi usque ad passionem Christi Salvatoris nostri anni sunt V.M.DXXX. Proinde ad conclusionem VI millium annorum debentur anni 470." And presently again: "A passione Domini Christi . . . anni compleantur necesse est 470, ut concludatur summa VI mille annorum. . . De quibus 470 annis . . . anni transierunt 369. Restant itaque anni 101, ut consummentur anni VI [sc. mille:] qui anni non ante complentur, nisi prius, propè ultimum, reges decem exierint in mundum, et filiam Babylonie quæ nunc obtinet de medio mundi tulerint &c."—The tract is curious; but has hitherto been overlooked by prophetic writers.

would extend to 500 years only.¹—But behold, as events progressed, that epoch of 500 A.D. passed, and the consummation came not. It might be that there was some small error in their calculation. It might be that the 500 years were to be measured from the first gospel-preaching to the Gentiles, not from the incarnation. It might be that the true date of Christ's birth was earlier than the Alexandrine copy of the Septuagint made it;—perhaps, as Sulpitius Severus, A.M. 5419;² in which case 581 A.D. would end the age and world: or, as Augustine calculated it, A.M. 5351; in which case it would be A.D. 650 before the sixth millenary would have its completion.³ If so, there was still reason, on this account, as the sixth century was advancing to its close, to look with awful expectations to the quickly coming future.—Even Augustine's theory respecting the Apocalyptic millennium, as commencing from Christ's first advent, and Satan's partial binding by the gospel,⁴ did not do away with the impression. For, both by himself and his followers, this millennium of time was supposed to mean only *what remained* at Christ's birth

¹ "Siquidem in consummatione sæculorum, in reprobationem peccatorum, per hostiam suam Salvator noster apparuit, et undecimâ horâ ad conducendos operarios venit. Et, completâ illius passione, Johannes loquitur; *Novissima hora est*. In sex millibus enim annis, si quingenti anni per horas diei singulas dividantur, novissima hora consequenter dicetur tempus fidei gentium." On Micah iv. 1.

Augustine notices the same argument. Alluding to the words, "It is the last hour," he says; "Quod nonnulli sic accipiunt, ut sex annorum millia constituent velut unum diem, eunque in partes, velut horas, duodecim partiantur; ut sic quingentos annos postremos hora videatur habere postrema. In [qu. de?] quibus annis jam Johannes, inquit, loquebatur, quando novissimam horam esse dicebat." De Fine Sæculi, Ep. 199. 17.

Palladius also, a contemporary of Jerome's and Augustine's, thus in his *Lausiac History* connects this same statement by St. John with the Gothic barbarians' capture of Rome, and Antichrist's coming. Melania, he observes, [about A.D. 400] spoke thus to friends at Rome. Παιδια, προ τετρακοσιων ετων εγραφη, οτι εσχατη ωρα εστι· τι ουν εφίλοχωρειτε τη ματαιοτητι του βιον, μηποτε φθασωσιν αι ημεραι του Αντιχριστου, και μη ευννηθητε απολαυσαι του πλουτου υμων. So she led them away to Sicily, and thence to Jerusalem; after which, says Palladius, the *barbarian storm* burst on Rome, as predicted: θυελλα τις βαρβαρικη, η και εν προφητειαις παλαι κειμενη, επεστη τη 'Ρωμη' και . . . παντα πορθησασα βαρβαρικη απονοια παρεδωκεν απωλεια, ως γενεσθαι την 'Ρωμην, την εν χιλιοις διακοσιοις ετεσιν φιλοκαληθεισαν, κατα την της Σιβυλλης ρησιν ρωμην. Bibl. Patr. (Paris, 1624) ii. 1034.

² Sulpitius Severus dates the consulship of Stilicho (which was A.D. 400) at A.M. 5819; (though some read 5869;) so making A.D. 581 to be the time of the end of the sixth chiliad. B. P. M., vi. 371.

³ See Hales i. 212.—*Eusebius' Chronicle* dates Christ's birth still earlier, viz. A.M. 5200; so making the sixth chiliad to end A.D. 800.

⁴ De Civit. Dei, xx. 6, 7. Augustine ended this work A.D. 426. His millenary view will be given more fully at the end of this Work, Part vi, Chap. iii.

of the sixth chiliad, or the world's duration.¹ Thus the chronology of the times was still that which might naturally add strength to the forebodings of coming evil.

3. The outward state and aspect of things was not of a nature to dissipate the gloom of such prognostics. In the *West* the wars and agitation of the new-formed Gothic kingdoms had by no means subsided. The Lombards, a fresh and barbarous Gothic horde, had but recently come down from the Danube; (it was in the year A.D. 570;) and, with the somewhat remarkable exception of Rome and a connected district, had seized upon and established their kingdom in Italy. In the *East* the Avar Tartars,—having, in their flight from the Turks of Mount Altai, tracked the course of the Huns from the Caspian to the western Euxine and Danube, subjected and made tributary the Slavonic Bulgarians, their immediate predecessors in the work of devastation, destroyed (conjointly with the Lombards) the Gepidæ of Hungary and Pannonia, and settled down into a kingdom in those provinces in their place,—there hung now like a dark thunder-cloud: prepared to burst at any moment, so far as human foresight could discern, on the Eastern empire; and (with the Persians, perhaps, from the Euphrates co-operating) to sweep it away, as the Western empire had been swept already, from the face of the earth.² The eye of the Roman contemplatist could find no light there.—Yet more, there was that which might alarm it, in turning from the inflictions of man to those of God. The historian commemorates “the comets, earthquakes, and plague which astonished or afflicted the age of Justinian.”³ And, as to the miseries experienced, they were almost unexampled. The plague especially is described as having for 52 years, from 542 to

¹ C. D. xx. 7. 2.—So too in Tichonius' Apocalyptic Commentary, written probably about A.D. 400, and Andreas' and Primasius' Commentaries, written about 550 A.D. The *first* (Hom. xvii.) says; “Mille annos dixit, partem pro toto. Hic reliquias mille annorum sexti diei, in quo natus est Dominus et passus, intelligi voluit.” The *last* speaks of the “spatia posteriora,” of the sixth chiliad as then evolving. B. P. M. x. 331. For *Andreas'* views, to much the same effect, see his Comment. on Apoc. xx. 2. All these will be noticed in my History of Apocalyptic Interpretation, in the Appendix to the last Vol. of this Work.

² Gibb. viii. 119—129, 194, &c.

³ Gibb. vii. 412.

594, infected the greater part of the empire.¹ Many cities of the empire were depopulated and made desert. In various districts of Italy the harvest and vintage withered on the ground. At Constantinople, during three months of the plague's chief virulence, 5000, and at length 10,000, died daily. At Rome, in a solemn procession for imploring the mercy of Heaven, 80 persons dropt down dead within an hour, from the infection.² Procopius relates that by the triple scourge of war, pestilence, and famine, 100 millions of the human race were exterminated in the reign of Justinian.³—Were not these visitations very like what the martyr Hippolytus had noted as what would precede the world's ending?⁴ Under judgments somewhat similar, during the mortality of the fourth Seal, the venerable Cyprian thought that he discerned the signs of decaying nature, and of a world near its dissolution.⁵ Were the signs, men tremblingly thought, less portentous or significant now?⁶

4. There was one who was emphatically the man of the age,—the most sagacious, the most observed, the most influential:—I mean the bishop of Rome, Pope *Gregory the Great*. We know what, on a general contemplation of the state of things around him, *he* thought. His forebodings

¹ Gibb. *ibid.* 422.

² Gibb. viii. 159. This was from a local pestilence.—Dr. Baron, in his *Life of Dr. Jenner*, i. 193, expresses an opinion that this plague was the *small-pox*: which unquestionably about the same time attacked the Abyssinian army besieging Mecca, A.D. 568.

³ So Procopius, as corrected by Gibbon, vii. 424.

⁴ See his *Consummat. Mundi*, Bib. Pat. (Paris, 1624) ii. 346.

⁵ See the extracts p. 230 *suprà*. He concludes in one place; “Cernimus cœpisse gravia; seimus imminere graviora.”

⁶ An *eastern* illustration occurs in Agathias of Smyrna, writing under Justinian. “Tum portenta mox quædam; et predictiones absurdæ in vulgus temerè divulgari, et mundi hanc machinam prædicari quàm conceitatissimè collapsuram. Nebulones præterea quidam, et deceptores, veluti divini quidam et vates, sponte suâ circumire, et sibi visa prædicere, terroresque multis ineutere, quibus facile poterat, ut antea territis, persuaderi. Hi itaque, sive incassum furere, et pravo exagitari demone se simularent, gravissima quædam passim jactabant, et tanquam ex adnatâ sibi pravorum demonum specie fuissent futura edocti, deque suis admodum furiis jactarentur. Alii præterea, astrorum decursus figurasque animo agitantes, majores calamitates, et perinde communem rerum eversionem, fore significabant. Itaque terrore omnes percellerantur.” *Hist.* v. 3.—I cite from Malvenda de Antichristo i. 117.

In an Epistle of Queen Radegunda to the Bishops of the district, written A.D. 567, on the formation of her monastery, the phrase used by her, “*Mundo in finem currente*,” indicates the vulgar belief in the *West*. Harduin iii. 369.

are on record. "Believing," says Dupin, "that the Roman empire was within a finger's breadth of its ruin, and participating in the common idea that it was only to end with the world's end, he came to the conviction that *the last judgment* was at hand; and in many of his letters expressed this his conviction."¹ The impressiveness and weight of such declarations from such a man, and at such a time, need scarcely to be suggested to the reader. We must remember, too, that of all modes of publication at that time, in regard specially of things religious, that by the Pope's letters missive was the most diffusive,² as well as the most influential. Thus throughout the length and breadth of Christendom, from England in the far northwest, to Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria in the east and south, his warning voice was directed, charged with presage of the dreaded evil. Was it not like the angel³ flying in mid-heaven; that cried, "Woe, Woe, Woe, to the inhabitants of the earth, by reason of the judgments about to come?" We may take his warning-cry to king Ethelbert⁴ as a specimen. "We know from the word of Almighty God that the end of the world is at hand, and

¹ Dupin Bibl. Eccl. v. 123. (Ed. Mons. 1691.)

² Thus of one of Gregory's successors in the papacy a few years afterwards,—I mean Pope Martin, enthroned A.D. 649,—we read how, after holding a Lateran Council against the Bishop of Constantinople, he sent its canons, "per omnes tractus orientis et occidentis, et per manus orthodoxorum fidelium disseminavit." Summa Concil. p. 293. (Paris, 1552.)

³ I have preferred the reading *angel* to *eagle*, for the reasons stated at the beginning of this chapter. But let me observe in passing, should any one get over the difficulty of supposing a work of proclamation consigned to such an agency, and, on account of its superior external evidence, wish to adopt the reading *eagle*, that the eagle still continued to Papal, as to Pagan Rome, a characteristic ensign.

⁴ This Letter to King Ethelbert is given by Bede, p. 84. (Ed. Stevenson, 1838.) "Præterea scire vestram gloriam volumus quia, sicut ex verbis Domini Omnipotentis agnoscimus, præsentis mundi jam terminus juxtà est, et sanctorum regnum venturum est, quod nullo unquam poterit fine terminari. Appropinquante autem eodem mundi termino multa imminet quæ antea non fuerunt; videlicet immutationes aeris, terroresque de cælo, et contra ordinationem temporum tempestates, bella, fames, pestilentia, terræ motus per loca. Quæ tamen non omnia nostris diebus ventura sunt, sed post nostros dies subsequuntur."

Dupin (ubi sup.) particularizes other passages in Gregory's Letters, to the same effect; viz. Lib. ii. Ind. 2, Ep. 62; Lib. iii. Ep. 44; Lib. vii. Ind. 2, Ep. 128, &c.

Fleury thus states Gregory's strong persuasion on this subject; Vol. viii. 102, on A.D. 595. "Il étoit effectivement persuadé que la fin du monde étoit proche; et en regardoit comme les préliminaires tant d'incursions de barbares, tant de guerres et de calamités publiques, dont son siècle étoit affligé. Il en parle en toute occasion; et ne repete rien plus souvent, dans tous ses discours et toutes ses lettres, que la venue du juge terrible, et la rigueur de son jugement."

In regard to Rome itself, he repeated the prediction of St. Benedict; a prediction

the reign of the saints which shall have no end. In the approach of which consummation, all nature must be expected to be disordered; seasons deranged, wars raging, and famines, earthquakes, and pestilences. If not in our days," he concludes, "we must expect it in those following."

Nor, in his warning-cry as to the judgments precursive of the world's end being at hand, did he omit the warning as to *Antichrist* being at hand also. He connected the one awful apprehension with the other in his forebodings, just as had been done by most of the Fathers of the Church before him.—A notable occasion had arisen to call forth the public declaration of his sentiments and his fears on this subject. The Patriarch of Constantinople, John the Faster, had just then assumed the title to himself (though not, we may be assured, in the full meaning of the words) of *Universal Bishop*.¹ Against this, Gregory,—as indeed Pope Pelagius just before him,—raised his most solemn protestations. In letters written and published at different times, from 590 (or rather, including that written in Pelagius' pontificate,² from 580) to nearly the end of the century, and addressed to the Greek Emperor and Empress, the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria, the Bishop of Thessalonica, and many others,³ he declared before Christendom that whosoever, in his elation of spirit, called himself, or sought to be called, *universal bishop*, or *universal priest*, that man was the likeness,

interesting, as showing that the expectation of the earlier fathers as to the peculiar fate of Rome, and which was derived from Scripture, was still kept up: "Roma à Gentilibus non exterminabitur; sed tempestatibus, eoruscis turbinibus, ac terræ motu, in semet ipsâ marcescet." Dialog. ii. 15.—Compare Lactantius, vii. 15, &c., on the fate of Rome.

¹ Moshcim vi. 2. 1.—The title had been, it seems, in the century preceding addressed to Pope Leo by certain oriental correspondents, but not adopted subsequently thus far by his successors.—In disputing this title with Gregory John the Faster is assimilated by Baronius (ad ann. 595) to the apostate Angel rising against the most High God:—a comparison, says Dean Waddington, i. 299, not far removed from blasphemy.

² Gregory, then a deacon, was Pelagius' delegate on this occasion to Constantinople: and from the similarity of the Papal protestation, then given in by him, to those that he wrote and published afterwards, it has been conjectured that Gregory was probably himself the composer of it.

³ The reader will find copious extracts from these letters of Gregory in *Daubuz*, ad loc. p. 393, &c. He was indeed so struck with Gregory's protestations and warnings on Antichrist's near approach, as to have explained the woe-denouncing in the vision altogether of them. In the which notice he was preceded by *Pareus*.

the precursor, and the preparer for Antichrist:¹—that he bore the same characteristic of boundless pride and self-exaltation: that the tendency of his assumption, if consented to, was that which was the grand object of Antichrist, viz. to *withdraw all members of the Church from its only true head, CHRIST JESUS*, and to attach and connect them in the stead with *himself*:²—moreover that, in so far as the priesthood might have acquiesced in it, there had been prepared an army, not of *soldiers* indeed, but of *priests*, to assist him in carrying out that design into effect.³ It was stated or implied in his letters, that he regarded the *title* spoken of as the *name of blasphemy* connected with the ten-horned beast in the Apocalypse;⁴ the *self-exaltation* manifested above all his fellow-men, as that predicted of the *man of sin* in St. Paul's Epistle to the Thessalonians;⁵ and the consenting thereto as that *departure from*

¹ "Ego fidenter dico quia quisquis se universalem sacerdotem vocat, vel vocari desiderat in elatione suâ, Antichristum præcurrit, quia superbiendo se cæteris præponit." Ep. to the emperor Maurice; Lib. vi. Ep. 30.—Dr. C. Maitland in his Book on the Catacombs, p. 188, observes that the Benedictines deserve credit for retaining in their edition of Gregory's Works this embarrassing epistle; considering that the *Vatican copy* omits the entire epistle, and the one following it.

² "Frater et co-episcopus noster Johannes, mandata dominica, &c. despiciens, eum per elationem præcurrere conatur in nomine:—ita ut universa sibi tentet adscribere, et omnia quæ soli uni capiti coherent, videlicet Christo, per elationem pompatici sermonis, ejusdem Christi sibi studeat membra subjugare." Lib. iv. Ep. 36.

³ "Omnia enim quæ prædicta sunt fiunt. Rex superbiæ prope est; et (quod dici nefas est) sacerdotum ei præparatur exercitus." Ib. Ep. 38.

I read *exercitus* for *exitus*, with Pareus, Daubuz, &c.—Pareus (p. 306, Engl. Ed.) says; "Most copies have '*exitus* sacerdotum est præparatus:'" justly adding, "But the words that follow in Gregory show that it cannot be so; viz. 'Because the clergy war and strive for mastery and advancement, who were appointed to go before others in humility.'"

But, in fact, the *exitus* is a simple falsification of *exercitus* by Romish Editors. Says Dr. James, in his Treatise on "the corruption of Scripture, Councils, and Fathers, by Romish Prelates," (London, 1688,) cited by Goode on the Divine Rule of Faith, i. 206, (2nd Ed.) "All the MSS. that I could procure, or get into my hands, that is *seven* MSS., do read *exercitus*, not *exitus*." Yet, he adds, "for citing these words *truly* Bishop Jewel has been traduced and slandered among the Papists;" as if misquoting Gregory to serve his purpose.—Not all Papists however, let me observe, have thus adulterated the passage. Bellarmine De Sum. Pontif. xiii. 14, ad fin., gives it correctly, "Sacerdotum ei præparatur *exercitus*," without even noticing any other reading. He only endeavours to do away with its force, as against the Papacy, by observing that Gregory did not mean that priests *as priests* would belong to the army of Antichrist; but only that priests in *their character of pride* were preparing an army for Antichrist: "Non sacerdotes ut sacerdotes, sed sacerdotes ut superbos, Antichristo exercitum præparare."

⁴ "Absit à cordibus Christianorum nomen istud blasphemiarum." Lib. iv. Ep. 32. Compare Apoc. xiii. 5; "There was given unto him a month speaking blasphemies."

⁵ The "in elatione suâ," and "per elationem," are in evident allusion, as Daubuz observes from Du Plessis Mornay, to the "exalting himself," ὑπεραιρωμένος ἐπι παντα λεγομενον θεου η σεβασμα, of 2 Thess. ii. 4:—a clause, let me observe, which

the faith, and that *apostasy*, which was predicted alike in the same epistle, and in that to Timothy.¹ As to the Greek Patriarch's having so acted, he said that it surprised him not: that he only saw in the fact prophecy fulfilling; and recognised in it a sign of Antichrist being close at hand.² Under which persuasion he could not but the rather raise his protesting voice; and that not as in a personal cause, but in that of God and of the whole Church: earnestly hoping that, when revealed, Antichrist might not find that which was his own in the principles, or even in the titles, of the priesthood.³

Oh! sagacious and most true observer! sagacious in perceiving that the effect of any such allowed and recognised pretensions to a universal episcopate would, as regards *men*, involve the probable prostration beneath it of all authority, secular as well as ecclesiastical;⁴ and, as regards *Christ*, the certain withdrawal of the Church into apostasy from *Him*, its only true Lord and head!—But what then when, in spite of this declaration,—thus pressed as it had been on the attention of Christendom, thus dispersed, thus repeated, and even enregistered in the canon-law of the Romish Church,⁵—this very title was, within 10 or 15 years after, officially conferred on and assumed by Gregory's own successor in the Roman episcopate, the Greek emperor himself conferring it: assumed by him, not in its re-

has been sometimes construed as alluding simply to God; but of which the meaning, —as inferred from the expression λεγομενον θεου, and the added word σεβασμα, or *Augustus*,—seems rather to be the high secular authorities of this world. Compare John x. 35; and see also Stephens' Thesaurus on σεβασμα.—The whole prophecy will be discussed in a later part of this Work.

¹ 1 Tim. iv. 1; "in the last times some shall *apostatize* from the faith," αποστησονται της πιστεως where the *verb* is one cognate with the *noun* in 2 Thess. ii. 3; "Except there come the *apostasy*." Gregory had said, Lib. iv. Ep. 39; "In isto scelesto vocabulo consentire nihil est aliud quam fidem perdere."

² "Propinqua jam esse Antichristi tempora designatur." Lib. iv. Ep. 34. "Antichristus juxta est." Lib. vi. Ep. 28, &c.

³ "Studiosè cupio ne proprium quid inveniatur, non solum in moribus, sed etiam nec in vocabulo, sacerdotum." vi. 28.

⁴ I only say *probable*, because I am here speaking simply of the title of *æcumenic*, or *universal bishop*; not of that title of even yet loftier pretensions, which in the case of the Roman patriarch (not of the Greek) was associated with the former;—the title of *CHRIST'S VICAR*, or, *VICEGERENT on earth*. On this see my remarks p. 412 *infra*, also those made more fully in Part iv. Ch. v. of my 3rd Volume.

⁵ Pope Pelagius' remonstrance is extant, says Daubuz, "in the Collections of the Councils, and inserted in the Collection of the Canon Law, and elsewhere." Moreover many of Gregory's Epistles,—for example, those to the Bishop of Thessalonica, —were *circular*.

stricted meaning, as by the Eastern Patriarch previously; but in its full and plain meaning of *universal episcopal supremacy* over the whole professing Church on earth, and as a title thenceforth never to be abandoned!¹ Surely the fact was one calculated to excite both the ponderings and the misgivings of thinking men: and to awaken inquiry whether that dreaded phantasm, the very ANTICHRIST of prophecy, might not even then have been brought into existence in the world, albeit under a form in some respects little expected; and, if so, with fearful evils, doubtless, following in its train.

II. But the idea thus suggested will be better judged of, after remarking on the awful prognostics in the *religion* of the times, as viewed by men such as St. John then specially represented; them that *kept the commandments of God*, and *judged of things by the unerring rule of his word*. In the definition of which persons I add the second characteristic to the first, because from the infirmity of the human mind, the speciousness sometimes of error, and the undue influence of example and authority, it is too lamentably notorious in Church-history that many good men have erred in judgment on points most important, and thereby unintentionally helped forward the cause of evil and error.—As to the sentiments of these wiser few on the point we speak of, we can scarcely fail to judge correctly, if we glance with them at the then general state and aspect of religion; including a brief retrospective view of its history and progress, during the century and a half of the Gothic revolutions and settlements preceding.

In other and earlier parts of this Apocalyptic comment, the instealing into the Church visible of the great Apostasy has been already set before the reader, in respect of its two earliest unfolded principles and features, both as prefigured in the prophecy, and as fulfilled in the historic times corresponding;—the times namely of the last half of the fourth century.² It was on account thereof that God's

¹ It was conferred by the Emperor Phocas, A.D. 606.—The grant itself, and the epoch constituted by it, will be recurred to in another part of this work. See on Apoc. xiii. in my 3rd Vol.

² See Part i. Chap. vii. § 3, and Part ii. Ch. i.

judgments were represented in vision as commissioned against Roman Christendom: and hence, accordingly, that fearful outburst on it of the symbolic tempests of the first four Trumpets, of the fulfilment of which we have just traced the progress.—And what then the moral effect resulting? Did God's judgments in the Gothic woe in any measure effect their intended end; and lead to the energetic expurgation of those apostatizing errors from among them, by the people of Roman Christendom:—either in the Eastern Empire, which from afar, though itself not altogether unscathed, witnessed the woe; or the Western, which was convulsed by it, and at length subverted? Far from it. Throughout the century and a half, or two centuries, during which the judgments from God had gone on fulfilling their commission, the evil had also gone on advancing. New superstitions and corruptions had been added to the old; and the old become more deeply rooted in the Church, and confirmed. The baptismal sacrament was still ministered, and regarded, as that which operated with the mysterious efficacy of a charm to men's salvation; and much of the same mysterious vivifying influence, *ex opere operato*, ascribed to the other and *more awful* sacrament.¹ The saints and their merits were still invoked and set forth, and this even in the authorized liturgies, as the most powerful mediators, and best plea, with God; and their relics and pictures more than ever venerated and worshipped. Alike in the *West* and in the *East* the practice had now become all but universal.² And who more in-

¹ Alike Ambrose, the two Cyrils, Chrysostom, and other fathers of the close of the fourth century, already then used such strong language about the character and effect of those "tremendous" mysteries, as might well awe men's minds into a very superstitious view of the sacrament; and also pave the way for the *transubstantiation* of the middle age. These views, and this language, continued in vogue afterwards; not the simpler and more scriptural views of Augustine. The latter viewed the Lord's Supper as a *commemorative* rite, though with grace accompanying it to the faithful participant. See his *Contrà Faust.* xx. 21; "Hujus sacrificii caro et sanguis ante adventum Christi per victimas similitudinum promittebatur; in passione Christi per ipsam veritatem reddebatur: post ascensum Christi per *sacramentum memorie* celebratur." *Doctr. Christ.* iii. 24, &c.—Let me refer the reader to an elaborate review of the origin and progress of the doctrine of Transubstantiation in the *American Bibliotheca Sacra*, No. 1.

² Mr. Palmer, in his valuable work on the *Origines Liturgicæ*, i. 278, notices the freedom of the ancient *Oriental* Litanies from the invocation of saints; and that it was not admitted into the *Roman* Litany till the seventh century. But, in fact, Litanies of this character had been long before chanted in the *East*; as on the

fluent than Gregory himself in finally establishing it? In his Sacramentary it is the saints' merits and the saints' intercession that are set before the worshipper as his ground of hope.¹ And when the Christian Bishop *Serenus of Marseilles*, seeing the idolatrous worship paid them by the people, cast out the saints' images from the churches of his diocese, Gregory took part with the people against him: and, though not indeed without protesting against the actual worship, yet ordered that which entailed it, the retention of the images.²

Besides all which, another error and corruption, long covertly instealing into the Church, had just now by the same Pope Gregory been authoritatively established, which was likely on peculiar grounds to excite the alarm and the misgivings of each Christian contemplatist;—I mean the error of *purgatory*. It was an error not unconnected with that of *saint-invocation* just before mentioned; as it similarly related to the inhabitants of the invisible world, and rose in part from the same source. For, the foolish minds of men having transgressed the limits of the written word in their speculations respecting departed *saints*, what was there to prevent the extension of those speculations to the state of *other* departed ones;—viz. of those that could not

memorable occasion of Nestorius' condemnation at Constantinople, A.D. 431. "A long order of monks and hermits, carrying burning tapers in their hands, chanted litanies to the Mother of God." Gib. viii. 295.—Mr. P. suggests further that where that invocation of saints was practised, it was rather "prayer made to God for the intercession of saints." than direct invocation of them. I suppose he means *through* the saints; so as in Pope Gregory's Sacramentary. But surely, even so, neither the guilt nor the folly of the supplicants were diminished thereby; for it was a worship that involved the supercession and neglect of Christ, (just as depicted in that most striking Apocalyptic figuration of the incense-offering scene, Apoc. viii. 3—5,) alike in his character of man's *propitiatory atonement*, and man's one great and divinely appointed *Mediator*!

Fleury ascribes Gregory's settlement of the Roman worship to the year A.D. 599. —His septiform Litany seems to have been instituted in 590, on occasion of the great pestilence at Rome. See Cave, Hist. Lit. on Gregory I.

¹ I extract the following from the Sacramentary. "Memoriam venerantes imprimis gloriosæ semper Virginis Mariæ . . . sed et omnium sanctorum tuorum; quorum meritis precibusque concedas ut in omnibus protectionis tuæ muniamur auxilio:" adding, however, the formal and now almost valueless saving clause, "per Christum Dominum nostrum."—Compare Cyril's *private* explanation to the same effect, p. 342, Note ⁵.

See also Gregory's own extraordinary report about the relics of St. Paul to the Empress Constantina; in exemplification of his superstition on *that* head. Waddington i. 296.

² Thus by the Church, as once by Gnostics, Christ as the *Mediating God-man* was set aside.

be considered *saints* at the time of dying? The solemn Church-prayers for the dead,—though originally only applicatory to *martyrs*, and others of the Christian brethren departed in the Lord, and in such case confined to thanksgiving for their past faith and victory, and supplication for the speedy hastening of the Lord's coming, and therewith of the perfect consummation of the saint's bliss in body and soul reunited,¹—had in process of time been extended to embrace more doubtful characters,—indeed *all* departed *professedly* in the faith:² and opinions had been broached by learned and eloquent fathers in the fourth century, though doubtfully and indeed self-contradictorily, that in cases even of men *deceased in sin* (unless aggravated cases) these prayers of the Church might perhaps avail to obtain for them mitigation, if not remission, of the judicial punishment.³ But, if so, must there not be some *purifying fire* to burn out their sins: perhaps applied, so as heathen poets and Platonists set forth, *instantly*

¹ Such is Dr. Burton's general view of the early Church's prayers for the dead: (p. 318;) it being understood that the Christians of the 2nd century, and part of the 3rd, expected that the saints' resurrection would precede that of the wicked, and take place at the Millennium; also, according to Tertullian, that during the Millennium the order of the saints' rising would be in order of merit. "Oblationes pro defunctis, pro natalitiis, annuâ die facimus." "Pro animâ ejus orat [vidua], et refrigerium interim adpostulat ei, et in primâ resurrectione consortium, et offert annuis diebus dormitationis ejus." Again; "Modicum quoque delictum *morâ resurrectionis* luentium interpretatur." So Tertullian De Cor. Mil. 3, De Monogam. 10, De Animâ 58.

See pp. 333, 342 *suprà*.—On the subject of purgatory generally let me refer to a brief digest of patristic testimony in *Riddle's Christian Antiquities*, pp. 377—394; (Ed. 1839:) also to the *Rev. W. J. Hall's Book on Purgatory*. (London, 1843.)

² The prayer after consecration of the sacramental elements, Cyril of Jerusalem tells us, had these words: "We offer this sacrifice in memory . . . of *all that have fallen asleep* before us," &c.; (i. e. in the communion of the Church;) and consequently of all about whom charity might entertain hope, in any of hope's various degrees: "believing that it is a great advantage to their souls to be prayed for, whilst the holy and tremendous sacrifice lies upon the altar." Catech. Lect. xxiii. 9.

³ So especially *Chrysostom*. "They," the wicked, "are not so much to be lamented, as succoured with prayers and alms. . . For not in vain does he who stands at the altar, when the tremendous mysteries are celebrated, cry, We offer unto thee for all those that sleep in Christ. . . The common propitiation of the whole world is before us: . . . and we may obtain a general pardon for them by our prayers and alms." Again he says, "that prayers were made for all that were deceased in the faith: (i. e. *professedly*;) and that none were excluded from the benefit but catechumens, dying in a voluntary neglect of baptism." Hom. 41 in 1 Cor., and Hom. 3 in Philipp.

Epiphanius in one passage said that prayer should be made even for sinners; in another, that after death there can be obtained no help.—The same inconsistency attaches to *Ambrose*, and even to *Augustine*; supposing certain passages adduced by Romanists from the latter to be genuine. But some of these we know are not genuine: (see Hall, p. 146, &c. :) while many other passages in *Augustine* are express to the effect that after death there is no change. So e. g. Epist. 199. 2; "In quo

after death;¹ and which possibly a passage in St. Paul might have meant,² though otherwise indeed explained by the fathers?³—So, during the century and a half or two centuries preceding, the foolish minds of men had been darkly intruding into things not seen,⁴ those secret things that belonged to the Lord God;⁵ and preparing further meanwhile, by their increased credulity in relics and miracles and visions, for any delusions on *this* point that the priesthood, itself also debased by superstition, might for gain or for ambition palm upon them. And now behold, as the sixth century closed in, Pope Gregory arose to *fix* authoritatively the awful truth of a purgatorial fire immediately after death.⁶ It was on the evidence of supernatural visions and revelations. Germanus, Bishop of Capua, had himself seen the soul of Paschasius the deacon boiling in the hot baths of St. Angelo!⁷—Who could calculate the depth of superstition into which the purgatorial doctrine, thus authorised,⁸ was likely to lead the *people*? Who the effect that it must have on the position and influence of the *priesthood*?

And indeed it seems to me that the influence and power accruing to the *priesthood*, from the accumulated superstitions

quemque invenerit suos novissimus dies, in hoc eum comprehendet mundi novissimus dies: quoniam qualis in die isto quisque moritur, talis in die illo judicabitur." Also Ep. 153. 3, Serm. 161. 4, De Peccat. Merit. i. 28, &c.—On Augustine's "varying and contradictory speculations about the possibility of a purgatorial state," Prof. Butler (writing against Newman's Development, p. 29) refers to Bishop Taylor's Dissuasive, Part ii. B. ii. § 2.

¹ See *Hall on Purgatory*, Ch. i.

² "Every man's work shall be made manifest; for the day shall declare it; because it shall be revealed by fire, and the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is. . . . If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire." 1 Cor. iii. 13, 15.

³ See the patristic expositions in Mr. Hall, pp. 54—56. *Origen*, *Jerome*, and *Augustine* thought that the apostle meant the fire of temporal tribulation before death; which even Gregory I. himself allowed *might* be the sense. *Lactantius*, *Basil*, *Ambrose* referred it to the general conflagration at the day of judgment; *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Chrysostom*, and *Theodoret* to hell itself.—*In the judgment* Augustine thought it not unlikely that sincere but inconsistent Christians might have temporal suffering to go through.

⁴ Col. ii. 18.

⁵ Deut. xxix. 29.

⁶ "De quibusdam levibus culpis esse ante *judicium* purgatorius ignis credendus est." Dial. iv. 39, 41.

⁷ *Ibid.* 40; cited by Hall, p. 26.—See on Pope Gregory's establishment of the doctrine of Purgatory Dean Waddington's remarks, E. H. i. 404.

⁸ It was not however dogmatically *established* as an article of faith in the R. Catholic Church till the Council of Florence, A. D. 1439; confirmed by the Council of Trent 100 years later.

of the last three centuries, was a point that could scarce fail to impress deeply the mind of the discerning Christian. Ever since the commencement of the Apostasy, each successive step of departure from gospel-truth into superstition and error had been of a nature to give, and to increase to them, an illegitimate, unscriptural, and most pernicious power; in substitution for that better and hallowing influence assigned to them in God's own holy word.¹ The *sacramental error*, as I have before stated, tended to make them viewed by the people, not only as God's honoured instruments of good by bringing men into outward covenant with Him who was the soul's life, and urging them to personal faith in Him, in order to its personal appropriation; but almost as themselves the direct efficient cause of life and salvation.² The *saint and relic-worship*, requiring attendance as it did at the churches enshrining those relics, which were under *their* care, suggested the necessity of securing the priest's co-operation and favour, who was the supposed saint's chief intimate, as well as chief voucher.³ The substitution by Pope Leo, about the middle of the fifth century, of *private confession* to priests, instead of *public* in the church,⁴—and moreover the extension somewhat later of the virtue of *indulgences* granted by them, to

¹ See Hebrews xiii. 7, 17, 1 Tim. v. 17, &c.

² See pp. 282—286 *suprà*.—"The Jewish priests," says Chrysostom, "had power to remove the leprosy of the body; or rather only to examine the cleansed, (*ἀπαλλαγεντας*.) and not any power to cleanse; (*ἀπαλλαττειν*) and you know how that office was contended for. Whereas Christian priests have received authority, not to remove the bodily leprosy, but the corruption of the mind; not merely to verify the removal, but to remove it entirely:" *ἀπαλλαττειν παντεως*. De Sacerdot. iii. 6.

³ See p. 340.—I might say *canonizer*; only that it was not till the tenth century that the canonization of saints was actually solemnized. See Mosheim x. 2. 3. 4.

⁴ On the injunction by Pope Leo I, Dean Waddington, after noticing its connexion both as effect and cause with the increased immorality of the times, has the following important observations. "But another consequence which certainly flowed from this measure, and which, in the eye of an ambitious churchman, might counterbalance its demoralizing effect, was the vast addition of influence it gave to the clergy. When he delivered over the consciences of the people into the hands of the priest, when he consigned the most secret acts and thoughts of individual imperfection to the torture of private inquisition and scrutiny, Leo had indeed the glory of laying the first and corner stone of the papal edifice; that on which it rose and rested, and without which the industry of his successors would have been vainly exerted." i. 253. See too Mosheim v. 2. 4. 3.

The practice existed earlier in the Eastern Church; but was, about A.D. 390, discontinued in consequence of abuses resulting. See Socrat. v. 19, and Sozom. II. E. vii. 16. It was however soon restored, and has been ever since continued. See Waddington on the Greek Church, p. 51.

the remission of *guilt*, as well as of *ecclesiastical penance*,¹—these fresh innovations, already brought in before the epoch of our text, had also each immensely added to their power. *And the doctrine of purgatory*, which now followed, as we have said, put a climax to it. For, if the *former* had made them masters of the consciences, and almost fate, of the living, the *latter* represented them as masters in no little measure of the fate of those dear to the living among the dead. It had given them, what Archimedes wanted, another world on which to fix their lever;² and, so fixt, they might with it move this.—A power such, and so derived, was fearful to contemplate:—the rather, as the now enforced celibacy of the clergy, (might not this be the evil predicted by St. Paul, 1 Tim. iv. 1?)³ detaching them from other ties, could not but have the effect of directing their ambition into the only line open to it, that of ecclesiastical power;⁴ and this when (in no little measure from the same cause) their morals, as well as their knowledge, were too generally debased and low.⁵ As to their use of this power it would of course be all necessarily *anti-christian*:—i. e. not to lead men to Christ; but, by the interposition and substitution of living priests, just as of departed saints, to shut Christ more and more out of view. Insomuch that, as a doctrinal system of *anti-christianism*, the Apostasy might seem to have been now almost brought by its secret deviser and guide to perfection; not *without* but *within* the professing Church, according to so

¹ Polydore Virgil, in his work *De Inventor.* viii. 1. (published A.D. 1499), refers the origin of the Romish doctrine of indulgences, as afterwards developed, i. e. as including the remission of the *guilt and future punishment* of sin, as well as of its *temporal punishment*, to the time of Gregory I. For the assignment of which *late date* to it his Book was put into the *Index Expurgatorius*. Bingham, vi. 595.

² Δος που σφω. I use, I believe, Mr. Hume's striking simile.

³ Said Ignatius, in a fragment preserved by J. Damascenus, (ap. Galland. *Bibl.* i. 288.), Παρθενιας ζυγον μηδενι επιτιθει. And Theodoret, in his comment on 1 Tim. iv. 1, ("Forbidding to marry,") remarks that it was not the approbation of celibacy, but the *legal enforcement of it*, so as by certain heretics, that was to mark the *apostasy* meant. *Hæret.* Fab. v. 29.

It is observable that the apostle's notice of this feature in the predicted apostasy occurs in the midst of his detail of the duties of bishops (or presbyters) and deacons; and just after stating of the one and the other that they should be "husbands of one wife:" so that the enforced celibacy predicted may naturally be construed as having special reference to the same classes of Church ministers.

⁴ So the Koran, ch. ix, charges it against the Christians of Mahomet's time: "They take their priests and monks for their lords, besides God." Sale ii. 8.

⁵ See Mosheim vi. 2. 3. 1, 2.

many ancient Fathers' understanding of those words "sitting in the temple of God," said by St. Paul of the great Antichrist of the apostasy.¹ Indeed it might seem only to need the superposition of one single individual heading it, to constitute ANTICHRIST!—For which, and whom, on a much larger view of the evidence than Gregory had taken, the Christian contemplatist's conclusion would be that the *priesthood* were prepared, even like *an army*, (I use Gregory's own strong language,) to abet and aid him: i. e. supposing that, as so long expected, this *αποστασία* should be but his *προδρομος*,² or forerunner; and he should at length really appear.

Finally,—as to this predicted ANTICHRIST,—it seems to me that when considered in respect of their history, character, pretensions, episcopal site, and relation to the too generally apostatized Church and priesthood in Christendom, there was that in *the see and bishops of Rome* which might well have struck the reflecting Christian as wearing to that awful phantasm of prophecy a most suspicious likeness, Considering that, while the Apostasy was progressing, those bishops had been too uniformly its promoters and inculcators, and that now, when it was all but brought to maturity, Pope Gregory had most zealously (though not altogether consistently)³ identified himself and his see with its whole system, inclusive alike of its infusions of Judaism and Heathenism, its enforced clerical celibacy and monasticism, its confessional and its purgatory, its saint, relic, and image worship, its pilgrimages, and its lying miracles,⁴—considering that the seat of the episcopate thus heading the Apostasy was *Rome*, the fated seven-hilled city, the seat of the Beast in Apocalyptic prophecy, and place to which so many Fathers had looked as that of Antichrist's supremacy,—Rome so singularly freed, by means of the very wrecking of its empire, from the "let" long time controlling it of the overlooking Roman *imperial* power, and

¹ See the opinions of Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom, Theodoret, &c. pp. 389—391 *suprà*.

² Cyril, &c. See p. 391.

³ I refer to the often apparent mixture of piety with his superstition.

⁴ I may refer to Dean Waddington's Church History, i. 291—304, and 403, 405, for an excellent summary of Pope Gregory the 1st's acts, policy, and character.

then, by Belisarius' and Narses' conquests, from the subsequent but short-lived let of Italian *Gothic* princes, similarly near and controlling,¹—considering that the *power of the keys* was now believed in the West to attach individually to but one bishop, viz. to St. Peter's episcopal successor and representative, (not, as previously long time supposed, to the body of priests or bishops,) and that the fact of St. Peter's having visited, and been martyred and buried at *Rome*, had (as was thought) determined that representative to be the *Roman* bishop,—considering that, in consequence, the bishop of the now revived Imperial city was indicating pretensions, which seemed likely to be realized, to a spiritual empire over Christendom immeasurably loftier than that of old Pagan Rome, and had not merely accepted and assumed the before-mentioned title of *Universal Bishop*, given by the Emperor,² but accepted and assumed the yet loftier title, distinctively ascribed to him a little earlier, as if Christ's own gift, by the Italian bishops and priesthood in Council, of *Christ's Vicar* on earth,³—the very characteristic predicated of the *Man of Sin* by St. Paul, and identical title, only Latinized, with St. John's term *Antichrist*,—considering that, besides the priesthood thus taking part to elevate him, the people also generally of the western part of the apostatizing Church acquiesced in it, (like Augustine's multiplied "*ficti et mali*," to aid in Antichrist's development,)⁴ and specially the kings of the new-formed

¹ i. e. of the *Herulian* and *Ostro-Gothic* dynasties, each of which embraced *Rome* in their kingdoms, and exercised royal power over it. See Mosheim vi. 2. 2. 2. The *Lombard* kingdom, which followed after Narses' final conquests, had nothing to do with Rome: which was then a dependency (though very much independent in action) of the Constantinopolitan *Exarchate* or *Vice-royalty* of Ravenna.—Other results of Belisarius' expedition were but transient.

The existence of such a man as Gregory at this conjuncture, to take advantage of the removal of "the let," was assuredly a very remarkable coincidence.

² The appellation moreover of *Pope*, or Παπας, hitherto the general designation of Bishops, in the West as well as the East, was now, in Italy at least, applied exclusively to the Bishop of Rome. Gieseler E. H. § 115.

³ Ennodius in his Apolog. pro Synodo, on occasion of the contest A.D. 503 between Symmachus and Laurentius for the papacy, wrote "*Vice Dei* judicare Pontificem;" and the Roman Council adopted it. See Mosh. vi. 2. 2. 2, 4; Hard. ii. 983; also my Part iv. Ch. v.

I say in the text "*distinctively*," because the phrase ascribed to him, or something similar, had been ascribed in earlier times to bishops generally. So in unguarded phrase even Ignatius, *supposing the passage genuine*, had said that the bishop was εἰς τὸ πρῶτον Θεοῦ: as also Cyprian, Epist. 63.—So early had the train begun to be laid.

⁴ See p. 391 suprâ.

Gothic kingdoms, thus adding power throughout the West to his name and office,—considering all these resemblances, I say, in respect of place, time, titles, pretensions, power, might not the thought have well occurred to the reflecting Christian of the day, that the bishops of Rome, regarded in their *succession and line*, might very possibly be the identical *Antichrist* predicted:—he whose incoming was to be with lying miracles; ¹ he who was to sum up in himself as their head, to use Irenæus' expression, all the particulars of the previously long progressing apostasy; and to be in short, as Justin Martyr had called him, “the Man of the Apostasy,” ² as well as, in St. Paul's language, “the Man of Sin?”

No doubt there was in Gregory himself much respectability of character, and semblance of piety. But this constituted no objection. Both Pagan emperors and unchristian heretics had often been personally estimable and respectable: and alike Hippolytus, and Cyril of Jerusalem, and other Fathers, had expressed an opinion (an opinion derived doubtless from the apostle's descriptive words respecting his incoming “with *all deceivableness* of unrighteousness”) that Antichrist would at first, under direction of the Master-Spirit of evil, wear that deceptive guise, in order the better to seduce men.³—No doubt, again, such a view of Antichrist was in this respect different from that of the earlier Fathers, in that they had looked to see him unfolded in one single *individual*.⁴ But here St. Paul's own language showed that they might very possibly be wrong. For the apostle designated the *Roman imperial succession*, that was to be the *let* to Antichrist's manifestation, *το κατεχον*, under the figure of *an individual man*, *ὁ κατεχων*, *he who letteth*; ⁵ so indicating that that other phrase *the man of sin* might similarly be meant of a continuously living succession.—Once more, if the 1260 days, or three and a half years, predicted of

¹ “Whose coming is after the working of Satan with lying miracles,” &c. 2 Thess. ii. 9.

² “In se recapitulans apostasiam.” So Irenæus.—“The man of the apostasy” is Justin Martyr's title to Antichrist. See pp. 229, 231 *suprà*.

³ See pp. 229, 389—391, *suprà*: also an abstract of patristic opinions about Antichrist, in my Examination of the Futurists' Scheme of Apocalyptic Interpretation, in the Appendix to Vol. iv.

⁴ See pp. 230, 389 *suprà*.

⁵ Thess. ii. 7.

Antichrist's continuance, would seem in such case to be too short a period, various late Scriptural expositors, e. g. Tichonius and Primasius, had suggested what might be a solution of the difficulty, and one well accordant with Scripture usage; viz. that the *days* in such prophetic formulæ might have a mystic and extended meaning: indeed, as those expositors had each in one place stated, as well as the learned Theodoret in his Exposition of the 70 hebdomads of Daniel, that each prophetic *day* might probably symbolize *a year*.¹

But however this might be,—and it is a subject that *we* shall have to discuss fully elsewhere,—of one thing he must have felt assured, viz. that the state of the bishops and priesthood and Church generally, alike in East and West, (for even as regarded *Antichrist*, the Eastern Patriarch was just as much prepared to enact the character as the Western, could he but have accomplished it,) I say that the ecclesiastical state, alike of East and West, was such as to call for the signal judgments of God. Already,—excepting the $\phi\omicron\nu\nu\omicron\iota$, the religious *murderings*,—there was not a single one in the catalogue of sins afterwards enumerated as the cause of the sixth Trumpet's woe and the woe preceding,² that had not, at the close of the sixth century, become markedly characteristic of the professed Christian Church and clergy. There was the *worship of dæmons*, or saints canonized, and of *images* or *idols* of gold, silver, brass, stone, and wood, which could neither see, nor hear, nor walk;³ and there were the *sorceries*, or lying charms

¹ Comment on Apoc. xi. 3, 9. The important *year-day* question will be fully discussed elsewhere. See on Apoc. xiii; where the whole subject of the Popes and Papacy, as the predicted Antichrist, will also come under review. See too my sketches of Tichonius' and Primasius' Apocalyptic Commentaries in the Appendix to my Vol. iv.

² ix. 20, 21; "The rest of the men, which were not killed by these plagues, yet repented not of the works of their hands, that they should not worship dæmons, and idols of gold, and silver, and stone, and of wood, which can neither see, nor hear, nor walk. Neither repented they of their murders, nor of their sorceries, ($\phi\alpha\rho\mu\alpha\kappa\epsilon\iota\omega\nu$,) nor of their fornication, nor of their thefts."

I shall fully support the explanation and application of the word *dæmons*, made in the text above, when we come to the consideration of the passage here quoted.

³ In an expedition of the Romans into Persia, A.D. 589, a *miraculous* image of Christ, one said to be made by higher hands than of man, was carried before the army. Gibbon, viii. 180, observes that this was the first example of what were afterwards common, the $\alpha\chi\epsilon\rho\omicron\pi\omicron\iota\gamma\tau\omicron\iota$ Christian *images*; "I had almost said," Gib-

and miracles ; and there were the *fornications*, and priestly religious *thefts*.—And must not all these have seemed to an enlightened Christian to cry to Heaven for judgment ?—Of the causes of coming *woe* against Jerusalem specified by the ancient prophets, and of those afterwards similarly specified by Christ and his apostles, how few were there but now applied to corrupted Christendom !¹ Specially it was for its rejection, its determined rejection, of his own blessed gospel dispensation long offered it, that the Lord Jesus had finally denounced woe against *Jerusalem*:—a denunciation, of which that maniac prophet's cry, which Josephus describes to us, of "Woe, Woe, Woe, to the city and the temple,"² was but the echo. And if woe was then boded against *Jerusalem*, how not, at this fearful crisis of its apostasy, against *Roman Christendom* also ? Surely the very air must have seemed vocal to each thoughtful Christian, into which ascended the incense of its Christ-denying worship and blasphemies. To the *West* indeed, if his suspicion were right respecting *Antichrist*, a *temporary* freedom from the woe might be probably presumed in order to admit of Antichrist's development, in fulfilment of the Scripture prophecy. Yet, sooner or later, the woe must be expected to embrace it also. So that the forewarning cry, not unlike that of the Apocalyptic angel in mid-heaven, might seem to him to embrace within it all that remained of the 'Trumpet-judgments ; and in triple boding-cry, to proclaim

bon adds, "*idols*."—In these cases the *sorceries* and the *idols* were combined in one ; and the *anceylia* of Rome Pagan outdone in Rome Christian.

¹ Take for example the following from the Old Testament. Isa. v. 20 ; "Woe to them that call evil good, and good evil, that put darkness for light, and light for darkness," &c. : Isa. xxx. 1 ; "Woe to the rebellious children that take counsel, but not of me ; and cover with a covering, but not of my spirit ; that they may add sin to sin : " Jer. xxiii. 1 ; "Woe be unto the pastors that destroy and scatter the sheep of my pasture, saith the Lord : " Ezek. xiii. 3 ; "Woe unto the foolish prophets that follow their own spirit, and have seen nothing : " Hos. vii. 13 ; "Woe unto them ; for they have fled from me : . . . though I have redeemed them, yet they have spoken lies against me : " Hab. ii. 19 ; "Woe unto him that saith to the wood, Awake ! to the dumb stone, Arise, it shall teach ! Behold, it is laid over with gold and silver, and there is no breath at all in the midst of it."—And from the New Testament : Matt. xxiii. 13 ; "Woe unto you, scribes and pharisees, hypocrites ; for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men ; ye neither go in yourselves, nor suffer them that are entering to go in : Woe unto you, hypocrites ; for ye devour widows' houses," &c. Jude 11 ; "Woe unto them ! for they have gone in the way of Cain, and run greedily after the error of Balaam for reward."

² Josephus, De Bell. Jud. vi. 5. 3.

Woe, Woe, Woe, against *all* the inhabitants of the *apostate* Roman earth! ¹

CHAPTER V.

THE FIFTH OR FIRST WOE TRUMPET.

“AND the fifth angel sounded: and I saw a star that had fallen² from heaven to the earth: and to him was given the key of the bottomless pit. And he opened the bottomless pit. And there arose a smoke out of the pit, as the smoke of a great furnace: and the sun and the air were darkened by reason of the smoke of the pit.

“And there came out of the smoke locusts upon the earth. And unto them was given power as the scorpions of the earth have power. And it was commanded them that they should not hurt the grass of the earth, neither any green thing, neither any tree; but only those men which have not the seal of God on their foreheads. And unto them it was given that they should not kill the men, but that they should be tormented five months: and their torment was as the torment of a scorpion when he striketh a man. And in those days shall men seek death, and shall not find it; and shall desire to die, and death shall flee from them. And the likenesses³ of the locusts were like unto horses prepared for war: and on their heads were, as it were, crowns like gold.⁴ And their faces were as the faces of men: and they had hair as the hair of women; and their teeth were as the teeth of lions. And they had breast-plates, as it were breast-plates of iron; and the sound of their wings was as the sound of chariots of many horses

¹ Jerome (Ad Dardanum) observes on this expression as one always used in a bad sense in the Apocalypse: “Ubi¹que *habitor terræ* legitur, et priora, et media, et extrema tractemus, et liquido scripturarum poterit regula comprobari, semper habitatores terræ peccatores appellari: de quibus in Apocalypsi Johannis illud exemplum est, *Væ habitatoribus terræ!*” So also Ambrose Ansbertus.—How this sense arises out of the figurative character of the Apocalyptic scenery, has been already noticed in the Introduction; pp. 95, 96. Compare the expression, “Them that dwell in heaven,” used of the saints, Apoc. xiii. 6.

² πεπτωκοτα.

³ ὁμοιωματα translated *shapes* in our English version.

⁴ ὡς στεφανοι ὁμοιοι χρυσοφ. So Tregelles and Hahn; as also the received text. Griesbach and Scholz prefer χρυσοῖ.

running to battle. And they have tails like unto scorpions, and there were stings in their tails:¹ and their power was to hurt men five months. And they have a king over them, the angel of the bottomless pit: whose name in the Hebrew tongue is Abaddon; and in the Greek tongue he hath his name Apollyon.”—Apoc. ix. 1—11.

THE interval of fore-warning depicted in the last vision had passed away; and the trumpet, sounding again in the Apocalyptic temple, gave sign to the apostle of judgment as afresh in action, and of the first of the three threatened woes as about to begin.—We do not find any particular division of the Roman earth and its inhabitants marked out *expressly* in this vision, either for infliction or exemption. But, from the comparison of a statement made in it with an apparently contrasted statement in the vision following, the former in verse 5 of the chapter before us, the latter in verse 15,²—it might have been afterwards probably inferred that the same third that was to be destroyed under the *sixth* Trumpet, i. e. the *third of the Empire nearest the Euphrates, or Eastern third*, was under *this* to be a *principal*, though not the only, sufferer.—Hitherto this division had nearly escaped. Under the first and third trumpet, though the European provinces of the Greek empire had suffered, yet neither by Alaric nor Attila had Constantinople been violated,³ or the war carried across the Hellespont. Again, though all open and exposed by sea to Genseric, when master of the Mediterranean under the second Trumpet, yet the Eastern coasts had scarcely been visited by him. “The fury of the Vandals was confined to the limits of the Western empire.”⁴ The same exemption

¹ So Griesbach and Hahn, as well as the received text; *Και εχουσιν ουρας ὁμοιας σκορπιοις, και κεντρα ην εν ταις ουραις αυτων και η εξουσια αυτων αδικησαι κ. τ. λ.* Tregelles reads: . . . *σκορπιοις, και κεντρα και εν ταις ουραις αυτων η εξουσια αυτων αδικησαι.* And so too Scholz, only with *τε* before *αδικησαι*. Thus there is for both readings perhaps equally good MS. authority. I have here followed the former; but shall again revert to the latter.

² Verse 5; “And to them (the locusts) it was given that they should *not kill* the men, but that they should be *tormented* five months.” Verse 15; “The four angels that had been bound by the Euphrates were loosed, which were prepared . . . to *kill* the third part of men.”

³ It will be remembered that Constantinople and the Thracian district adjoining were parts of the Eastern third. See pp. 361, 363 *suprà*.

⁴ Gibbon vi. 189.

continued afterwards. The extinction of the imperial sun in Italy and the West was an event by which the tranquillity of Constantinople and the East was little affected. Through the 50 years that succeeded,—including the reigns of Zeno, Anastasius, and Justin,—the silence of its annals evinces the general freedom of the Greek empire from external war and suffering. In Justinian's reign it even put on the aggressive; and, both in Africa and in Italy, under Belisarius, and then under Narses, was crowned with success specious and surprising. It is true that the desolating irruptions made into the Illyrian provinces by the Bulgarians about the middle of the sixth century, and by the Avars at its close, were ominous of the reverses that might be. But into the Asiatic third proper, comprehending Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt, they reached not. The Hellespont was still to that division its guarantee Northward; and, towards the East and the Euphrates, the 100 years' peace with Persia, which had been concluded in 444 A.D. by the second Theodosius, and renewed after a year or two of war,¹ A.D. 551, by Justinian.—But now at length its hour was come to be judged. For of its time of reprieve it had made no profit. Throughout the two centuries reviewed in the last chapter, its religion, as there indeed set forth, had, like that of the West, been sinking deeper and deeper into superstition. In the history of its theological controversies and synods,² which constitute perhaps the most characteristic feature in the Greek ecclesias-

¹ A war of longer continuance branched off into Colchis and Armenia; but with this the Greek provinces in Asia had no concern.

² The chief Councils in this period were that of *Ephesus*, A.D. 431, against Nestorius, in which it was concluded that there attached to Jesus Christ but *one person*; and that of *Chalcedon*, A.D. 451, against Eutyches, in which it was concluded that there attached to Christ *two natures*. These were the third and fourth General Councils.—The decisions of these, and of the two General Councils of Nice and Constantinople preceding, respecting Christ's nature, were said to be briefly comprehended in four Greek words; viz. that Christ is God and man, *αληθως, τελειως, αδιαιρετως, ασυγχυτως*.* After the 5th and 6th Councils the definition was; *εν δυο φυσεσιν, ασυγχυτως, ατρεπτως, αχωριτως, αδιαιρετως*. Gieseler i. 369. § 126.

* So the Athanasian Creed. "The right faith is that our Lord Jesus Christ is God and man; . . . perfect God and perfect man : . . . equal to the Father as touching his Godhead : . . . who, although he be God and man, yet he is not two, but one Christ : one altogether; not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person." Hence the proof of the Creed being one of at least a century later than Athanasius : as I have stated in the foot-note on p. 274 *suprà*.

tical annals of the period thus retrospectively glanced at, we seek in vain for the Christian spirit. Rather, even when most zealous and agitated for the letter of Christian orthodoxy, a spirit verging towards antichristian apostasy may be discerned as that which most deeply moved the people.¹ And therefore judgment must visit them. The first bitterness of the first woe must fall on the Eastern third of the Roman world.

But what the scourge, and whence? Was it from the Avars, now established, as we have seen, on the lower Danube? Or, from the Persians, ready at any time apparently to break in from the Euphrates upon the Eastern provinces? There were in fact irruptions, as the new century opened, by the Avars.² And there was a succession of invasions, from 611 to 621 A.D.,³ very desolating and terrible, by the Persians under Chosroes. But the former were transient; and confined, as before, to the European limits. And on Chosroes the tide of war and victory was, after those ten years, fearfully rolled back by Heraclius: indeed, ere a very few more suns had accomplished their annual revolution, the Persian empire was swept away from the earth.⁴ But this was by another instrumentality;—the same that was destined, as here foreshown, to scourge the Greek empire also.—And what and whence then, I repeat, that avenging scourge? The annals of the seventh century declare it to us in characters so glaring and terrific that he who runs may read them. And, if I mistake not, it was indicated to the Evangelist also, in a manner scarcely

¹ It was Nestorius' assertion that the Virgin Mary ought not to be entitled Θεοτοκος, *Mother of God*, but rather Χριστοτοκος, *Mother of Christ*, which first inflamed the passions of the priests and populace at Constantinople, and throughout Egypt and Asia Minor:—i. e. zeal for the *Virgin*, who was already the object of their worship, not for *Christ*. Of the feeling at Ephesus, where the Council was held, Dean Waddington says: "Popular tradition had buried her in that city; and the imperfect Christianity of its inhabitants had readily transferred to her the worship which their ancestors offered to Diana." E. H. i. 349. ² Gibb. viii. 194, 200.

³ In the four or five years preceding, which included the reign of Phocas, the Persians had been engaged chiefly in reducing the Roman fortresses on the other side the Euphrates; and so, thus far, had not carried their invasions within the more proper limits of the empire.

⁴ It was about the year 616 A.D. that Chosroes, like a second Sennacherib, when Heraclius earnestly supplicated for peace, returned the blasphemous answer: "I will never give peace to the Roman emperor, till he has abjured his crucified God, and embraced the worship of the sun." (Gibbon viii. 230.) It was in 621 that the tide of success was for ever turned against him: and in 636, after he had himself miserably perished, that the Persian monarchy was annihilated by the Saracens.

less intelligible, by means of the symbols, *the locally characteristic symbols*, of the prefigurative vision.—But this is a species of evidence, and involves a principle of interpretation, which it may be well to set forth in a distinct preliminary Section.

§ 1.—THE LOCAL APPROPRIATENESS OF SCRIPTURE SYMBOLS.

Let me then remind the Reader,—and I think it may be well worth his while to pause for a few moments on the topic, ere proceeding to examine the imagery of the vision before us,—that the symbols and hieroglyphics of Scripture prophecy are not of that locally indefinite character, for the most part, as simply to indicate characteristic qualities; without reference in the selection to what we may call *geographical propriety*. Many images there are indeed, and these too useful and striking to be left out of the language of symbolic prophecy, that belong alike to every country; such as (to borrow examples from Apocalyptic visions already analyzed) those of the luminaries of the heaven above, and the tempests and the convulsions of the earth beneath.¹ On the other hand, as there are many varieties,—whether we regard its plants and animals, or the dress, visible customs, or assumed insignia of the inhabitants,—by which, in the wise appointment of the world's great Creator and Governor, one country under heaven is in a measure distinguished from others, so, where these characteristic objects afford suitable emblems of the things to be signified of a people, it is the frequent habit of Scripture to select them for its purpose. The beauty of this local appropriateness of the Scripture imagery, wheresoever the locality may have been stated, must doubtless have often struck the tasteful and observant reader. Again

¹ Yet even to them, as we have seen in my chapters on the four first Trumpets, a local appropriateness may be attached:—in the one case by the intimation of some peculiar division of the heavenly luminaries; in the other by a statement of the quarter of the compass from which in any particular case the tempest might blow. The latter either directly, as where the wind is called the East wind; or indirectly, as where the tempest is spoken of as one bringing hail, and so from the North. See pp. 356, 357, 367—371.

where it is unnamed, as in the unexplained prophecies,—and it is to this point that I here wish to call the reader's attention,—the mind may reason on the imagery; and, with no slight measure of confidence often, argue from the symbol to the country symbolized. We might almost do this when glancing at the graphic comparisons that are sometimes used by uninspired writers;—writers such as are both intimate with the countries spoken of, and select in their choice of figures.¹ But the habit of Holy Scripture to make use of locally appropriate imagery is much more marked than that of any uninspired writer. Moreover that which I am here proposing to argue from meets us in the form of symbolic impersonation, not of mere comparison. Hence the force of the inference is in its case greater in proportion.

In order to judge of the strength of the argument thence arising, it seems necessary that the reader should satisfy

¹ I may first exemplify from the earliest of the classic poets, *Homer*. A student need but visit the Troad, as the author himself can testify, to be struck with delight at the perpetual realization before his eyes of one and another of Homer's similes, on the self-same living scene. The following may serve as specimens;—specimens alike from the natural scenery, the zoology, and the works of man.

- B. 456. *Ἡύτε πυρ αἰδηλον ἐπιφλεγει ἀσπετον ὕλην
Ουρεος ἐν κορυφῆς, ἕκαθεν δ' ἔτε φαίνεται ἀυγῆ'*
E. 87. . . . ποταμῶ πληθοντι εοικως
*Χειμαρρῶ, ὅστ' ὡκα ῥέων ἐκεῖδασσε γεφυρας, . .
Ἐλθοντ' ἐξαπινης, ὅτ' ἐπιβριση Διος ὀμβρος'*
Γ. 3. *Ἡύτε περ κλαγγη γερανων πελει θρανοθι προ, . . .*
Ib. 151. . . . τεττιγεσσι εοικοτες, οἶτε καθ' ὕλην
Δενδρεῶ ἐφεζομενοι ὅπα λειριεσσαν ἱεῖσι'
E. 499. *Ὡς δ' ἀνεμος ἀχνας φορεει ἱερας καθ' ἄλωας,
Ἀνδρῶν λικμωντων, ὅτε τε ξανθη Δημητηρ
Κρινη, ἐπειγομενων ἀνεμων, καρπον τε και ἀχνας,
Αἰ δ' ὑπολευκαινονται ἀχυρμιαι.*

Among *modern* Poets, illustrations may be found innumerable. For example, when *Goldsmith* draws his comparison from

. . . those domes where Cæsars once bore sway,
Defaced by time, and tottering in decay,

it is of the Italians, and especially the Romans, as we might expect, that he is speaking.—Again in the comparison,

Dull as their lakes that slumber in the storm,

it is of the inhabitants of Holland.—I need but to name *Walter Scott's* *Lady of the Lake*, *Moore's* *Lalla Rookh*, &c., to suggest to the reader's own memory multitudinous other examples.

Even among historians, whose mind and style partakes of the graphic and picturesque, an observance of the same rule of propriety is often to be marked. So, for example, in *Gibbon*. When speaking in his *History* (ix. 312) of ambassadors kneeling before Mahomet's throne in Medina, he says they were "as numerous, according to the Arabian proverb, as the dates that fall from the maturity of a palm-tree;"—an Arabian simile for an Arabian subject.

himself as to the strength of this Scripture habit, if I may so call it. I shall therefore beg him, in the present Section, just to cast his eye with me over some of its symbols; and to observe how strikingly, whether the figure be borrowed from the botanical world or the zoological, or from the appearance, dress, or other visible characteristics of the inhabitants of a country, the local appropriateness that I speak of still marks the selection. He will find that the symbolic pictures are indeed for the most part pictures drawn from life.

1st, let us notice examples of emblems from *plants*.

Is it then *Judah* that is to be symbolized? We find the *olive*, the *fig-tree*, and the *vine*, selected to symbolize it:¹—*fruit-trees*, because the point and moral of the comparison had reference to its religious culture by God, and consequently expected fruitfulness; but all fruit-trees of the country: and of these the vine most frequently, as being of all others, perhaps, the most characteristic of its mountain-produce; indeed, as such, particularized in Judah's blessing by Jacob.² And, as of Israel nationally, so of particular classes in it. Of its princes and high ones, the *cedar of Lebanon*, the loftiest of the trees of Israel, is the frequent symbol: the beauty of its holy ones is resembled to the *palm*, perhaps the stateliest fruit-tree in the land;³ and the people, when withering under God's dis-

¹ The *olive*, Jer. xi. 16; "The Lord called thy name a green olive-tree, fair and of goodly fruit." Again Rom. xi. 17; "If some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive-tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive-tree;" &c. Also Isa. xvii. 6, xxiv. 13, &c.—The *fig*. In Matt. xxi. 19 the fig-tree described as cursed by Christ, is allowed by all commentators, I believe, to be a symbol of the Jewish barren and, at length, accursed nation. So too Joel i. 7; "He hath barked my fig-tree:" and Hosea ix. 10; &c.—The *vine*. Psalm lxxx. 8; "Thou hast brought a vine out of Egypt; thou hast cast out the heathen and planted it." &c. Isaiah v. 7; "The vineyard of the Lord of Hosts is the house of Israel, and the men of Judah his pleasant plant." Also Jer. ii. 21; Ezek. xv. 2; Hosea x. 1; Matt. xxi. 33, &c. &c.—In Abimelech's Parable, Judges ix. 8, &c., we have the three, the olive, the fig-tree, and the vine, united.

² Gen. xlix. 11; "Binding his foal to the vine, and his ass's colt to the choice vine."

³ So Ezek. xvii. 3, 22, quoted in the next paragraph; Zech. xi. 2; 2 Kings xiv. 9, &c.—In one passage, viz. Ezek. xxxi. 3, a foreign king, the Assyrian, is also likened to a cedar in Lebanon: perhaps in the enlarged use of the figure as *any* high cedar; perhaps from the Assyrian having, in the height of his power, possessed himself, for a while, of Lebanon. So he boasts, Isaiah xxxvii. 24.—In some examples the cedar and palm are united. So in Psalm xcii. 12; "The righteous shall flourish as a *palm-tree*: he shall spread abroad as a *cedar of Lebanon*."

pleasure for sin, to the dried up *grass upon the housetops*.¹—The same is the case in respect of other countries. So when *Egypt* is the subject, and the particular point to be illustrated its weak and faithless friendship to the Jews trusting in it, the *reed* is the symbol chosen ;² that characteristic produce of the Nile banks. Or when a *Babylonish* dependency, then the *willow* ;—that of which Zion's captives told as growing by the rivers of Babylon. “A great eagle came unto Lebanon, and took the highest branch of the *cedar*. He cropped off the top of his young twigs, and carried it into a land of traffic. He took also of the seed of the land, and planted it in a fruitful field : he placed it by great waters, and set it as a *willow-tree*. And it grew, and became a spreading *vine* of low stature.”³ It was Jehoiakim, king of Judah, that was the top-most branch of the *cedar*. It was Nebuchadnezzar that was the eagle that cropped it, and carried it to Babylon. It was Zedekiah that was the seed of the land, and consequently a *vine* in the prophetic imagery : but one of low stature, and planted as a *willow-tree* ; i. e. as a prince dependent on, and to be supported by, the king of Babylon.

2. Next let us turn to emblems from *animals*.

It is less often that *Judah* is so symbolized. For its relation to *God* is that which is most constantly and prominently dwelt on in what is said of Judah : and thus the illustrative emblems required, are in character such rather as those already noticed ; or perhaps that of a *city dedicated*, or a *virgin affianced* to Him ;⁴ not of a wild animal. Still there occurs at times occasion for the *animal* symbolization ; and then the zoology of Judah furnishes the emblem. Thus is it Judah *conquering* ? The figure is that of the *lion*, such as might rise up from the swelling of Jordan : “Judah couched as a lion : who shall rouse him up ?” Or

¹ 2 Kings xix. 26, Isa. xxxvii. 27. The Israelites of Samaria were among those to whom this comparison applied. See 2 Kings xviii. 34.

² 2 Kings xviii. 21 ; Isa. xxxvi. 6 ; “Dost thou trust upon the staff of this bruised *reed* ? Also Ezek. xxix. 6 ; “They have been a staff of *reed* to Israel.” Compare Isa. xix. 6 ; Exod. ii. 3.

³ Ezek. xvii. 3, &c.—Compare, on the *willow*, Psalm cxxxvii. 1, 2.

⁴ In the Apocalypse the Church too,—as we have partly seen already, (p. 102,) and shall see more as we proceed,—is figured in both of these emblematic characters.

Judah foolishly snared by her foes? It is that of the *dove*, so common in the land; (as that bird's constant use in the Jewish sacrifices assures us;) "Ephraim is a silly dove." Is it Judah *apostatizing*? Then, it may be, the *dromedary* is the figure; impatient of the holy city, and bent on regaining the wilderness of its preference.¹ Or Judah, or her sons, *in sorrow and desolation*? "Like a *crane*, or a *swallow*, so did I chatter:" "I am like a *pelican* in the wilderness, like an *owl* in the desert."²—Of *other* nations the animal class of symbols is frequent.³ And see the suitability. The symbol of *Edom* was that of the *eagle* that might have built his *eyrie* in the mountain-rock; the very image,—as he that has seen pictures of Petra, or other Idumean cities, must be aware,—of the high rocky excavations that they inhabited.⁴ The *wild ass* of the desert is the not less characteristic symbol of the *Arabs*; "Ishmael is a man, a *wild ass*:"⁵ and the *crocodile*, the dragon of the Nile, that of *Egypt*.⁶—Nor, passing to Daniel's animal-symbols, do we find anything inconsistent with the usual Scriptural rule of local appropriateness in the selection. In the case of the four wild beasts emblematic, according to the all but universal consent of commentators ancient and

¹ The *lion*, Gen. xlix. 9; Isa. xxix. 1, margin, &c. The *dromedary*, Jer. ii. 23. The *dove*, Hosea vii. 11:—the commonness of which bird in Judæa is illustrated by its frequent use in the temple sacrifices; so Luke ii. 24, Matt. xxi. 12, &c.

² Is. xxxviii. 14; Ps. cii. 6. The writer of the Psalm seems here to impersonate the Jewish nation.

³ Compare Peter's vision, Acts x. 12; in which the animals in the sheet let down from heaven are expressly indicated to have typified heathens.

⁴ Jer. xlix. 16; "O thou that dwellest in the clefts of the rock, that holdest the height of the hill, though thou shouldest make thy nest as high as the eagle, yet I will bring thee down from thence, saith the Lord."—So Numbers xxiv. 21, of the *Kenite*, and Jer. xlviii. 28, of *Moab*.—Sketches, such as I allude to, may be seen in Laborde, in Finden's Scripture Illustrations, or Keith's Fulfilment of Prophecy.

⁵ Gen. xvi. 12; פָּרָיִם אֲרָמִים. The former word is the wild ass in Job xxxix. 5.

⁶ Ezek. xxix. 3; "I am against thee, Pharaoh, king of Egypt; the great dragon (crocodile) that lieth in the midst of his rivers," &c. On which see Scheuchzer. So also Psalm lxxiv. 13, and Isa. li. 9. Bochart asserts that *Pharaoh* means *crocodile* in Arabic, which language has many Egyptian words in it; and he blames Josephus for saying it meant *king*. (See Calmet on *Pharaoh*.)—The crocodile was stamped, I may add, upon Roman coins, on the conquest of Egypt, as its fittest symbol.

Elsewhere Egypt is symbolized as a *heifer*, Jer. xlvi. 20, 21; with reference apparently to the worship of the bull Apis. Or, Is. vii. 18, as the *gad-fly*, too well known in Upper Egypt and Abyssinia. About which see the Note in the Pictorial Bible on the *hornet* mentioned Josh. xxiv. 12. (Qu. Livingstone's *tsetse*?)

It is observable that Diodorus Siculus notices the habit of the Egyptian kings to wear about the head, ταυρων και δρακοντων προτομας, σημεια της αρχης. Biblioth. i. p. 39. Cited in Note to Amm. Marcell. xix. 1.

modern, of the four successive heathen and persecuting powers of Babylon, Persia, Greece, Rome, there is indeed less of distinctiveness; in consequence of the wide range, over many countries, of such savage animals as might fitly represent the persecutors of God's people. Yet still the *lion* was a native of Babylonia; the *bear* of the Median mountains; and the *leopard*,—as we may infer from hints in the old notices of the neighbouring countries,—of the forests of Pindus and Macedon.¹ Besides that the *winged lion* has been found by Capt. Layard, as almost a self-appropriated Assyrian emblem, in majestic sculpture at the gates of the royal palace of Nineveh.² Again, in another of Daniel's visions, (that in chap. viii,) the nature of the comparison allowing it, we find selected as the symbols animals directly characteristic, in the same manner as the last noted, of the powers symbolized; that is, of Persia and Macedon respectively. For the symbols are those adopted by the nations themselves, as in a manner their own appropriate emblems, and stamped as such, by the one and the other, on their respective coinage;—I mean the *ram* in symbolization of Persia, the *goat* of Macedon.³ Of which two

¹ So Jer. i. 17, notices the *lion* as of *Babylon*. Xenophon, in his *Cyropædia* i. 4. 7, notices the *bear* as one of the wild animals of the *Median* mountains. And as both Pindar (*Pyth.* iv. 143) speaks of the *leopard-skin* as worn by his Thessalian heroes, at the foot of Mounts Olympus, Ossa, and Pelion, and Homer (*Il.* i. 17, &c.) of *his*, at the foot of the Trojau Mount Ida, we cannot doubt but that the *leopard* existed in the earlier days of Greece in the forests and mountains of Macedon.

Let me suggest further, whether, as the *lynx* is of the *leopard* genus, and as the names of the region *Lyncæstis*, the town *Lyncus*, and the river *Lyncæstius*, (all appurtenances of Macedonia,) may not improbably have been derived from some legend connected with the lynxes of the country, (see Ovid, *Metam.* v. ad fin. "Lyncum . . . lynca Ceres fecit,") the leopard may not have been chosen partly on this account as the representative of Macedon?—*Ευθεις ως παρδαλις εκειθεν ορμησας ο Αλεξανδρος*, says John Malala of Alexander; adopting Daniel's emblem. Ap. Dautz, p. 561.

Three of Daniel's destroying beasts, and perhaps the fourth also, are particularized in Hosea xiii. 7; "I will be to them as a *lion*: as a *leopard* by the way will I observe them: I will meet them as a *bear* bereaved of her whelps: . . the *wild beast* shall tear them."

² See the Plate in Layard's *Nineveh*.—Dr. Keith, in his "Signs of the Times," i. 15, (3rd Ed.) spoke of the "four-winged leopard as the identical emblem engraved on the shield of Alexander." But, in reply to my inquiries, he informed me that he had been unable to find any authority for the statement; though believing (I fear erroneously) that the authority exists. He proposed to cancel the statement in subsequent editions. [I see in the 8th Ed. i. 17, it has been cancelled.]

³ Engravings are given in a later part of this work, (Part v. Ch. vii.,) on Dan. viii. from Calmet; Taylor's Edition, Vol. v. The *ram* is stated to be from the Hunter Collection. Mionnet gives a copy of the *goat*, also; which is not uncommon. The symbol continued in use under the Sassanides. Ammianus Marcellinus notices it as

emblems one at least, and perhaps both, may further have had allusion to a current name of the country or nation.¹

The examples last given being those of symbols not otherwise locally characteristic only, but *self-applied* as characteristic by the inhabitants of the countries symbolized, I might naturally proceed, were it the occasion, to notice other self-adopted national emblems,—whether derived from animals or other objects,² and whether designative of the people themselves collectively, or of certain ranks or offices of note among them,—which have been likewise, with its usual beautiful appropriateness, adopted and applied by sacred Scripture. Such, for example, are those striking symbolizations, (and more striking, I think, there could not be,) that have occurred to our notice under the three first Seals of this Apocalyptic prophecy. And indeed I wish, by this passing retrospective notice of them, to connect the emblematic imagery of the parts already discussed of the Apocalypse, as well as that of those which remain, with this general view of the local fitness of Scripture emblems, and of the argument from it. But my present more immediate object is to prepare the reader for a right appreciation of the symbols of the fifth Trumpet. And I shall therefore hasten on to suggest just one other class of symbols, locally

a part of the insignia of King Sapor : (xix. 1 :) “Aureum capitis arietini figmentum, interstinctum lapillis, pro diademate gestans.”

¹ The name of the capital of Macedon *Ægæ*, of its people *Ægeadæ*, and perhaps too of its sea the *Ægean* or *Goat-sea*, arose out of the tradition that Caranus, the first king of Macedon, was directed, according to an oracle, by a flock of *goats* to its site. With reference to which same circumstance Alexander's son by Roxana was called *Ægus*, *son of a goat*.

As to *Persia*, or *Elam*, its scriptural name, Mede notices the affinity between the word אֵיִל, *a ram*, and פֶּרְסִיָּה, *Persia*.—It is observed by Heeren in his *Manual of Ancient History*, Book i., that all the great empires of Asia seem to have been founded either by mountaineers, or nomad tribes, which invaded and overran the more wealthy regions. Such, he says, was the origin, among others, of the Persian empire, the Parthians, &c. If so, the *ram* was a natural emblem of the Persians, as *nomads*.

On the allusion in popular symbols to popular names, see Eckhel's chapter (iv. 341) headed “De adlusione ad urbis populivæ nomen.” In which chapter he exemplifies in the towns of *Ægæ*, *Cardia*, *Leontini*, *Melos*, *Rhodes*, *Selinus*, &c. : of which the appropriated symbols were severally a *goat*, a *heart*, a *lion*, an *apple*, a *rose*, a sprig of *parsley*, &c. So again in his Vol. v. p. 90.—On the *paronomasia* in Holy Scripture, see p. 433, Note ⁹ *infra*.

² Such as the *eagle*, the well-known Roman ensign, which is used to symbolize the Roman power, Matt. xxiv. 28, Luke xvii. 37, and Apoc. xii. 14;—a *ship*, the emblem that we still see on the Tyrian coins; and which is perhaps meant to symbolize Tyre, Ezek. xxvii. 26.

significant, that are more directly illustrative of the vision I am referring to; I mean the class of the *prosopopœia*.

3. In the which class the symbolic figure exhibited being in the *human* form, occasion is taken to notice distinctive points in the *personal appearance*,—whether in respect of *dress, armour*, or otherwise,—*of the people symbolized*.

Take, as a *first* example, that beautiful personification of Judah given in Ezek. xvi, as a woman-child saved at the birth, and brought up through childhood and youth by her God, then affianced to Him, but soon faithless and apostatizing. Here, in the dressing up of the *prosopopœia*, there are certain details of personal appearance naturally brought into the description;—the woman-like growth of hair, the anointing with oil, the white and brodered apparel, the jewels, and other personal ornaments: and commentators, not without probable reason, as it seems to me, have assigned an *emblematic* meaning to them, as significant of the spiritual privileges and graces conferred by God on Israel.¹ However this may be, and whether they were intended to be emblematic themselves, or merely appendages to the general emblematic picture, in one thing we cannot be mistaken, viz. that these characteristics of appearance and dress in the female personified, were drawn from the appearance and dress of the noble ladies of Israel:—that is, that the details of personal appearance portrayed in the hieroglyphic were those of a portraiture drawn from life.

A *second* example, and one precisely of the same character, will be found in Ezek. xxiii: but with this addition that, besides the female personifications of Judah and Israel, the neighbouring heathen with whose idolatries they associated,—both the Assyrians and others,—are here also in a manner symbolized; viz. as their lovers. The descrip-

¹ The spiritual application of such figures is beautifully intimated in Psalm xlv. 13; "The king's daughter is all glorious within." Compare also what is said in 1 Pet. iii. 3 of the spiritual adorning of the Christian female; and in Rev. xix. 8, of the meaning of the white robes of the saints.—In the passage from Ezekiel, though the articles of dress and ornament may all be shown to have been worn by Israelitish ladies, and the anointing with oil, &c. &c. to have been customs familiar to them, yet there is, in regard of much that is said, such an applicability to the tabernacle, its priesthood, and its services, that the Targum, I think, understands the whole as having reference to them.

tion paints them as cavaliers, all goodly young men, girded with girdles, and with turbans of dyed attire, or it might be crowns, on their heads:¹ a description that must be noticed afterwards, as containing in it points of resemblance very striking to certain of the details in the imagery of the fifth Trumpet.—But there is no need at present of further dwelling on this example, as it is so similar to the former. I therefore proceed to,

A *third* example, different from the other, and indeed somewhat peculiar in character; but which may yet partially, if I mistake not, be connected with the class I speak of: I mean that of the *symbolic image* of gold, silver, brass, and iron, seen in vision by Nebuchadnezzar.

In this there were figured to himself, and to the prophet Daniel, those four kingdoms which, rising round Judah as a centre, and all connected with it, were in succession, and each in *image-form*, (i. e. as associated with and supporting *idolatry*,)² to hold the empire of the civilized world, until the establishment at the last of God's own kingdom. It has been the all but universal opinion of commentators, both ancient and modern, that the four kingdoms thus pre-figured (the same as those figured by the four wild beasts of Dan. vii, previously spoken of,) were the Babylonian, Persian, Greek, and Roman. And with reason. For the succession of these four great empires is a plain historical fact, recognised by the most learned heathen writers, as

¹ See verses 15, 42. In the latter verse the *Sabeans from the wilderness* are mentioned among Aholibah's lovers, "which put bracelets on their hands, and beautiful crowns on their heads." It is a question among expositors whether this was on their own heads and hands, or on those of Aholah and Aholibah. But the context seems clearly to favour the former meaning: because one only of the two women is mentioned either in this verse or the two verses preceding; and thus the plural pronouns seem scarcely explicable, but of the Sabeans. This conclusion is confirmed by the mention of the head-covering of Aholibah's lovers in verse 15.

² This explanation of the meaning of the *image-form* is, I think, the correct one; and not, as Lowth, Newton, and others explain it, that it was a mere form of splendor; the result, in this dream, of Nebuchadnezzar's own view of the glory of mighty empires. Thus the hieroglyphic of *this* vision will well harmonize with that of the *four wild beasts*, under which the same four empires were afterwards figured to Daniel. In the one was figured *idolatry* invested with power; in the other its *persecuting spirit* against God's saints.—The fact that idolatry should be thus associated with, and upheld by, the whole succession of dominant powers in the world, even to the consummation, was a fact most singular to predict, but which has yet been fulfilled. In Apoc. xiii the manner in which idolatry was to be associated with the *last* form of Nebuchadnezzar's image, I mean when in its ten toes, is expressly and wonderfully illustrated. See my Chapter on the Image of the Beast.

well as Christian.¹ And the suitability of the component metals of the image to symbolize them, in regard at least of the golden splendour of the first and the iron strength of the last, is obvious, and partially confessed even by Gibbon.²—Besides which illustration from *qualities*, it has been further and appositely observed by expositors, that there was in one case a *visible* resemblance between the nation symbolized and the symbolizing metal; inasmuch as the very appearance of the warrior *Greek* was characterized by his *brazen* armour.³ Now the same kind of illustration, it appears to me, might be carried further. In comparison of the appearance of the Greek (or indeed of the Roman) battalia, the splendid adornment of the Persian with silver or with gold (the Babylonians having at this time been absorbed and included in the Persian empire) was very characteristic, and often observed on. It was noted on

¹ Of the *heathens* I may mention, 1. *Dionysius of Halicarnassus*; who (Antiq. Rom. i. 2), expressly including the Seleucidæ and Ptolemies in the Macedonian dynasty, as mere branches of it, speaks of the *Perso-Median* empire as followed by the *Macedonian*, the Macedonian by the *Roman*: 2. *Tacitus*; (His. v. 8) who prefixes the Assyrian to the *Perso-Median*; “Dum Assyrios penes, Medosque et Persas, oriens fuit;” &c.: 3. *Ptolemy*; who regulates his Canon by this same succession of the four empires.

From the *Fathers* ample quotations have been already given to the same effect: showing especially that they regarded the Roman empire as the fourth of Daniel’s prophecies. Jerome says it was the view of *all* previous ecclesiastical writers.

I believe *Porphyry* was the first to suggest the Seleucidæ as a distinct empire: his object in which was obvious; viz. to escape from the cogency of the Christian argument from prophecy. *Grotius* subsequently adopted the idea. But, with all his learning, Grotius is little to be depended on in explaining prophecy. “In this way of interpretation,” says Bishop Butler of *Porphyry*’s notion, “anything may be made of anything.” Analogy, Ch. on the Evidence of Prophecy, p. 318. (Ed. 1813.)

² “The arms of the Republic . . . advanced with rapid steps to the Euphrates, the Danube, the Rhine, and the ocean: and the images of gold, or silver, or brass, that might serve to represent the nations and their kings, were successively broken by the iron monarchy of Rome.” vi. 407.—Similarly Schlegel, speaking of the Roman empire, Phil. of Hist. i. 337; “It was as if the *iron-footed god of war*, so highly revered by the people of Romulus, actually bestrode the globe.” Again, Lord Byron, speaking of the Roman legions, calls them, “the men of *iron*.” Noted too by Davison on Prophecy, p. 489.

The very name Rome (*ῥωμη*, strength) seems alluded to in the prophecy; “The fourth shall be *strong* as iron.” Such an allusion to name is quite according to Scripture custom: and that this was the origin of the word Rome is suggested by profane authors. So *Solinus* in his *Polyhistor*, and *Festus* in *Roman*. It seems that it was sometimes on this account called by the Latin equivalent, *Valentia*. See Facciolat. Lexic. in *Roma*.

³ So Homer speaks of the *Ἀχαιοὶ χαλκίχιτωνες*, continually.—So Herodotus (ii. 152) of an oracle respecting men of brass, *χαλκιοὶ ἄνδρες*, fulfilled by the landing on the coast of brazen-armed Greeks. From the same circumstance Pakephatus explains the story of *Æolus* surrounding his city with walls of brass: and Strabo (p. 723) relates a legend, that the *Chalcidean* Greeks of Eubœa were so called from having been the first to wear brazen armour. (Ed. 1707.)

occasion of the battle of Plataea, in the grand review by Xerxes, and on the fields of Issus and Arbela;¹ and was but the result and expression of that superiority in wealth, which showed itself also in their general appearance and habits of life. On the other hand in the *Roman* battle-array, *iron*, a metal of later discovered working,² at least for military purposes, was as observable as the gold and silver in the Persico-Assyrian, or the brass in the Grecian. The Mars they worshipped as their father, was not, as with the Greeks, the brazen,³ but the iron-armed Mars.⁴ It was early inculcated on them by their generals, that iron armour, not gold and silver, as with more luxurious nations, was the proper guise of the Roman soldier.⁵ And when, in the progress of their conquests, even Oriental kings had been subjected to Rome, the poet describes it as the subjection of the purple to the Latian iron.⁶—Thus we see a correspondence in the metals of the image with certain characteristics in the *visible appearance* not of *one* only but of *all*, of the respective people.—Nor was the *image-form* in which they were combined an objection to this their *national* distinctiveness: because the idolatry that

¹ So at *Plataea* in Masistius's case; Herod. ix. 22. In *Xerxes' Review* the same historian relates, vii. 83, that the Persian troops, over their other accoutrements, were splendidly adorned with gold: χρυσον πολλον και αφθονον εχοντες ενεπρεπον. At *Issus* Alexander bade his troops behold the "aciem hostium auro purpurâque fulgentem." Curt. iii. 10. The same at *Arbela*; Justin. xi. 13.—I may observe that long after, and when the Sassanidan kingdom of Persia was just about to fall under the Saracens, the same national characteristic was still observable. The golden armour of the Persian general was the prize of his victory to Heraclius. Gibbon, viii. 241.—After Alexander's conquest of Persia the Macedonians imitated the Persians, in this point as in others. Curt. viii. 8.

² This fact seems the groundwork of Hesiod's statement in his *Εργα*, 149, respecting the third or brazen race of men;

Τοις δ' ἦν χαλκεα μὲν τευχεα, χαλκφοι δὲ τε οἰκοί·
χαλκῷ δ' εἰργάζοντο· μέλας δ' οὐκ ἔσκε σιδήρος.

Lucretius asserts the same fact; Lib. v. 1285.

Posterius ferri vis est ærisque reperta:

Et prior æris erat quàm ferri cognitus usus.

So also Pausanias, *Laconia*, iii. 3.

³ Homer, *Il.* v. 704, 859, &c. χαλκεοε Αρης.

⁴ "Mars ferratus," is in Rutil. *Itin.* &c. Statius figures even his palace as of iron; *Theb.* vii. 43.

"Ferrea compago laterum; ferro arcta teruntur

Limina; ferratis incumbunt tecta columnis."

⁵ "Docti a ducibus erant horridum militem esse debere; non cælatum auro et argento, sed ferro et animis fretum." Livy, ix. 40. This was on occasion of the Samnite army appearing in gold and silver armour.

⁶ Lucan, vii. 228; "Atque omnis Latio quæ servit purpura ferro."

these kingdoms successively exhibited and enforced was but as part and parcel of themselves. It was the golden splendour of himself and his empire, that Nebuchadnezzar would have homage done to, in that golden image that was set up in the plain of Dura.¹ The same was the case with Darius, and with the Seleucidæ.² Finally it was Rome's own iron will and power to which the consciences of men were required to bow down, when it allowed of no other worship but that of its own idolatrous state-religion.

And now we shall be better prepared for an intelligent consideration of our present subject. The point of *personal appearance*, observed on in the last example, I mean as regards the metal armour, will not be without its use in illustrating a part of the imagery of the 5th Trumpet. The two previously noted examples under the same head, of direct living impersonations, will yet more illustrate it. And, when with these there is conjoined in the reader's remembrance the class of Scripture *animal* hieroglyphics noted under a former head, he will find himself furnished, I think, with all the parallelisms that he could desire, to help him to a right appreciation of the point and meaning of what I may call the primâ facie *nationally distinctive* symbols of the vision.

§ 2.—THE SYMBOLS OF THE FIFTH TRUMPET ANALYZED
TO SHOW THE ORIGIN OF THE FIRST WOE.

I now proceed, as proposed, to the consideration of the symbols of the fifth Trumpet vision. It was a vision portending woe, as we are told, to the Roman earth and its apostatized inhabitants. And what the woe, and whence, and how originating, was all to be found intimated, if I mistake not, and this not indistinctly, in the figures of the sacred description following.

“The fifth angel sounded: and I saw a star which had fallen³ from the heaven to the earth; and to him was given

¹ “It was designed to represent Nebuchadnezzar himself, or the genius of his empire, according to Jerome, supported by Daniel; ‘Thou art this head of gold.’” Horne's Introduction, vol. iii. Geogr. Index, p. 17.

² Vid. Dan. vi. 7—9, 1 Macc. i. 41—51.

³ ΠΕΠΤΩΚΟΤΑ.


the key of the bottomless pit. And he opened the bottomless pit: and there arose a smoke out of the pit, as the smoke of a great furnace.—And there came out of the pit locusts upon the earth. And unto them was given power, as the scorpions of the earth have power. . . . And the shapes of the locusts were like unto horses prepared for war. And on their heads were, as it were, crowns like gold. And their faces were as the faces of men: and they had hair as the hair of women: and their teeth were as the teeth of lions. And they had breast-plates, as it were breast-plates of iron: and the sound of their wings was as the sound of chariots of many horses running to battle. And they had tails like unto scorpions; and there were stings in their tails.”

The quotation above given includes all the chief *emblems* of the vision: and in them an intimation as to the *origin* of this woe to Christendom,—both as respects the *people* commissioned, their *new and false religion*, their *commission to destroy*, and their *originator and leader*. These I propose to discuss in the *present* Section: reserving for *another* what remains of the prophecy; as it had relation chiefly to the subsequent progress and history of the emblematic locusts.

I. And *first*, as to the *country* and *people* whence it was to originate;—a point this for which the Section preceding will have prepared us. For while, by the admixture of *human* similitudes in the hieroglyphic with the *bestial*, it was shown that *men* were the destined scourge, not literal *wild beasts*, as in some of the ancient prophecies,—there was further indicated, as I feel persuaded, and in the manner illustrated by the examples in that Section, the very country and people intended.

Thus in regard of the *animal* resemblances.—As the ground-work of these, if I may so say, in the hieroglyphic, there appeared the *locust*:—with the following marked peculiarities, however, that it was in look, movement, and sound like the *horse*, in teeth like a *lion*, and in the tail and poison-sting like a *scorpion*. Now the *qualities* of the in-

THE APOCALYPTIC SCORPION-LOCUST.



A Sketch from imagination, illustrative of the possible combination of the details of the Apocalyptic symbol.



vaders thus prefigured were obvious. The *locust*-form indicated their swarming in numbers numberless;¹ their being in their migratory progress rapid, far-ranging, and irresistible; and moreover,—except from some special preventive check, such as in this case the prophecy foretold would be actually given,²—being wide wasters of the herbage and vegetation.³ The *horse-like* appearance seemed to imply that they would be hordes of cavalry; the likeness to the *lion*, that they would be savage destroyers of life; and the *scorpion*-likeness, that of the men in Roman Christendom,⁴ whose lives they spared, they would be the tormentors, even as with a scorpion's poison-sting. All this, I say, seems obvious.—But, passing this for the present, let us look to see, as suggested, what the *local or national* indications contained in these animal symbols. On doing so we shall find, I doubt not, that they pointed the Evangelist, and that not obscurely, to *Arabia* and the *Arabs*.

First, and chiefly, the *locust*, the ground-work of the symbol, is peculiarly Arabic. So the sacred history of ancient times informs us. “It was the east wind,” it says, “which brought the locusts” on Egypt:⁵ from which the inference arises, that the country they issued from must have been that which, in all its extent, lies east of Egypt, that is Arabia. Such too, in modern times, is the testimony of Volney; “the most judicious,” as Gibbon calls him, “of Syrian travellers.” “The inhabitants of Syria,” he observes, “have remarked that locusts come constantly from the desert of Arabia.”⁶ Lebrun, from the convent at Rama, gives the same report:⁷ and the Moorish writer Leo Africanus, from the western part of North Africa, one not dissimilar.⁸ Besides that the very name for locust,—and similarity of names is a thing not unattended to, as we have seen, in Scripture symbols,⁹—I say

¹ So Nahum iii. 15; “Make thyself many as the locusts.”—In the Arabic poem Antar, we find the comparison used similarly; “I shall command these armies, numerous as the locusts;” &c. i. 6. Also iii. 73, &c.

² Verse 4. ³ As in Exod. x. 13—15, Deut. xxviii. 42, &c. &c. ⁴ Verse 5.

⁵ Exod. x. 13.

⁶ Chap. xx. Sect. 5.

⁷ Vol. ii. 152.

⁸ “Persia, et potissimum Arabia, ubi plurimæ generantur [locustæ], hoc insecto secent!” Cited by Robertson in his *Clavis Pentateuchi*, on Levit. xi. 22.

⁹ For examples of the *paronomasia* in Hebrew see Stuart's *Grammar*, pp. 193, 194; and Dr. Wilson's *Table of Paronomasie* in the *Append. to his Bible Student's Guide*. As one example I may cite Jer. i. 11, 12; “What seest thou, Jeremiah? And I

the very word for *locust* might almost to an Hebrew ear suggest *Arab*: the names of the one and of the other being in pronunciation and in radicals not dissimilar;—of the *locust* אַרְבֵּה (arbeh), of an *Arab* אַרְבִּי (arbi). And indeed the *locust*-simile is one used in other and earlier Scriptures, with its usual appropriateness, to designate the numbers and character of an invading *Arab* horde.²—Again, as of the locust, so of the *scorpion*, the native locality was by the Jews considered the Arabian desert. Witness Moses' own words to the Israelites, on emerging from it after forty years' wandering; "that great and terrible wilderness wherein were fiery serpents and *scorpions*."³—And who know not, if facts so notorious be worth mentioning, that it is Arabia, still Arabia, that is regarded by naturalists as the original country of the *horse*;⁴ and that its wildernesses are the haunts also of the *lion*?⁵—The *zoology* of the hieroglyphic is all *Arabian*.

said, A rod of an *almond-tree*, אֶזְרָא. Then said the Lord, Thou hast well seen; for I will hasten,* אֶזְרָא, my word, to perform it." A second may be given from Dan. v. 28; "*Peres*, thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians:" where פֶּרֶס, in the Hebrew, signifies both to *divide*, and *Persia*; and in the hand-writing on the wall included both these meanings. In the Greek Testament we have the notable example, Matt. xvi. 18; "Thou art *Peter*, Πέτρος, and upon this *rock*, πέτρα," &c.

See too the same in the words for *ram* and *Persia*, remarked on p. 426 *suprà*; and my notice there, from Eckhel, of the very frequent custom of such allusion to names in classical types and symbols.

¹ So אֶרֶב is a *desert*; and, with the definite article prefixed, the desert, i. e. the *Arab desert* between the Dead and the Red Seas.—In this case the א is the initial letter; in the Hebrew for *locust*, the א. But these two letters are frequently interchanged, and in sound not dissimilar. Of their interchange instances occur in Gen. xviii. 27, Job xxx. 19, Is. ii. 19, 21, &c.; given in Dr. Wilson, *ubi supra*. See Gesenius' Hebrew Lexicon on א.

² Judges vi. 5; "They (the Midianite Arabs) came as *locusts* for multitude:" where the Hebrew word is the same אֶרֶב; incorrectly rendered *grasshoppers* in our translation. So too Judg. vii. 12.—Mr. Forster in his *Mahommedanism Unveiled*, i. 217, writes: "In the Bedoween Romance of *Antar* the *locust* is introduced as the national emblem of the *Ishmaelites*."

³ Deut. viii. 15.—The Hebrew for *scorpion*, אַכְרָב (akrab), is still retained in the Arabic. "The most remarkable creature," says Mr. Buckingham, in his account of the desert east of Orfah, "was a large black scorpion, called in Arabic *akrabee*." *Travels in Mesopotamia*, p. 140. Its bite or sting, he adds, is generally fatal.

⁴ "Arabia, in the opinion of the naturalist, is the genuine and original country of the *horse*." Gibb. ix. 224. His reference is to "the incomparable article on the *Horse*" in Buffon's *Nat. History*.

⁵ "The land of trouble and anguish, from whence come the young and old *lion*." So Isa. xxx. 6; on which Bp. Lowth observes, that the same deserts are here referred to that the Israelites passed through in their way from Egypt. "Her speech," i. e. of Arabia, says Gibbon, ix. 240, "could diversify . . . the 500 names of a *lion*." It is the constant emblem of valiant warriors in *Antar*.

* Rather, *be intent upon*, or *watch over*. See Blayney in loc.

Next as to what was *human* in the appearance of the symbolic locusts: viz. their faces as the faces of men, their hair as the hair (the *long* hair) of women,¹ with crowns as of gold on their heads, (or, it might be, gold-adorned turbans,)² and breast-plates like iron breast-plates.³—The *qualities* and *character* indicated, seem here also sufficiently plain. There was indicated man-like courage, but united apparently with effeminate licentiousness;⁴ a combination somewhat singular: also invulnerability in war, and splendid and constant victory.—But, for the present, what I would wish chiefly to inquire into, here as before, is the *local significancy* of these features in the symbol; and whether any, and what particular *nation*, might seem to be figured by them. For in cases like this, as we have seen, the portraiture may be generally supposed to be drawn from life: and, considering all the particulars specified, it is assuredly very characteristic and distinctive.—Applying this test then, by what is said of *the faces as faces of men*,⁵

¹ 1 Cor. xi. 15; “Doth not even nature teach that . . . if a woman have *long hair* it is a glory to her; for her hair is given her for a covering.” So Mary Magdalen’s, John xii. 3. To cut it short was a mark of mourning. So Jer. vii. 29; “Cut off thine hair, O Jerusalem, and take up a lamentation:” and similarly Micah i. 16.

And the same among other nations. Thus Clemens Alex. observes, *Pædag. Lib. iii. p. 224*; “Ὁ Θεὸς τὴν μὲν γυναῖκα λείαν ἠθέλησεν εἶναι, αὐτοφύη τῆ κομῆ μόνρ, ὡσπερ ἵππον τῆ χαιτὶ γανυρομένην. (Paris Ed. 1629.)

² ὡς στεφανοὶ ὁμοιο χρυσοῦ. The word *στεφανος* is the usual rendering in the Septuagint of the Hebrew כִּטְוֹן: and they are both used, not merely of royal crowns worn by kings, but of ornamented turban-like circlets for head-covering, such as on festival days were worn by Jewish women. So Ezek. xvi. 12, “I put a beautiful *crown* on thy head:” (Hebr. כִּטְוֹן, Sept. *στεφανον*;) some encircling covering “made of fine linen, silk, or gold intermixed with the same;” says Greenhill *ad loc.*: also in the striking passage, Ezek. xxiii. 42, which will be noticed more particularly in the Text presently afterwards.

The more usual Hebrew word for the mitre, or turban, is כִּטְוֹן or its cognates; the Greek *μίτρα*, or *κιδάρις*. But the two are united, Ezek. xxi. 26, (Hebrew, verse 31,) “Remove the *diadem*; take off the *crown*.”

³ θωρακας ὡς θωρακας σιδηρους. The word is repeated in the Greek.

⁴ This seems inferable from the hair being as the hair of women, and the turban head-dress, conjointly. So Suidas; *οὐδεὶς κομητῆς ὅστις οὐ ψημιζέται*, quoted by Daubuz, p. 422; and again, *θηλυμίτρος ὁ πορνος*. Compare Cicero’s description of Clodius;—“P. Clodius a mitrâ, a muliebribus solcis,” &c. De Harusp. Resp. 21.

⁵ The Greek word for *men* is not indeed that which is absolutely distinctive of the masculine sex, *ἀνδρῶν*; but *ἀνθρωπων*, a word often used of human beings, irrespective of sex. But where used, so as here, in immediate association with, and contradistinction to, *γυναικῶν*, *women*,—“they have faces as the faces of *men*, and hair as the hair of *women*,”—there, I conceive, it must be taken as having a distinct reference to the masculine sex. So Matt. xix. 3, 5, 10, three several times successively, 1 Cor. vii. 1, &c. So again in the Septuagint Gen. ii. 18, Exod. xiii. 2, Levit. xx. 10, Esther iv. 11, Eccl. vii. 28, Isa. iv. 1, &c. &c. And so too in classic authors; e. g. Æschin. in Ctesiphon 76 4. (Reiske); &c. Had the clause next following

(i. e. with beard or moustache,) the *Goths* and other kindred barbarian tribes are set aside: the faces of these being very singularly noticed by a contemporary of their earliest incursions, I mean Jerome, as having faces shaven and smooth; faces, in contrast with the bearded Romans, “*like women’s faces.*”¹—Again, while from the usual habits of both Greeks and Romans in the empire that which is perhaps most remarkable in the described appearance, viz. *the hair as the hair of women* (not to add the turban head-covering also) was abhorrent,²—there were two great neighbouring nations, and I think but two,³ with whose national costume and habits both these and the other points of description well suited; I mean the Persians and the Arabs. Of the Persians, alike in the earlier times of their history and the later, the appearance is *nearly* thus represented, both by historians, and upon ancient coins and bas-reliefs still remaining.⁴ And of the Arabs, of whom I

“and with hair as the hair of *women*,” been wanting, the meaning might be simply “with *human* faces,” in contrast to the bestial locust-likeness previously mentioned. As it is, supposing the faces *woman-like*, surely the needless and misleading *ανθρωπων* would have been omitted; and the description run thus, “And they had faces and hair as of women.” The word *ανθρωπων* is, I conceive, preferred to *ανδρων*, in order thereby to intimate the double contrast in the *face*, alike to the *general bestial* resemblance, and to the *woman-like* fashion of the *hair*.

¹ “*Fœmineas incisas facies præferentes virorum, et bene barbatorum, fugientia terga confodiunt.*” In *Isa.*

As regards the beard, it was sometimes worn by the Romans, sometimes not—on this point the heads on Roman coins, &c. vary. See Eckhel’s chapter *De Cultu Capitis*, viii. 363. From Nero to Hadrian, the imperial custom was to have the beard shaven; (so Dion Cass. lxxviii. 15;) from Hadrian to Constantine unshaven: afterwards (with Julian’s single exception) down to Phocas, shaven.

² This appears from the Apostle’s question, addressed to the Corinthian Greeks, 1 Cor. xi. 14; “Doth not even nature teach you, that if a man have long hair, it is a shame to him?” Just like their poet Phocylides, 290; *αρσσειν ουκ επεικει κομη.*

Originally the Greeks wore their hair long, as Homer describes them, *καρηκομωντες Αχαιοι*. But the custom had very much past away before the Peloponnesian war, as the Elgin marbles show us. Afterwards, mingling in the Roman empire, the Roman customs in this respect seem to have prevailed among them.—Among the Jews too the same habit, as to the *hair*, seems to have prevailed: for when the Nazarete let his hair grow long, it was as a badge peculiar to himself. Absalom, I conceive, cherished *his* hair somewhat in the spirit of Clodius; as an effeminate man. See 2 Sam. xiv. 26.

³ On Trajan’s column the Dacians sculptured with long hair are the *nobles*. So Niebuhr (Ed. Schmitz) ii. 248. The same was the case with the Franks in the 5th century. “These *princes* (the Merovingians) allowed their hair to descend in long curls over their shoulders; while the rest of the Franks shaved the hair on the back part of the head; whence the Merovingian dynasty were entitled the *longhaired kings.*” W. Scott’s *Tales of a Grandfather*, France, i. 42.

The Lusitanian mountaineers too had once the distinction of flowing hair. . . So Strabo, p. 232. (Ed. Casaub.) But these were the inhabitants only of a provincial district.

⁴ The beard, the long hair, and the turban, are seen on the Darics of the Achæ-

must speak more fully, as being the people indicated apparently by the points previously considered of the hieroglyphic,—of them descriptions are given *yet more exactly* agreeing with that before us. So *Pliny*, St. John's contemporary at the close of the first century, speaks of the Arabs as wearing the turban, having the hair long and uncut, with the moustache on the upper lip, or the beard; ¹—that “venerable sign of manhood,” as Gibbon in Arab phraseology calls it.² So *Solinus* describes them in the third century; ³ so *Ammianus Marcellinus* in the fourth: ⁴ so *Theodore of Mopsuesta*,⁵ *Claudian*, and *Jerome*,⁶ in the fifth:—of the last of which writers the acquaintance with the people he wrote of must have been most familiar; as he passed most of the latter years of his life at Bethlehem, on the borders of the Arab desert. This was about two centuries before the great Saracen irruption. Yet once more, in the age immediately preceding that irruption, and which indeed included Mahomet's childhood, the same personal portraiture is still given of the Arab. In that most characteristic of Arab poems, *Antar*, a poem composed at the time I speak of,⁷ we find the moustache and the beard, the long hair flowing on the shoulder, and the

menides, and on the rock-engraved bas-reliefs of the Sassanides. See Mionnet for the one; and, for both, the plates in Sir R. K. Porter's Travels. So Herodotus describes the Persians as both *κομηται* and *μυροφοροι*; in the latter respect contrasting them with the Egyptians; vi. 19, iii. 12.—I have used the word *nearly*, in the text above, because with the Persians neither the *μυτρα*, nor the *bushy* form of wearing the hair, were so *woman-like* as with the Arabs.

The Lydians and Phrygians were anciently bonnetted. But, after being long absorbed into the Roman empire, it is probable that their better classes, as of the Greeks, adopted Roman costumes and habits.—The *turban*, or *mitre*, was, I believe, never worn by the Romans.

¹ “Arabes *mitrati* degunt, aut *intonso crine*. Barba abraditur, *præterquam in superiore labro*. Aliis et hæc *intonso*.” Nat. Hist. vi. 32.

² ix. 235, 238.

³ c. 33: “Plurimis *crinis intonsus, mitrata capita*, pars rasâ in cutem barbâ.”

⁴ “*Crinitus* quidam,” sc. e “Saracenorum euneo.” Amm. Marc. xxxi. 16.

⁵ On Jer. x.; “Saracenos ait comam fronte quidem detondere, *retro autem intonsam demittere*.” So Valesius, on the above passage from Ammianus Marcellinus, reports Theodore's testimony: adding also Claudian's; “Hinc *mitrà redimitus* Arabs:” in Stil. xxi. 156.—We may compare Herodotus' statement, iii. 8, *κειρονται ἐν περιροχαλα, περιξυρουντες τους κροταφους*, with the first clause in Theodore.

⁶ Jerome, in the Life of Malchus, says; “Ecce subito equorum camelorumque sessorum Ismaelite irruunt, *crinitis vittatisque capitibus*.”—Most of my authorities on this point are given also by Bishop Newton from Valesius, &c.

⁷ See the Preface to Mr. Hamilton's translation, from which I quote. In the reign of Haroun Al Raschid, copies were by his order compared, and so a correcter copy formed. It was the *Ossian* of the Arabs, but more genuine.

turban also, all specified.¹—And let me add, in regard to the *turban-crown*, it happens very singularly that Ezekiel (xxiii. 42) describes the *turbans* of the Sabæan or Keturite² Arabs under this precise appellation; “Sabæans from the wilderness, which put beautiful *crowns* upon their heads:”³ and, still as singularly, that even the perhaps hinted resemblance of them in the vision to *crowns*, or *diadems*, (they being spoken of as *like gold*,⁴) is one that has been made by the Arabs themselves. Of the four peculiar things that they were wont in a national proverb to specify as bestowed by God upon the Arabs, the first was that their *turbans* should be to them instead of *diadems*.⁵

The testimonies thus quoted refer to *three* out of the four points of personal appearance noted in the vision. And on the *fourth*, that of the locusts appearing *breast-plated with iron*, both Antar, the Koran, and the history of Mahomet and the early Moslem Saracens, will also satisfy us. In Antar the steel or iron cuirasses of the Arab warriors are frequently noticed.⁶ In the Koran, among

¹ i. 340; “He adjusted himself properly, twirled his whiskers, and *folded up his hair under his turban*, drawing it from off his shoulders.” i. 169; “His hair *flowed down his shoulders*.” iii. 117; “Antar cut off Maadi’s hair in revenge.” iv. 325; “We will *hang him up by his hair*.” ii. 4; “Thou *foul-moustachio’d wretch!*” &c. &c.

² So Forster in his *Geography of Arabia*: making these Sabæans the descendants from Abraham and Keturah; tribes which intermingled with the Ishmaelites. See p. 446 Note ³.

³ Hebr. תְּכָנִים, Greek σιφάρον, as before. See p. 435 Note ².

⁴ I have already stated that the reading of the textus receptus, ὄμοιοι χρυσοῦ, is also the reading adopted in the late critical Edition of Tregelles, (as well as in that of Tittman and Hahn.) in preference to Griesbach’s χρυσοῦ.—In explaining its force I say, “the *perhaps* hinted resemblance to crowns or diadems,” because it may possibly have been intended merely in the sense of the beautiful colouring of the crowns, so as in Ezekiel. Compare Ps. lxxviii. 13, “the wings of a dove covered with silver, and her feathers with yellow gold:” or, as in the Septuagint, ἐν χλωροσθητι χρυσοῦ, the greenish yellow of gold.

And indeed *golden* embroidery was not, and is not, uncommon in the turbans of the wealthier Arabs. Says Niebuhr, the Eastern traveller; “The Arabs wear fifteen caps, one over the other, some of linen, others of thick cloth or cotton. That which covers all the rest is usually richly embroidered with gold.” (Cited by Alwood, “Key to Revelation,” i. 340.)

⁵ “It was a usual saying among them, that God had bestowed four peculiar things on the Arabs; that their *turbans* should be to them instead of *diadems*, their tents instead of walls and houses, their swords instead of intrenchments, and their poems instead of written laws.” Preface to Antar, p. ix, from Sale; on the authority of Abulfeda, Pococke, and others.—Mr. Forster in his “Mahommedanism Unveiled,” i. 217, quotes, as a precept of Mahomet, from the Mishcat-ul-Masabih, “Make a point of wearing *turbans*, because it is the way of angels.”

⁶ ii. 203; “A warrior immersed in *steel and armour*.”—ib. 42; “15,000 men *armed with cuirasses*, and well accoutred for war.”—i. 23; “They were clothed in *iron*

God's gifts to the Arabs, their coats of mail for defence are specially particularized.¹ And in Mahomet's history we read expressly of the cuirasses of himself and his Arab troops.²—Individual Arabs, no doubt, like the one more early noted by Ammianus Marcellinus,³ might not seldom astound the foe by their "naked bravery."⁴ And hence by some it has been fancied the general habit. But the Saracen policy was the wearing of defensive armour. The breast-plate of iron was a feature of description *literally* answering, like the three others, to the Arab warriors of the 6th or 7th century.

Thus, on the whole, the *country* whence the woe was to originate might seem almost fixed, by these concurrent symbols, to *Arabia*. And, turning from *prophecy* to *history*, if we ask whether there was then, about the times of Heraclius, and the opening of the seventh century, any correspondingly destructive irruption of *Arabs* on Roman Christendom, the agreement of fact with the prediction is so far notorious. A mighty desolating locust-like Arab, or Saracen⁵ invasion, is the chief topic of the history of that century.⁶

armour and brilliant cuirasses."—iii. 274; "The dust opened, and there appeared horsemen clad in iron."—Also ii. 145; i. 238, 176, &c. &c.

¹ Sale, ii. 104; "God hath given you coats of mail to defend you in your wars."

² Seven cuirasses are noted in the list of Mahomet's private armoury. Gagnier iii. 328—334. In his second battle with the Koreish 700 of the little army are spoken of as armed with cuirasses; &c. Gibbon, ix. 296, 300, 304.

Similarly in the first Saracen irruption into Syria, under the first Caliphate, among the spoils of the defeated Roman army described as "inestimable to the Arabs," and as the instrument to them of new victories, we find particularized innumerable suits of the richest armour. Ib. 391, 405. Some two centuries earlier Socrates, H. E. vii. 18, speaks of the Saracen allies of Varanes, king of Persia, rushing under some panic, in armour as they were, (*ενοπλοι*.) into the Euphrates at Nisibis.

Euthymius Monach. Zigabenus relates, as one of Mahomet's sayings, *Τον θωρακα τον σιδηρουν παρα του Δαβιδ λεγει πρωτον επινοηθηναι*. Bibl. Pat. (Paris 1624) ii. 301.

³ xxxi. 16.—Such was Derar, described as so formidable to the Christians of Syria, in Ockley's History of the Saracens. Gibb. ix. 389.

⁴ Gibbon x. 145: "The Arabs in the tenth century disdained the *naked bravery* of their ancestors." So too ix. 369. Gibbon is in this point, where he deviates from the Apocalyptic description, a little incorrect.

⁵ "The name *Saracen*," says Niebuhr, (Roman History Lectures, Ed. Schmitz, ii. 333,) "is derived from the Semitic *Sharx*, i. e. the *East*." Others, as Valesius on Sozomen vi. 38, after Bochart and Scaliger, derive it from *Sarak*, a robber. He adds that it occurs long before the time of Mahommed. I have myself observed it in a letter of the Emperor Aurelian's, of the third century, given by Pollio, in his Triginta Tyranni, c. 30: "Non Arabes, non Saraceni." A century after, Ammianus Marcellinus, *ibid.* uses it. Also Eusebius, H. E. vi. 42, and Hilary i. 325.

⁶ So in the so-called "Revelations" of Methodius of Patara: "Erunt [sc. the

II. But it is further said of the locusts prefigured, that they issued *out of the smoke of the bottomless pit, or pit of the abyss*;¹ the pit having been opened just previously, and the smoke ascending thereupon, out of it, as the smoke of a great furnace. What might this mean? And does it apply to the origin of the Saracen invaders just mentioned? The point is one strongly marked in the hieroglyphic, and evidently most important.

The word *αβυσσος*, *abyss*, answers in the Septuagint most generally to the Hebrew *תְּהוֹם*. It is the same word that is used of the *deep* on which the primæval darkness rested, in Gen. i. 2; and which seems to signify, most properly, that depth or hollow of the earth which is the bed of the ocean-waters, though often used also of those waters themselves.² By an easy extension or change of meaning, it came to signify sometimes that deeper depth, in which opinion, if not Scripture, placed the receptacle of the departed; at least of the departed wicked. So it is used, for instance, in Ezek. xxxi. 17, where it is rendered *hell* by our translators; "They went down into *hell* with him, unto them that be slain with the sword:" and it is thus connected with the supposed habitation, or rather destined habitation,³ of evil spirits. In the New Testament this seems to be the more general use of the word. In Luke viii. 31, the *abyss* into which the devils entreated that they might not be sent, seems directly contrasted with the *sea*

Saracen invaders] *tanquam locustæ* in multitudine, quæ congregabuntur à vento." B. P. M. iii. 731. And similarly a modern historian; "Their [the Saracens'] victorious marches must have been like the flight of *locusts*; and the devastation they occasioned have resembled the calamities wrought by those devouring insects." Barthe, Hist. of the Christian Church, p. 80.

¹ φρεαρ τον αβυσσου.

² e. g. Ezek. xxxi. 4; "The *waters* made him (the cedar) great, the *deep* set him on high;" &c. And Ezek. xxvi. 19, of Tyre, "I will bring up *the deep*, (Hebrew *תְּהוֹם* Sept. *την αβυσσου*,) upon thee, and great waters shall cover thee." So again Job xli. 32, of leviathan, or the crocodile, stirring upon the waters; where however the Hebrew word is different.

³ Probably this latter is the more correct expression. At present the evil spirits seem to have the range of our earth, and the power of the air. See Mede on this subject, Disc. iv: and compare Luke viii. 31, alluded to above, Job i. 7, 1 Pet. v. 8, Eph. ii. 2, John xiv. 30, Matt. xxv. 41, Apoc. xx. 3, 10.—But this does not prevent allusions to the locality beneath, as the source of what is hellish *now* on earth. Thus St. James says, iii. 6; "The tongue is set on fire of *hell*:" *ὑπο της γειννης*. So too John viii. 23.—"Quomodo cor animalis in medio est, ita et infernus in medio terræ esse prohibetur." So Jerome on Jonah ii. 3.

into which they precipitated the swine, immediately after entering and possessing them. And in the Apocalypse,—passing over those two passages that speak of the *Beast from the abyss*, in chapters xi and xvii, where its meaning might to some perhaps seem more equivocal,—there remains that other at the beginning of chap. xx, in which the sense of the word, as signifying the prison-place of evil spirits, can scarcely be mistaken;—I mean that in which an angel that had the *key of the abyss* is described as seizing the Devil, that old serpent, and casting him into the abyss, and there sealing him up.—In the present case the word $\Phiρεαρ$, or *pit*, (“pit of the abyss,”) that is added, confirms this as the meaning. For it signifies evidently an opening in the earth, a shaft of communication, as it were, between the earth and the infernal region beneath.¹—And it is yet more confirmed by the notice of the *smoke, as of a great furnace*, ascending from it. For in every case in Scripture, where the smoke as of a furnace is described as rising from out of, or from beneath the earth,² the context shows that it is the smoke of penal fire. So in the case of Sodom; so in that predicted of the mystic Edom in Isaiah; so in that of the Apocalyptic Babylon.³—Thus, on the whole, the observer could scarce be mistaken in interpreting this smoke from the pit of the abyss as an emanation from the pit of hell:—i. e. as some system of error and *false religion* thence originating: originating, it would seem, very suddenly; and of which the effect would be, almost instantaneously, to darken the moral atmosphere, and dim the imperial sun in the firmamental heaven.

Which being the thing predicted, we have again to recur to history, and to inquire,—1st, whether, about the opening of the seventh century, there arose any *hellish and false religion* in Arabia, in its *manner* of development sud-

¹ $\Phiρεαρ$ answers continually to the Hebrew בֵּיַר , a *pit*. So Jer. xli. 7, 9, *a dry pit*; Psalm lv. 23, where the word is used metaphorically; “Thou, O God, shalt cast them into the *pit* of destruction:” $\Phiρεαρ \tauης \deltaιαφθορας$.—Compare also Psalm lxix. 15; “Let not the *pit* shut her mouth upon me:” where the cognate word בֵּיַר is used.

² When *above* the earth, as for instance in the case of Mount Sinai, Exod. xx, the smoke and the fire were simply the accompaniments and indications of the presence and majesty of Jehovah.

³ Gen. xix. 28; Isa. xxxiv. 9, 10; Rev. xix. 3. Compare however Note ³ p. 440.

den, and in *strength* such as almost at once to darken Christendom;—2ndly, whether it was *out of it* that the Arab invaders before-mentioned issued forth to be a woe to the Roman world.

And to both of these questions who knows not the answers?—Who knows not of the sudden rise of *Mahomedism* in Arabia, just at *the very time* we speak of:—that most extraordinary invention of fanaticism and fraud; which being, as it was, from beginning to end a lie, in its pretensions superseding the Gospel of the Lord Jesus, in its doctrines inculcating views of the blessed God dark, cruel, and unholy, and in its morals a system of pride, ferocity, superstition, sensualism,—indicated too well, to any one who had eyes to see, that it had indeed its origin from hell, and was an emanation, like the pestilential smoke in the vision, from the pit of the abyss?—Again, who knows not the fact that it was *after embracing Islamism* that the Saracen cavalry hordes burst forth in fury (as I shall have to detail in the next Section) on Roman Christendom; and yet more, that they were imbued from *this very source* with the qualities that the symbols in the vision indicated? For there is indeed a perfect fitness in the representation of the symbolic locusts as issuing forth all formed in character, out of the smoke from the pit of the abyss. It was the religion of Mahomet in fact that made the Arabs what they were.¹ It was this that for the first time united them as one, in numbers countless as the *locusts*; this that gave them the *locust-like* impulse to speed forth as its propagandists over the world;² this which imparted to them, as to *lions* of the desert, the irresistible destroying fury of fanaticism;³ this, further, which, in case of their conquering

¹ “The Arabs, or Saracens,” says Gibbon, “who spread their conquest from India to Spain, had languished in poverty and contempt till Mahomet breathed into those savage bodies the soul of enthusiasm.” vi. 413.

² It is a Mahomedan tradition that there fell *locusts* into the hands of Mahomet, on whose wings was written the inscription, “We are the army of the Great God.” So Bochart, Hieroz. P. ii. c. 6. p. 485. This has been often cited: e. g. by Daubuz, p. 403; by Forster in his Mohammedanism Unveiled, i. 217; by Hug on Apoc. ix, who cites it in Arabic from the Persian Miscellanies; and by Kirby and Spence, Entomology i. 216. [5th Ed. 1828.]

³ “The religion of Mahomet,” says Hallam, “is essentially a *military* system. The people of Arabia . . . found in the law of their native prophet, not a license, but a command to desolate the world.” Middle Ages, ii. 165. It only needs to read the ixth chapter of the Koran, to see the justice of this statement.—Schlegel yet more

the provinces of Christendom, as I shall notice in the next Section more at large, had already prepared in them a *scorpion-like* venom of contempt and hatred, wherewith to torment the subject Christian:—this, finally, that made them the *θηλυμιτροι* described: that added sensualism to their ferocity; suggesting indulgence of their lusts in life, and bidding them look and fight for a heaven of lust beyond it.—So that here, too, there was no one point in which the *Saracen* character and history did not answer to the prophetic emblems.

III. But who, or what, that *fallen star* to whom was given the key wherewith to open the pit of the abyss?

Originally my explanation, like that of Daubuz, Bishop Newton, and Hales, was that the fallen star was *Mahomet*.¹ But, after much careful re-consideration of the question, I have been led at length to acquiesce in Mede's opinion that it symbolized *Satan*; already, sometime before the epoch of this Trumpet's sounding, fallen from his high estate of supremacy in Roman Heathendom; and now plotting in wrath against the kingdoms in which his rule had been overthrown. The often-cited saying of Christ, (Luke x. 18,) "I saw Satan as lightning fall from heaven," in anticipative view of his ultimate fall from *all* earthly

exactly depicts the spirit, after the Apocalyptic picture: calling it "the *infernal spirit* that produced that antichristian combination of spiritual and temporal authority, &c.;" "the new *power of hell*." *Philos. of Hist.* ii. 76, 93.

Let me add that, besides the general religious fanaticism that animated them in battle, there were two principles inculcated in the Koran that exercised a mighty influence to this effect on them:—first, the absolute belief in *predestination*; secondly, the ambition of a *crown of martyrdom* on the field of battle, as that on which the joys of the Mahomedan paradise were promised to follow. *Gibbon*, ix. 297.

¹ Very various have been the explanations of the *fallen star* by expositors who yet concur in interpreting this Trumpet-Woe of Mahomedanism and the Saracens. Besides the two mentioned above of *Mahomet* and *Satan*, Lowman explains it to be the *heavenly angel* who afterwards sealed up Satan in the abyss; Pareus, and after him Faber and Cuninghame, as the *Bishop of Rome* then completely *fallen into apostasy*: Keith (3rd. Ed.) as the Persian king *Chosroes*, who by weakening the Byzantine empire opened the way for the Saracen successes against it: others refer it to *Sergius*, a Nestorian monk, who is said (though on doubtful authority) to have instructed Mahomet.

In my former Editions the opinion was expressed that the only question appeared to me to lie between the two solutions of *Mahomet* and *Satan*. And the circumstance of Satan being nowhere else in the Apocalypse represented as a *fallen star*, (so I then thought, not having sufficiently considered the figures of the Apoc. xii.) determined me in favour of *Mahomet*. The previous fall of his family from the high office of governor of Mecca, and keeper there of the keys of the Caaba, was my explanation of the star being figured as fallen at the opening of the vision.

dominion under the power of the Gospel, is of course much to the point: though not perfectly so; inasmuch as the *figure* is different, (that of lightning, not a star,) and the *time* to which the fall spoken of refers different also. The same as regards Isaiah xiv. 12, another passage which has been often similarly cited by expositors; "How art thou fallen from heaven, Lucifer, son of the morning:" for, though the figure there corresponds with the Apocalyptic one before us, yet the person so figured is the king of Babylon, not Satan; and the time in this case is quite different also.—But it now seems to me, on re-consideration, that what is incidentally mentioned under the next Trumpet-Woe (Apoc. xi. 7) respecting a further most momentous result of this opening of the pit of the abyss, besides that of the plague of the *scorpion-locusts*, viz. the issuing forth from it of what is called the *Beast from the abyss*, and which at the time there prefigured is represented as the Anti-christian power then dominant in Roman Christendom, goes far to furnish the needful corroboration of Mede's view of the point here in question; that is, when compared with what we find afterwards very particularly related respecting the author, the time, and the circumstances of that Beast's emanation from the pit of hell. For, in the supplemental visions of Apoc. xii, xiii, *Satan* is expressly described as the Author of its evocation from the abyss; and this at a time, and under circumstances, well agreeing with what we here read of the opener and the opening of the pit of the abyss at the epoch of the 5th Trumpet's sounding. First in Apoc. xii he is figured as a seven-headed Dragon (a Draconic constellation) in the Apocalyptic sky, erect in deadly antagonism against a sun-clothed woman symbolizing the Church, as we shall hereafter see, at the crisis of her primary elevation to power and dignity, through Constantine's instrumentality; then as worsted in the conflict, and cast down from heaven to earth. After which,—not immediately, but subsequently to an unsuccessful attempt at overwhelming the woman with floods cast out of his mouth, which floods seem to symbolize those self-same Gothic hosts whose invasions of Roman Christendom, after the fall of Heathenism, we have lately

seen otherwise figured under the first four Trumpets,—after this, I say, he is in Apoc. xiii represented as evoking *the Beast from the abyss*,¹ in order to the more successful prosecution of his enmity against the woman and her children. Now the *opening* of the pit of the abyss was of course an essential preliminary to the Beast's issuing from it; and the causal agent of the one could scarce but be the causal agent of the other. Thus, on the whole, comparing the two cases as set forth there and here, we find the *time* of the opening of the pit in either case to correspond. We find too that in either case the opener *had fallen* some certain time before from high place in the heaven of Roman supremacy: moreover that the *emblem* under which the opener was designated in either case was not dissimilar; if only we suppose the fallen star of Apoc. ix to have been the brightest or chief star of the Draconic constellation of Apoc. xiii. Which being so it follows, as the most natural conclusion, that the opener, as well as opening, was the same in the one case and in the other; (the darkness of the smoke from the pit being equally suitable as the medium of passage for either emanation from the abyss;) and, as *Satan* is expressly indicated as the actor in Apoc. xii, xiii, so here also.²

There seems to be additional confirmation of this view in the fact that the leader of the scorpion-locusts which issued out of the darkness from the pit is afterwards (as we shall see in the next Section) said to be the *Angel of the abyss*, and the title given him of *Apollyon*, or the *Destroyer*. For who of the evil angelic intelligences so fit to be the invisible inspirer and leader of the locust-plague, as he who had opened the pit of the abyss, very mainly with a view to their emission; that is, the *star fallen from heaven*? And to whom so applicable the title of *Apollyon*, given to that evil angel, as to *Satan*?

The conformity with historic fact of this view of the pre-figured synchronism of the outburst of Mahommedanism in the East, and establishment of the Popedom or Papal em-

¹ The identity of the *Beast from the abyss* of Apoc. xi and xvii with the *Beast from the flood* of Apoc. xiii will be fully considered, and I doubt not fully established, in a later Part of this Book.

² Satan's fall from the heaven of heavens, with those other angels that kept not their first estate, (Jude 6,) should also not be forgotten.

pire in the West, is notorious. And he who most carefully traces by the light of God's unerring word the yet completer anti-christianism of the latter than of the former, will be most ready to recognise the justice of the assignment to it of a common hellish origin with the Mahommedan delusion.¹ It is of this *Mahommedan* delusion, however, that we have now to speak. On the other we shall have largely to dilate in a subsequent part of this work; and then, I doubt not, a full justification will be given of the opinion just expressed concerning it.

§ 3.—OUTBURST, PROGRESS, AND LIMITS OF THE FIRST
WOE, AS PREDICTED AND FULFILLED.

The family of Mahomet was of the princely house of the Koreish: who, at the time of his birth in the latter part of the 6th century, had been for some three or four generations hereditary governors of Mecca;²—and holders too of the keys of the Caaba in that city; the then central spot of the religious worship of the tribes of the vast peninsula of Arabia.³ After his birth his father and grandfather

¹ It was a curious coincidence between the Mahommedan Caliphs and the Roman Popes, (the one the soi-disant successors and representatives of Mahomet, the other of Peter and of Christ,) that each and either claimed to have the keys of hell and of paradise committed to them, which really are in the hands of Christ alone. (Apoc. i. 18.) Every one knows how, in token of this, the *keys* appear in the *Papal* arms. And similarly in Peyron's *Essais sur l'Espagne*, p. 189, we read; "The Koran continually speaks of the *key of God*, which opened to them the gates of the world and of religion. So in the Koran; 'Did not God give to *his legate* the power of heaven which is above, and fire which is beneath? With the *key*, did he not give him the title and power of a porter, that he may open to those whom he shall have chosen?' "

The following form of renunciation of Mahommedism, enjoined by the Greek Church on a convert to Christianity, and which is given in Nicetas' *Saracenicæ*, *Bibl. Patr.* (Ed. in four vols. Paris 1624), Vol. ii. p. 286, thus alludes to Mahomet's pretended *key of heaven*: *Αναθεματίζω την παρα τοις Σαρακηνοις αποκρυφον διδασκαλιαν και υποσχεσιν τς Μωαμεδ' ητις φησι κλειδου αυτον γενησεσθαι τς Παραδεισου.*


The key was also an armorial bearing of the Andalusian Moors. So Peyron, *ubi supra*. When they crossed from Africa into Spain, it was on their standard; and was thus, with a double significancy perhaps, sculptured on the archway of the Alhambra.

² Gibbon ix. 246.

³ Hallam *Midd. Ages*, ii. 162.

In the Rev. H. Forster's learned work on the Geography of Arabia, a clear and satisfactory view is given of its colonization, grounded on evidence scriptural, classical, and that of modern researches.—He traces it from six different sources, as follows: 1. *Cush* and his sons, who, before the confusion of tongues, colonized the coast of Bahrein and Oman along the Persian Gulf, and the north-east part of Hadramaut.—2. *Joktan*, the fourth from Shem; (brother to Peleg, in whose days, Gen. x. 25, was the confusion of tongues;) whose settlements

KEY ON THE ARCH OF THE GATE OF JUSTICE OF THE ALHAMBRA



From Murphy's Alhambra

died; and then the governorship of Mecca, headship of the tribe, and keys of the Caaba, past into the hands of another branch of the family. Thus Mahomet, as he grew up, an orphan and destitute, found himself forced to enter into service for his support; and in that character trafficked for some years in the markets of Arabia and Syria. But thoughts were even then working in his mind which were to raise him to an eminence (a bad eminence indeed!) immeasurably higher than that of Prince of Mecca. Brooding darkly over the fall of his family, the idea of a new and false superstition was suggested to his mind by the father of lies, whereby he might more than recover its ancient dignity and power. Withdrawing each year to the secret cave of Hera, three miles from Mecca, he there consulted, and listened to, "the Spirit of fraud or of enthusiasm, whose abode," says Gibbon, "was not in the heavens but in the mind of the enthusiast;"¹ and came to suppose himself commissioned as the prophet of God. The pestilential fumes from the pit of the abyss worked successfully within him. At length he declared his mission; first privately; three years after publicly. For a while the elders of the city, and uncles of Mahomet, affected to despise his presumption. They chased him ignominiously from Mecca. His flight marks the æra of the Hegira, A.D. 622. But soon fortune changed. "After an exile of seven years the fugitive missionary was enthroned

occupied the interior, Nejd; and thence in time extended to Hadramaut and Yemen, where the *Hamyarites* preserved the name of Hamyar, grandson to Joktan.—3. *Ishmael*, whose twelve sons were heads of twelve tribes, and their names still traceable through the peninsula; the chief being the Nabatheans and Kedarites; the latter the acknowledged progenitors of the *Koreish* and *Mahomet*. These (under the general names of Ismaelites, or Hagarenes) stretched from the wilderness of Sin and Sinai across the neck of the Arabian peninsula, so as at length to invade the Cushites of Bahrein.—4. *Abraham's sons* by *Keturah*, who intermixed with Ishmael across the neck of Arabia: the most remarkable tribe being the Midianites; the Sabæans (mentioned in Ezekiel xxiii) another.—5. *Esau*; whose descendants, under the names of Edomites and Saracens, (the latter, Mr. F. thinks, meaning the children of Sarah,*) occupied the desert nearest to Judæa; among them Amalek. On Amalek's destruction it would seem that a division, fleeing under Omar, made a final settlement in Arabia Felix, where they were known as Homerites.—6. The tribes of *Ad*, son of Uz, son of Aram, son of Shem, according to Arabian tradition. The Holy Scripture does not mention them.

It is of these last that the famous Hamyaritic Inscription speaks; which Mr. Forster considers himself to have decyphered. But whether correctly, or not, is, I believe, still *sub judice*. ¹ Gibb. ix. 260.

* See Niebuhr's and Valesius' different solutions, p. 439 Note ⁵ *suprà*

as the prince, as well as prophet, of his native country : ”¹ and as leader too of its armies, according to the commission which he declared to be intrusted to him against idolaters and unbelievers, whether in Arabia or foreign lands. His death prevented his fulfilling his mission against the latter. But he marked them out to his followers ; especially the Mariolatrists and saint-worshippers of the Roman empire.² And the Caliphs, his successors and vicars, were not slow to enter on the career so marked out to them. And how can the woe be described so graphically and truly as under the imagery of the Apocalyptic prophecy before us ?

I. There was indicated, as well by the hieroglyphic itself as by the words of explanation accompanying, that to the Arab cavalry hordes, emerging from the smoke of the hellish exhalation, there would be opened a fearful career of conquest over Roman Christendom : one in which, as just hinted before, they would *fly*, as it were, *with locust-wings*, destroy what opposed them with the strength of *lions’* teeth, and torment the subjugated Christian inhabitants³ as with the poison of a *scorpion-sting*.—And was there then a correspondence with this in the facts of the subsequent Saracenic history ?—It was in the year 629 that the Saracens under Mahomet himself first issued from the desert

¹ Gibbon, ix. 308.

² In the Koran, ch. 5, the Christians of the Roman Empire were distinctly charged with worshipping the Virgin Mary as God. And in ch. 9, it is said of the priests and monks specifically ; “ Very many of the priests and monks devour the substance of men in vanity, and obstruct the way of God.” Sale’s Koran, i. 141, 115, ii. 8. Sale explains the first charge against the priests, as having reference to their fraudulent gains, by the sale, exhibition, and false miracles attached to relics.

What has been already said pp. 331, 406, 414, might well suffice to justify this charge of idolatry. But I add the following, as referring to the exact epoch we speak of, and as what Gibbon could not omit in his sketch of the rise of Mahomedism. “ The Christians of the seventh century had insensibly relapsed into a semblance of Paganism ; their public and private vows were addressed to the relics and images that disgraced the temples of the East : and the throne of the Almighty was darkened by a cloud of martyrs, saints, and angels, the objects of popular veneration.” Gib. ix. 261.

“ The Greeks have been everywhere worsted by the Arabs,” said one of his officers to the Emperor Heraclius, “ because they have for a long time walked unworthy of their Christian profession, and have corrupted their holy religion,” &c. So Theophanes Chronogr. p. 276, cited by Hales, Chronol. iv. 331.

³ The Apocalyptic locusts’ commission was against *τους ανθρωπους*. So verses 4, 6, 10. In Dion Cassius, lxxvii. 9 I observe that the same insulated phrase is used of *the inhabitants of the Roman empire*, distinctively.

into *Syria*, with proclamation of war against Christendom. They appeared, and they retired: it was but the omen of what was to follow. But in 636, very shortly after his death, they returned under the Caliph Omar to prosecute their mission in earnest; and behold, within less than three years *Syria* was subdued. When *Damascus* had fallen, and then *Jerusalem*, the unhappy Emperor *Heraclius*, with tears of anguish, bade farewell to the Syrian Province. He saw that it was lost to his crown irretrievably. The Patriarch of *Jerusalem*, yet more unhappy, had to attend the victor Caliph through it. He muttered as he passed on, "The abomination of desolation is in the Holy Place!"¹ And soon, as if to remind the Christian remnant of the fact, there resounded that voice of the *Muezzin*, from a mosque erected on the site of *Solomon's temple*, which, except with brief intermission during the reign of the crusaders, has since then never ceased.²—The subjugation of *Egypt* followed quickly on that of *Syria*;—then, some 20 or 40 years after, that of the *African Province*; then, at the beginning of the eighth century, that of *Spain*. All this, within the limits of Roman Christendom: and contemporaneously,—though without those limits, and consequently without the sphere of the Apocalyptic prefigurative vision,—that of *Persia* in the second quarter of the seventh century, and that of *North-west India* and of *Trans-Oxiana* at the commencement of the eighth.—Let us take, in exemplification of the rapidity and extent of their conquests and destructions, two historical statements. The one, that in the ten years of Omar's Caliphate, from 634 to 644, the Saracens had reduced to his obedience 36,000 cities or castles, destroyed 4000 churches, and built 1400 mosques for the exercise of the religion of Mahomet. The other, that at the end of the first century of the Hegira the Arabian empire had been extended to 200 days' journey from East to West; and reached from the confines of *Tartary* and *India* to the

¹ Gibb. ix. 413.

² The *Muezzin* began with Mahommedism. He is mentioned expressly in the capitulation of *Jerusalem*. "The *Muezzin*," said Omar, "that calls the faithful to prayers, shall not stand on the steps of the Church of *Constantine*." *Mod. Un. Hist.* i. 431.

The *minareh*, it may be observed, was not erected till 690 A.D.; and then first at the great Mosque of *Damascus*. *D'Herbelot* iii. 157. Hence the *Muezzin's* standing in Omar's time on the church-steps.

shores of the Atlantic. "Over all which ample space," says Gibbon, "the progress of the Mahommedan religion diffused a general resemblance of manners and of opinions :"¹—over all which ample space, we may add, the venom of the scorpion-sting of their conquerors was made to rankle in the breasts of the subject Christians.

For indeed the bitter contempt and hatred flowing out from the Moslem faith towards them could not but be felt perpetually. It was marked in the very terms of appellation, Christian dogs and infidels.² The enactments of the capitulations granted them were their every day remembrancers of it. Deprived of the use of arms, like the Helots of old, and with tribute enforced as their annual life-redemption tax,—with a different dress enjoined them from their masters, and a more humble mode of riding,—an obligation to rise up deferentially in the presence of the meanest Moslem, and to receive, and gratuitously entertain for a certain time, whosoever of them when on a journey might require it,—such were the marks of *personal* degradation ordained in the Capitulations. And then, in token of the degradation of *their religion*,—that to which, notwithstanding all their superstitions, they clung with fond attachment,—there was the prohibition to build new churches, to chime the bells in those retained by them, or to refuse admission into them to the scoffing Moslem, though they regarded his presence as defilement.³ Add to which the inducements to *apostasy*, operating to an incalculable extent, on the young and thoughtless in families more especially, and then the penalty of death against the apostates returning to the Christian faith, the insults too

¹ Gibbon ix. 361, 501.

² "Ye Christian dogs, ye know your option, the Koran, the tribute, or the sword." Such was Caled's characteristic address to the Romans before the battle of Aiznadin. Such, near 200 years after, that in the letter of the Caliph Haroun Al Raschid to the Emperor Nicephorus; "Haroun Al Raschid, Commander of the Faithful, to Nicephorus, the Roman dog." Gibb. ix. 390, x. 54.—In later years it has been the same from the *Turks*, and from the same cause. "What care I whether the dog eat the hog, or the hog eat the dog?" was the Vizier Kiuperli's answer to the French Ambassador, on his informing him of Louis XIVth's victories over the Spaniards. Eton's Turkey, p. 110.

³ The above is extracted from the Capitulation of Jerusalem granted by Omar; which was the basis and prototype of most of the subsequent capitulations granted to Christian subjects. The document is given by Al Wakedi, and copied into the Modern Univ. Hist. i. 428, 429.—Compare Gibb. ix. 499; who speaks of these degrading enactments as in force 200 years after.

to Christian females, and thousand undefinable injuries of oppression;—and how could it be but that the bitterness of their lot should be felt, and the poison rankle within them, yet more even than in other days with the Jewish captives in Babylon, and so as to make life itself almost a burden? ¹

And now we shall be better prepared to consider,

IIIndly, What is said of the locusts having a king over them, “the *angel of the bottomless pit*; whose name in the Hebrew tongue is *Abaddon*, but in the Greek tongue he hath his name *Apollyon*.” I have already explained this as the opener of the pit of the abyss, and chief of destroyers, *Satan*; ² or perhaps one of Satan’s angels, ³ the *Spirit of evil* that, like the lying Spirit in the mouth of Ahab’s prophets, ⁴ had inspired Mahomet; and of whom Mahomet, and after him his Caliphs, or Vicars, ⁵ were but the mouth and instrument.—So interpreted, we see in this intimation not merely a singular fact predicted, but one of important bearing on all the main points of the prophecy. For the prediction was to this effect,—that wheresoever the Arab locusts might travel in their career of conquest, there they would carry the false religion of Mahomet with them;

¹ “And in those days shall the men seek death, and shall not find it; and shall desire to die, and death shall flee from them.” Verse 6. A statement, of which the meaning is made clear by the parallel one in Jer. viii. 3; where it is said of the Jews taken captive to Babylon; “And death shall be chosen, rather than life, by all the residue of them that remain of this evil family, which remain in all the places whither I have driven them.” And so again Job iii. 20; “Wherefore is light given to him that is in misery, and life unto the bitter in soul? Which long for death, but it comes not, and dig for it more than for hid treasures: which rejoice exceedingly when they can find the grave.” It is a strong proverbial expression of great wretchedness.

Under the judgment from the sons of Ishmael, says the Pseudo-Methodius Patarensis, cited p. 439, supra, “desperet homines de vitâ suâ, in captivitatibus et calamitatibus suis.” B. P. M. iii. 732.

Eichhorn in loc. compares Ovid in Ibin, 121;

Causaque non desit, desit tibi copia lethi;

Optatam fugiat vita eoacta necem.

² Mede, while explaining this angel as *Satan*, suggests *Oboda*, a name then common to Arab princes by the Red Sea, as perhaps alluded to in the appellative *Abaddon*.

³ In Apoc. xii. 7, we find noticed the Dragon’s angels, as well as God’s.

⁴ 1 Kings xxii. 21, 23.—It is well to remember that the Spirits of evil, as of good, have attached to them an individuality of work and office, as well as of person.—As to the *name* here noticed, it simply marks *character*; just as in Mark v. 9; “Our name is *Legion*, for we are many.”

In the Nimrod sculptures, when a king with his bow bent is going forth to battle, a winged spirit with his bow bent is often represented over him. ⁵ Gibb. ix. 329.

there, for however long, be ruled by its laws, and actuated by its spirit. Now this was not a result necessary, or to have been anticipated *à priori*. By no means. The *Gothic* invaders that conquered and settled in the Roman empire, embraced, almost immediately after, the religion of the conquered, and so were rapidly amalgamated into one people with them. The same was the case with the *Saxons* afterwards, the *Hungarians* of the tenth century, and other invaders. But, as the prediction (thus understood) noted the fact respecting the symbolic locusts, so in the case of the *Saracens* was it fulfilled. Through all their conquests, in countries the most remote, the *Koran*, the book dictated by the Spirit of the abyss to Mahomet, was the code of religion and of law that governed them ;¹ and the Caliphs, invested with civil power, were invested simply in virtue of their religious character and office, as Caliphs or Vicars of the false Prophet.—And hence, in fact, the perpetuation of their character through this period as destroyers to Christians. For the name of that *Spirit of the abyss*, their king, was *Destroyer*. Such it appeared in the doctrine of the Book ; such on the field of battle. And when we consider not only the destruction of bodily life resulting, but also the destruction of soul from the poisonous doctrines of Mahommedism, surely the suitableness will by all be allowed of the name thus given him. Oh what a contrast, (it is one that even Gibbon cannot help alluding to,)² what a contrast in character, doctrine, and results to mankind, between the spirit that animated MAHOMET and his Koran, and the Spirit of HIM and his Gospel against whom Mahomet set himself,—the Prince of Princes, the Lord JESUS :—the one the Spirit of Peace and Salvation ; the other the Abaddon, the Destroyer !³

III. But there was a *term* and *limits* prescribed to these

¹ "It is not the propagation, but the permanency of his religion, that deserves our wonder. The same pure and perfect impression which he engraved at Mecca and Medina, is preserved, after the revolutions of twelve centuries, by the Indian, African, and Turkish proselytes of the Koran." Gibbon, ix. 350.

² ix. 295.

³ We may compare Dan. viii. 23, 24, "A king of fierce countenance, . . . and that shall *destroy* wonderfully : " a description very similar, though the Hebrew *word* there is not מַשְׁחֵה , as here ; and similarly, I believe, in reference to Mahometism.

locusts; a limit as to *effect*,—a limit as to *time*. They were not to *kill* the men of Christendom, so as were the agents under the second woe,¹ i. e. not to annihilate them as a political Christian body; but only to torment them: moreover, while injuring the *men*, they were very singularly not to injure the *grass* or *trees*. Also their tormenting and destroying was limited to the defined period of 150 *days*. These are the next points for investigation.

1. And, first, as to the limit respecting the *grass* and the *trees*.—Strange as such restriction on the scorpion-locusts must appear, (“it was commanded them that they should not hurt the grass of the earth,² neither any green thing, neither any tree,”) yet had it its precise counterpart in the Koran, and in the actions of the otherwise destroying Saracens. The often-quoted order of the Caliph Aboubeker, issued to the Saracen hordes on their first invasion of Syria, “Destroy no palm-trees, nor any fields of corn, cut down no fruit-trees, nor do any mischief to cattle,” was an order originating not from the individual character of the Caliph, but from the precept of Mahomet.³ It was dictated to *him*, not by motives of mercy, but of policy. And its policy was soon evidenced in the rapid formation of flourishing kingdoms out of the countries conquered by the Saracens;—a formation that but for this could never have been accomplished.—But what I wish here to impress on the reader’s mind is its *distinctiveness*, as a *characteristic* of the Saracens. For let him but mark the direct contrast that they herein presented to other conquests and conquerors.

¹ Apoc. ix. 15, 18.

² Τον χορτον της γης. The word χορτος includes corn. So Matt. xiii. 26, ὅτε δε εβλαστησεν ὁ χορτος, και καρπον εποιησε. So again Gen. iii. 18; ix. 3; Sept.

³ So Gibbon, ix. 311. Speaking of the siege of Tayaf, 60 miles south-east of Mecca, he says that “Mahomet violated *his own laws* by the extirpation of the fruit-trees.”—It is curious that, while I am writing, a modern illustration of this law should meet my eyes. In the Evening Mail of Dec. 25, 1839, there occurs, in the Correspondence from Circassia, the following passage. “My host and a man from Semez were disputants; the latter maintaining the impropriety of burning the corn, the former its necessity in the present emergency. Our guest said, ‘It is *contrary to the injunction of our Book*, the Koran.’” (H. A. 1st Ed.)

Compare the merciful ordinance in Deut. xx. 19: for what was dictated by *policy* in the Koran, was dictated by *mercy* as well in the law from Sinai. “When thou shalt besiege a city a long time, in making war against it to take it, thou shalt not destroy the trees thereof by forcing an ax against them: for thou mayest eat of them, and thou shalt not cut them down; for the tree of the field is man’s life. . . Only the trees which thou knowest that they be not trees for meat, them thou shalt destroy and cut them down.”

For example, in the invasions of the Goths, Huns, and Vandals, the desolation of the trees and herbage was a striking feature.¹ The *ερημιαί*, or desert places, that abounded in the provinces conquered by them were long a memorial of it.² Hence in the Apocalyptic prediction of the *Goths* the wasting of the vegetation by them is made a distinct feature of prophecy; in that of the *Saracens*, now before us, there is the foreshowing of the direct reverse.³

2. Further, as to the idolatrous *men* of Roman *Christendom*, there was the limit in the commission of the scorpion-locusts of this woe to the effect that they should not *kill*, or politically annihilate,⁴ but only torment them. And this too must surely seem most singular. But it had its fulfilment. When the reader consults any carefully written history of the Saracens, he will be almost sure to find the notice of their successes followed by a notice of certain remarkable checks that they received after a while; the consequence of which was the preservation of Christendom, both in the East and in the West. And he will find, intermingled with these statements, expressions of surprise and admiration, at checks such as these occurring, after so long and irresistible a progress of success.⁵—Thus, as regards the *Eastern* empire. Twice did the Saracens, in the pride and plenitude of their power, attack the *vital* part of that division of Christendom, by besieging Constantinople;—1st, in the seven years' siege, which lasted from 668 to 675; 2ndly, in the years 716—718, when Leo the Isaurian was on the imperial throne. Alike on either occasion they

¹ "I shall not be easily persuaded," says Gibbon, vi. 21, "that it was the common practice of the Vandals to extirpate the olives, and other fruit-trees, of a country where they intended to settle." But his authorities are against him: and his own narrative embodies the fact. See pp. 377, 378 *suprà*.

² See the strong statements to this effect, from Muratori and others, in Robertson's Charles the 5th, Vol. i, Note 5, E.

³ Theophanes, in his Chronographia, notices that the administration of Persia, after its conquest by the Saracens, was regulated by an actual survey, not only of men, but of cattle and plants of the earth; *εγενετο δε η αναγραφη και ανθρωπων και κτηνων και φυτων*. Gibb. ix. 375. The act was characteristic.

⁴ Compare Hos. xiii. 1.

⁵ So Gibbon x. 2: "The calm historian, . . . who strives to follow the rapid course of the Saracens, must study to explain by what means the Church and State were saved from this impending and, as it should seem, inevitable danger." And Hallam, Middle Ages, ii. 169: "These conquests, which astonish the careless and superficial, are less perplexing to a calm inquirer than their cessation:—the loss of half the Roman empire, than the preservation of the rest." Also *ibid.* p. 3.

were unsuccessful; and obliged to retire, defeated and disgraced, as they had never been before.—Similarly, in the *West*, after that the Visi-gothic empire in Spain had been all but destroyed, A.D. 711, in the fatal battle of Xeres, and when, its remnant and only germ of re-vivification being with Pelayo in the mountains of Asturias, the Moorish Saracens, flushed with victory, attacked, in order completely to destroy that remnant,—their former success forsook them. They were twice repulsed with great loss, and gave up the enterprise. Again, and yet more remarkably, in the year 732, when Abdalrahman and his Moorish Saracens had prolonged a victorious line of march above 1000 miles, from Gibraltar to the Loire, “adjudging to the obedience of the Prophet whatever yet remained of France or Europe, . . and in the full confidence of surmounting all opposition either of nature or of man,”¹—at that crisis, when, as Sismondi declares, “it appeared impossible for France to avoid subjugation,” in the which case all Europe would probably have fallen, and, as regards our own island, “the interpretation of the Koran be now taught in the schools of Oxford, and her pulpits demonstrate to a circumcised people the truth and sanctity of the revelation of Mahomet,”—at that crisis a bulwark was raised up most unexpectedly by the Franks under Charles Martel. The Saracens recoiled broken and discomfited from the blows of him who was called the *hammer* of Western Christendom; and “Europe owes its existence, its religion, and its liberty, to his victory.” Historians, I repeat, agree in speaking of these deliverances of Christendom as events of which, at the time, there could have been no reasonable anticipation. But to the student of the Apocalypse, who has thus far followed and agreed with me, it will appear all accounted for. It was said to the Saracen locusts, “that they should not *kill*,” not politically annihil-

¹ Gib. x. 21, 23; Sismondi, ii. 48. In Vol. ix. p. 483, Gibbon thus notices, further, the design of the Moorish conqueror Musa against all Christendom:—“to extinguish in Gaul and Italy the declining kingdoms of the Franks and Lombards; to preach the unity of God on the altar of the Vatican; thence, subduing the barbarians of Germany, to follow the course of the Danube to the Euxine Sea; to overthrow the Greek or Roman empire of Constantinople; and, returning from Europe to Asia, to unite his new acquisitions with Antioch and the province of Syria.”

ate the united Church and State of Christendom, either in the East, or in any one of the kingdoms of the West;—however scorpion-like they might mutilate the political body, and torment the men, its constituents. In attempting to *annihilate* them, they exceeded their commission, and were repulsed.

3. Once more there was a restriction as to *time*. It was to a period of *five months*, or *150 days*,¹ that their commission was confined, to injure the inhabitants of Roman Christendom.—In order to the understanding of which restrictive clause, (a clause that will necessarily detain us some length of time,) it is important, indeed essential, that the reader should bear in mind two things:—1st, that the period noted is not that of the *duration* of the symbolic locusts, but of their *aggressively striking, injuring, and tormenting* the men of Roman Christendom, with their lion-like teeth and scorpion-stings:² 2ndly, that the period intended by the 150 days is, if I am right, *150 years*. For I adhere to the principle of expounding a *day* as significant of a *year*, in the chronological periods of symbolic prophecy:—a principle early suggested, as I have already intimated,³ and partially applied, by certain old prophetic expositors of eminence; and subsequently, and in more modern times, adopted and fully carried out by *Mede*, and most other English Protestant interpreters after him. An examination of the objections lately urged against it, by Dr. S. R. Maitland and others, will of course be necessary. This I reserve for my comment on Apoc. xiii, as the most fitting occasion. For the present I will only repeat my deliberate conviction of the truth of the principle; and beg attention to the remark that, in its application both here and elsewhere, it will be my care to allow myself no more license or latitude than such as we find distinct precedent and authority for

¹ For 30 days went to a month. E. g. if we compare Gen. vii. 11 and viii. 3, 4, it will appear that 150 days are the equivalent of five months.

² Verse 5; “And it was given them that they (the apostatized Christians) should be tormented by them *five months*; and their torment was as the torment of a scorpion when it has struck a man; and in those days men shall desire to die, and death shall flee from them.” Verse 10; “And their power is to injure (*αδικησαι*) the men *five months*.”—The period seems to me to be twice noticed, only by way of emphasis; somewhat like those in Apoc. xii. 6, 14; xx. 4, 6. See my Note ² p. 464 *infra*.

³ p. 414 *supra*.

in other Scripture chronological prophecies ; prophecies allowed on all hands to have received their fulfilment.

This premised, we turn to the history of the Saracenic warfare against Roman Christendom, to see whether there be discernible in it any well-marked period of five symbolic months, or 150 years, defining what we may call the *intensity of the woe* :—in other words that of the irresistible *aggressive* movement of the symbolic locusts ; (irresistible, except with the reserve implied in the restriction as to *effect* already noted ;) and that of the full outflowing of the venom of their scorpion-stings, to wound and to torment.

In the carrying out of which inquiry, the first question of course must be, *from what act or event*, as an epoch, to date the *commencement* of the period. And here,—just as in regard of those two famous ancient prophecies, the one Jeremiah's, respecting the seventy years of the Babylonish captivity, the other Daniel's, respecting the seventy weeks to the Messiah,¹—it is not *one* epoch only that suggests itself, as that from which we might reasonably date the commencement of the period we speak of, but *two* or *three*. Thus, did we know when first the idea established itself in Mahomet's mind of preaching his new and false religion, *that* perhaps might be considered a fit epoch of commencement ; as being the time when the key of the abyss was given to Satan.² Next there was that of the year A.D. 609, when Mahomet began *privately* to preach his divine mission, and so, before his family, there rose up the smoke of the abyss ; and, yet again, that of 612, when he first *publicly* announced his prophetic mission,³ and so publicly caused the smoke of the pit of darkness to rise up before the eyes of men. Fourthly, there was the epoch of the year 629, when the locust-armies first issued out of the

¹ Jer. xxv. 11 ; Dan. ix. 24.

² Bishop Newton on Dan. xi. follows Prideaux in making A.D. 606 the year in which Mahomet retired to his cave to forge this imposture.

³ Gibbon ix. 255, 256, 284.—Elmacin (Hist. Sarac. p. 3) thus notes the chronology of these acts. "Ut annos implevit 40 vocatus fuit ad munus propheticum : anno autem ætatis suæ 44 manifestavit vocationem ; ante enim elanculũ tantũ invitavit ad Islamismum." He adds afterwards, "Anno decimo quarto migravit Mohammed Medinam."—Hence his supposed prophetic call was in the fourteenth year previous to the flight of Medina : or (since this flight gave date to the famous Mahommedan æra of the *Hegira*, A.D. 622) A.D. 609.

smoke, to make their attack on Syrian Christendom.¹—Now out of these four epochs I agree with Daubuz in selecting the *third*. I prefer it to the two first, because in regard of the term of duration of any public woe, we ought, I think, to have some *noted public* act, and not anything merely *private*, to mark both its commencement and its end. And I am led to it, in preference to the *last*, because the commencing epoch of 612 has, as we shall see, a suitable epoch of termination corresponding with it, whereas that of 629 has none.²—It is to be observed, that in the circumstances of this public opening of his mission, A.D. 612, there was then for the first time expressed that principle of propagating his false religion by violence and with the sword, which made his followers a woe to all the countries near them, and was specially a declaration of war on Christendom. Nay, more: the organization might then be said to have begun, the destroying commission to have been given, and in the person of *Ali*, whom *Mahomet* named the *Lion of God*, the locust-form, with its lion-teeth and scorpion-sting, to have been discernible in the smoke from the just opened pit. For what passed on that occasion? “Who,” said Mahomet, after announcing his mission, “will be my Vizier and Lieutenant?” “O prophet,” replied Ali, “I am the man. Whoever rises against thee, I will dash out his teeth, tear out his eyes, break his legs, rip up his belly. O Prophet, I will be thy Vizier.” On which I find Mr. Hallam thus observing:³ “These words of Mahomet’s early and illustrious disciple are, as it were, a text upon which the commentary expands into the whole Sara-

¹ It is to be observed that the Christians in Arabia, and along the Red Sea, suffered previously to the year 629 from Mahomet’s persecutions: e. g. those of *Dawmat Al Jandal*; as related by Al Jannabi, p. 147, referred to in the Mod. Univ. Hist. i. 137. Some were Roman subjects.

² Some object to the application of this principle, for the determining of the commencing epoch of the woe. To myself, common sense seems to require it. On what other principle do we decide on the particular Persian Edict of restoration, whence to date the 70 weeks of Daniel? So too as to the 400 years of Gen. xv. 13.

Mr. Birks prefers reckoning from Mahomet’s death, and the Caliph Aoubeker’s accession, A.D. 632, to 782, when Haroun Al Raschid carried on a fierce and successful aggression on the Eastern Empire, and concluded, he says, a treaty by which the empire was declared a permanent tributary to the Caliph. I again refer the reader to some subsequent remarks on this point, p. 464, and the *double* reckoning of the 150 years, also preferred by Mr. Birks.

³ Middle Ages, ii. 166, 167.

cenic history." And, just as in the case of the 400 years of affliction and servitude, predicted as to befall Abraham's seed,¹ the epoch of Isaac's mocking by Ishmael has by some been fixed on as that of the commencement of the period, because that in that mocking laugh there was manifested the spirit and the germ of what was more fully developed afterwards,²—so, in the case before us, the epoch of the announcement and first manifestation of the bitter, fanatic, persecuting spirit of Mahommedism against all opposers, or even dissentients, may as justly be fixed on as that of the commencement of the 150 years of the chief virulence of the Saracenic woe. "After the year 612," says the Modern Universal History, "Mahomet sought to propagate his religion with all his might."³

But supposing the epoch of the *commencement* of the woe thus fixed, when may we consider that its five months' period of intensity *ended*? Not evidently during the progress of the aggressive religious wars and victories of the Saracen Moslems. Not, that is to say, during the *first* prophetic month (or thirty years) from this commencing epoch of 612, in the course of which Syria and Egypt fell before them:—not during the *second* month, in which month Cilicia was reduced to obedience, their inroads advanced to near Constantinople, and the African province invaded:—not during the *third* month, that in which the subjugation of Africa was all but completed;—or the *fourth*, in which Spain was subdued, and the south and centre of France almost to the Loire.⁴ The earliest date for the end of the chief intensity of the Saracenic woe, that can for a moment be thought probable, is that of the battle of Poic-

¹ Gen. xv. 13.

² So by Dr. A. Clarke, ad loc. He compares Gal. iv. 29.

³ Mahomet's celebrated Letter to Chosroes the Persian king, enjoining him to acknowledge him as the Apostle of God, and on his refusal, and tearing the letter, declaring, "God will so tear the kingdom of Chosroes," occurred as early as A.D. 615, according to Boulainvilliers. See his Life of Mahomet. Gibbon would place it somewhat later. Gibbon, viii. 226.

⁴ The Syrian war was from 632 to 638, A.D.; the Egyptian from 638 to 640; the African began 647. The conquests of the Saracens, suspended in Africa near twenty years, were resumed 665, and in 689 advanced to the Atlantic. In A.D. 670 Cairoan was founded, their African capital. The conquest of Africa was completed in a war from 698 to 709. That of Spain occupied them from 710 to 713. That of the south of France, from the Garonne to the Rhone, was effected, 721; to the Loire, 731.—The battle of Poitiers was in the month of October, 732: i. e. (as it would seem that the date of Mahomet's public opening of his mission, A.D. 612, was in an earlier

tiers, already spoken of, in which Charles Martel defeated them, and which occurred in October 732, the beginning of the *fifth* prophetic month. But though defeated, or at least repulsed, on that memorable occasion,¹ their power and spirit to aggress and to torment, with all the bitterness of fanaticism, was not terminated. "The vanquished spoilers," says Mosheim,² "soon recovered their strength and ferocity; and returned with new violence to their devastations." In *France* the strength and power of the Saracens was so far from being crushed, that we find its Southern districts continued in subjection to them till the middle of this century. Charles Martel besieged Narbonne, the chief town of the Saracens, in vain after the battle.³ In 739 he had to invoke aid from Luitprand king of the Lombards against the Saracens, who had taken all the chief cities in Provence, and extended their ravages as high as Vienne, near Lyons.⁴ Nor were they finally driven out till some 15 or 20 years afterwards.⁵ In Spain the tide of their success and supremacy, notwithstanding the ill success of their efforts at totally extinguishing Pelayo and the Gothic remnant, had not yet begun to ebb.⁶ In Africa, some twenty years after the battle of Poitiers, the torment of the scorpion-sting so operated, as to induce nearly the whole Christian population of the province to apostatize, and become Mussulman.⁷ From east to west, throughout the vast Mahomedan world, one Caliph still governed the locust-hordes in the name of the Prophet. Their power remained unbroken.

But just about the middle of the eighth century a change

month than October, perhaps July,) at the beginning of the *fifth* prophetic month. So Daubuz, pp. 414, 415.

¹ "It is now believed that the slaughter at the battle near Poitiers was by no means immense, and even that the Saracens retired without a decisive action." So Mr. Hallam, Note 14 to the Supplement to his Middle Ages. He refers to Sismondi ii. 132, Michelet ii. 13.

² H. E. viii. 1. 2. 2.

³ Michelet, Hist. of France.

⁴ This is stated in Paul Warnefrid's History of the Lombards: and he says that Luitprand, accordingly, crossed the Alps to give the requested aid to Charles Martel.

⁵ Pepin recovered Septimania and Narbonne not till A.D. 759. Sism. ii. 59.

⁶ Fleury (Hist. Eccles. ix. 297) gives from Sandoval (p. 87) the substance of a treaty between an Arabian chief, (respecting which see Cornwall Lewis on the Romannt, p. 118,) and the Goths and Romans of Coimbra in Portugal, fixing the tax to be paid by them for permission to live as Christians; a treaty of the date A.D. 734.

⁷ In A.D. 750 a lieutenant of Africa informed the Caliph that the tribute of the Infidels was abolished by their conversion. Gibb. ix. 495.

occurred, marked by two events of such a nature, and such importance, as to be regarded by historians, both the one and the other, as constituting epochs most memorable in the Saracenic history. The change was this. The *Abbasides*, descendants of a different family of the early followers of Mahomet, in the year 750 supplanted the *Omniades* in the Caliphate. —And then what followed? First the one and only survivor of the deposed and proscribed family escaped to Spain: and behold he was there received, acknowledged, and established as the lawful Caliph. This was in the year A.D. 755. So at length was the Caliphate divided. There was thenceforth a Caliph in the West, in opposition to the Caliph in the East. “The Colossus,” says Sismondi, “that had bestridden the whole South was now broken.” And he adds, “This revolution did more for the deliverance of Europe from the Mussulman arms than even the battle of Poitiers.”¹—Such was the *first* notable result.

Further, out of this change of dynasty, a *second* most important consequence followed in the East. The new Abbassidean Caliph, dissatisfied with the *Syrian* capital, where his rivals and enemies, the Omniades, had so long lived and reigned, determined on building another on the *western bank of the Tigris*, where a canal with the waters from the *Euphrates* joined it,² just a few miles beyond the old Roman Euphratean frontier. It was in the year 762 that Almanzor there laid its foundations; and thither the government and head of the locusts then took its flight, far eastward, away from Christendom. This was the era, as Daubuz well calls it, of the *settlement* of the locusts.³ They no more roved, he says, in a body as before, in quest of new conquests. And so Dean Waddington; ⁴ “The [Arab] conquerors now settled tranquilly in the countries they had subdued.” In fact the ancient warlike spirit, at least in this eastern

¹ Fall of Roman Empire, Vol. ii. p. 92. He dates it about the middle of August.

² See the Mod. Univ. Hist. Vol. ii. pp. 277, 279, 284, for a full account of the building of Bagdad, and with the original Arabic authorities subjoined. The palace of Al Manzor, and the oldest part of the city, were built on the *western* or *Euphratean* side; the fort of Al Mohdi on the eastern; round which the city afterwards chiefly gathered.—So Benjamin of Tudela also reports of the site of one of the Caliph’s palaces in his time; i. e. in 1170, as “on an arm of the *Euphrates*.”—Travels, ch. xii.

³ Daubuz, p. 415.—It is to Daubuz that we are indebted for this explanation of the 150 years.

⁴ Church Hist. ii. 44.

divisions, had ceased to animate them as of old. "War," says Gibbon, "was no longer the passion of the Saracens."¹ The very name that the Caliph gave to the new capital, was but an indication of the comparatively peaceable character that was thenceforth to attach to the Saracens. It was named *Medinat al Salem*, the *City of Peace*.—The æra is further noted by historians as that of the *decline* of the Saracenic power. So Gibbon observes;² "In this *City of Peace*, amidst the riches of the East, the Abbassides . . . aspired to emulate the magnificence of the Persian Kings." . . . "The luxury of the Caliphs (i. e. of the Abbassides) relaxed the nerves, and *terminated the progress*, of the Arabian empire." So too Mills, in his *History of Mahomedism*;³ "The period preceding was that of . . . the rise of the Saracenic power; that which succeeds of . . . its decline and fall:" and Hallam; "The Abbassides . . . never attained the real strength of their predecessors."⁴—Nor must I omit to observe on the manner in which the very geographical position of the new capital contributed to the relaxation of the woe. For not merely with reference to *maritime* enterprises against it, as Mr. Hallam suggests,⁵ but with reference to *military* also, the distance of the new seat of government added to the difficulty, and diminished the temptation. The locusts were no more in such immediate contact, as before, with Eastern Christendom.

And now, behold, instead of aggressive war on the part of the Saracens, aggression has begun against them, and victoriously too, on the part of the Christians. In the *West*, under the son of Charles Martel, Narbonne and Septimania were in the year 759 recovered, and the Saracens driven beyond the Pyrenees.⁶ Again in 761, as Baronius marks the date,⁷ the Christian remnant in the mountains of Spain, under the first Alphonzo, began to roll back the tide of war on their Saracen oppressors.—It was the same in the *East*. There Constantine Copronymus, the then reigning emperor, seized the opportunity for avenging the

¹ x. 41.² *Ibid.* 36, 40.³ As referred to by Faber, *Sacred Calendar*, ii. 285.⁴ *Middle Ages*, ii. 173.⁵ *Ibid.* 177.⁶ See Sismondi, ii. 59, and the *Univ. Hist.* xxii. 393. Gibbon, x. 27, dates it A.D. 755.⁷ Others give the date A.D. 757.

wrongs, and enlarging the limits, of the Greek empire.¹—So that the septenary of years begun A.D. 755, and ending 762, is obviously every way remarkable, as the period of the deliverance of Christendom from the chief terror and persecution of the Saracens. And either its year of commencement, 755, or that of its termination, 762, is just the fittest epoch, so far as I see, the one or the other, at which to consider the intensity of the Saracen woe as terminated.²

And what then the *length* of the *period of intensity and aggression*, thus defined?—It is possible that the exact time when the idea was first formed by Mahomet of acting the part of false prophet, and when thus the *key was used* wherewith to open for him the pit of the abyss, may have been about the year 605,³—four years before his private preaching; and so have furnished a date of *inceptive commencement*, corresponding with the year 755, as that of the *inceptive termination*. But the epoch of decided commencement may rather be fixed, as we have said, at Mahomet's public opening of his mission, A.D. 612; and the epoch of full termination,—as regarded the *Greek* empire at least, to which in this and the next Trumpet there seems all through a special reference,—at the removal of the Caliphate to Bagdad, A.D. 762. Indeed there is in the next vision, as it seems to me, a direct allusion to this removal, as constituting an epoch recognised and marked out for notice in the Apocalyptic prophecy. And the interval between these dates of commencement and termination is, as the reader sees, precisely that laid down in the prophecy; viz. *five prophetic months*, or 150 years.

AND now we have discussed, I think, all the prophetic details, and seen their truth and their fulfilment; more especially as characterizing the Saracen woe during its

¹ Gibb. x. 52.—How strange, when such were the facts, the statement of Dean Woodhouse; that “the progressive conquests of the Saracen Mahometans continued more than double the length of the period of 150 years!”

² Andreas, I observe, also suggests two periods, the 1st of greater intensity. See my Sketch of his Exposition in the History of Apocalyptic Interpretation, Vol. iv.

³ Prideaux and Newton say A.D. 606, as observed p. 457, Note 2.

term of chief intensity, the above-mentioned 150 years.—A discussion this somewhat discursive; and which has forced us, like the historian of the Decline and Fall, though all in relevancy to his and our great topic, into inquiries respecting “the genius of the Arabian prophet, the manners of his nation, and spirit of his religion.”¹ It is to be remembered, however, that this period did not define the whole duration of the Saracen power or woe.² It was but, I conceive, a marked primary period, within the whole period of this 5th Trumpet vision; just like another noted (the parallel is observable) as a primary marked period of the *second* woe, under the 6th Trumpet.³—And thus it seems fitting that we glance, ere we quit the subject, at what remained of the history of these Apocalyptic locusts, after the ending of their first 150 years, and memorable flight beyond Euphrates, which later history of them was one of a period during much of which the woe on Christendom might seem to have been almost *bound*; and bound, as I have already hinted at as foreshown in the prophecy, and shall in my next Chapter have more fully to notice, by that selfsame *Euphratean* locality.

There then, far East, in Bagdad and the country round it,—after a brief temporary splendour, and temporary revival too into military enterprise and success, (though not the enterprise of *aggressive warfare*,) from 781 to 805,

¹ “The genius of the Arabian prophet, the manners of his nation, and the spirit of his religion, involve the causes of the decline and fall of the Eastern empire: and our eyes are curiously intent on one of the most memorable revolutions, which have impressed a new and lasting character on the nations of the globe.” ix. 218.

² In proof that the woe had not wholly terminated, yet that its character, in respect of aggressiveness, strength, and bitter religious venom against Christians, was very different from what it had been before, I may refer the reader to the history of the Abbassidean Caliphs, from after their removal to Bagdad, in the *Modern Univ. Hist.* Vol. ii. Mohadi’s war, A. D. 781, against the Greek empire was, as Gibbon says, (x. 52,) *retributive*.

And hence, in fact, the opinion propounded by some expositors (Mr. Birks the latest, *Mystery of Providence*, pp. 302—305,) as to two periods, of 150 years each, being indicated as the *full* duration of the woe, by the twice exprest mention of the period of five months:—the *first* that of *tormenting*, as in verse 5; the *second* that of *injuring* merely, as in verse 10. But since verse 4 ascribes the *αδικια*, or *injuring*, to the five months’ period, on its *first* mention, and verse 10 the *tormenting* scorpion’s sting to the period on its *second* mention, I cannot think we are warranted in thus interpreting. Rather it seems to me to be only emphatic; like the twice exprest mention of the 1000 years in Apoc. xx. 3, 5, which does not imply two millenniums: or, as Joseph said to Pharaoh, Gen. xli. 32, that his dream was doubled to mark its certainty.

³ Apoc. ix. 15; “An hour and day and month and year.”

under the reigns of Mohadi and Haroun al Raschid, wherein the Greek Emperors who had provoked it suffered painfully,¹—we must think of the once terrible power of the Saracens as declined and declining: luxury and licentiousness working their usual sure process of decay with both prince and people, and the fervour of religious fanaticism past away. At length in the year 841 the reigning Caliph, distrusting the martial spirit of his Arabs, hired a band of 50,000 Turkmans from beyond the Oxus, to be the support of the Caliphate at Bagdad: and these, acting precisely the same part as the Roman Prætorian guards before them, revolted against, insulted, humiliated, and deposed the Caliphs; and so, in this case too, became a further and powerful accelerating cause of their sovereigns' downfall.—Meanwhile among the Moslems both in Africa, and in Asia, the example of the Spanish schism had had its imitators. At Fez and Tunis, in Egypt and in Syria, in Chorasán to the North, and Persia to the East, new and independent dynasties were set up in the course of the ninth century: until at length, as the tenth century opened, the *Futimites*,—descendants of that *Ali*, Mahomet's first Vizier, of whom we have before spoken,² and of his wife

¹ That these were not *aggressive* acts on the part of the Abbassidean Caliphs, but *retributive*, is expressly stated by Gibbon, x. 52, 54, 55. He says: "In the bloody conflict of the Omniades and Abbassides the Greeks had stolen the opportunity of avenging their wrongs, and *enlarging their limits*. But a severe *retribution* was exacted by Mohadi, the third Caliph of the new dynasty." An army of 95,000 men, under his son Haroun al Raschid, after desolating Asia Minor, appeared A.D. 782, to the terror of the empress Irene, opposite Constantinople, who bought favour by the promise of a tribute. "As often as they [the Greeks] declined the payment of tribute, they were taught to feel that a month of depredation was more costly than a year of submission." So when Nicephorus, on his accession, added to his refusal to pay the defiant message, "Irene submitted to pay a tribute: . . . restore the fruits of your injustice, or abide the determination of the sword." So again afterwards, when Nicephorus felt "encouraged to violate the peace." In every case, during these wars of Haroun al Raschid against the Romans, which Gibbon (x. 52) dates as from 781 to 805, the *aggression*, or *αδικια*, was on the part of the Greeks. And so too on the only other occasion recorded by Gibbon of the Saracens of Bagdad invading Greek Christendom; viz. in 838, when Amorium was destroyed by the Caliph Motassem. Moreover in every case these were but desolating inroads, not territorial conquests.

From what has been said the unfitness of Mr. Birks' terminating epoch (A.D. 782) of the first 150 years of the Saracenic woe will be, I think, apparent. It includes the 20 years before 782, when the Greeks were successfully aggressing on the Saracens, not the Saracens on the Greeks. It makes the war of 781, 782 one of Saracenic *aggression*, when it was one of *retribution*. Once more, it draws the line of division at 782, in the middle of Haroun's wars against the Greeks; which wars Gibbon classes together, as continued from 781 to 805.

² P. 458 *suprà*.

Fatima, Mahomet's favourite daughter,—asserted their rightful claim, not to independent *political* sovereignty only, but even to the *Caliphate* itself: in the prosecution of this claim reduced Africa, Egypt, and Syria; and, from *Cairo* as their capital, became known as the *third* Caliphate of Islamism, excommunicating and excommunicated by its rivals, both at *Cordova* and at *Bagdad*.—Thus more and more dismembered, the Abbassidean Caliphate at Bagdad more and more languished: until the Persian independent Moslem dynasty of the Bowides, interposing on occasion of the factions there prevalent, advanced in the year 934 to Bagdad; stripped the Caliph of his *secular* office and supremacy; and reduced him to his *spiritual* functions as chief Pontiff of Islamism, the mere phantom thenceforward of departed power. The four angels continued *bound* as it were, and that for a long inaction, by the Euphrates.

Such was the progressive decline of the *Eastern* Saracens; and in that decline their brethren in the *West* in a measure participated. Throughout the ninth century the Christians of Spain were ever gaining ground on their Moorish oppressors. In 904 the capital of Asturias was advanced from Oviedo in the Gallician mountains to Leon; and that of Arragon from Jaca, in the Pyrenean valleys, to Pampeluna.—The spirit of bravery and enterprise indeed had not yet left the Western Arabs. It appeared in the Spanish battle-fields. It appeared in the exploits of the marauding bands that issued both from Spain and Africa:—of whom some, ere the middle of the ninth century, conquered the islands of Crete and Sicily; attacked, though vainly, Rome itself; nor were expelled from their conquests, till after a tenure of above a century in Crete, and two centuries in Sicily.¹—But these were but like the marauding enterprises of the Normans of the eleventh century; indeed not so remarkable. The strength of the lions' teeth, and the venom too of the early religious

¹ *Crete* was seized by Saracens from Spain A.D. 823; regained by the Greek emperor Nicephorus Phocas, A.D. 960.—*Sicily* was attacked by Saracens from Africa A.D. 827; subdued 878; reconquered by the Normans, for the Greek empire, A.D. 1060—1090.—*Rome* was attacked by the Saracens from Sicily A.D. 846; repulsed by Pope Leo the 4th, A.D. 849.

fanaticism, was greatly wanting.¹ The *intensity* of the woe to Christendom had evidently passed away. The Saracenic conquests and incursions in Crete, Sicily, and Italy, were but a memento of what had been.

There remains just one other point to which I would wish to call attention, ere concluding this present Chapter; I mean the fact of two remarkable coincidences between certain notable epochs in the history of the Saracen woe already noticed, and others equally notable in the ecclesiastical and religious history of Eastern Christendom. Its *apostasy*, its *open* apostasy from Christ,² has been mentioned as the predicted cause of the infliction; and further how Mahomet and the early Saracen Moslems, understanding their special commission to be against *idolaters*, avowed that it was as regarding its people in *that* character, that they carried the war into Roman Christendom. Now throughout the seventh century this charge was made against them by their conquerors and tormentors altogether ineffectually. At length, some twenty years, or less, from the commencement of the eighth century, the celebrated Isaurian family was raised to the imperial throne of Constantinople. And its princes, otherwise doubtless illustrious, became chiefly so on this account, because for sixty years almost uninterruptedly,—supported by not a few really religious, as even Gibbon admits,³ but with opposition

¹ In proof of the *former* point we may illustrate from the facts of both the Sicilian and Roman campaigns. To effect the conquest of *Sicily*, it cost the Saracens above 50 years; viz. from A.D. 827 to 878; notwithstanding the weakness of the Greek occupants of the island to resist them. Again the attack on *Rome* was but a marauding attack; which even the weak Papal government, aided by some Greek ships from Gaeta, Naples, and Amalphi, was able to repulse. So Gibbon: “the [old] design of conquest and dominion was degraded to a repetition of predatory inroads.” x. 61.

In proof of the *latter* point, let it be observed that the marauding band that attacked and conquered Crete, did, in their marauding voyage from Alexandria, pillage alike the settlements of *Mohammedans* and of *Christians*, and destroy *mosques* as well as *churches*. Says Gibbon, x. 57, “The conquest of Crete is *disclaimed* by their own writers.”—Again in Western Spain, where Christians were held in subjection, we read that from soon after 757 Abdulrahman, the Moorish king, changed the former mode of treating his Christian subjects to one of greater mildness. In the ninth and tenth centuries the Saracens even courted alliances with Christian powers. Hallam, ii. 4.

² It was against “the men that had not God’s mark on their foreheads.”

³ ix. 122; “They (the monks) were now opposed by the murmurs of many simple or rational Christians; who appealed to the evidence of texts, of facts, and of primitive times, and secretly desired the reformation of the Church.”

bitter and abiding from the great majority within the empire, and the Roman Popes without it,¹—they set themselves strenuously to wipe away the reproach of image-worship, at least from Eastern Christendom.² And what followed? It was in A.D. 717, very soon after the emperor Leo's accession,³ who even then was secretly bent on this reform of the Church, that the grand armament of the Saracens attacked Constantinople. It attacked it, but was completely defeated and repulsed.—Again, in A.D. 754, Constantine Copronymus, the successor of Leo in determination of spirit on this point,⁴ as well as in the throne and kingdom, (it is of his public acts simply that I now speak,) convened a grand synod at Constantinople,—the seventh General Council, as he most properly called it, though it was afterwards stigmatized and disowned,—for the express purpose of condemning image-worship. It passed that public sentence of condemnation on it; and behold the very next year, as historians record, the Caliphate was divided; the Mahommedan colossus broken; the scorpion-locusts carried away, as by a strong west wind, to the Euphrates; the intensity of the Saracenic woe brought to an end.

Alas! the efforts of these emperors and of the more enlightened of their subjects, always resisted by the majority, proved abortive.—In the year 781 *Irene* succeeded to the imperial throne: and, having murdered her iconoclastic husband, who stood in the way of her object, she gathered in 787 another synod, the famous seventh General Council;⁵ in the which the decrees of the former Council were

¹ They were branded with the reproachful name of *iconoclasts*:—a name of reproach which, by a curious coincidence, was the very selfsame applied by the heathen Sophist Eunapius, in the latter half of the 4th century, to the Christians of that time, as *the destroyers of heathen idols*.

² Gibb. ix. 129, 130, describes both the determination of the then reigning Emperor Constantine, and the reluctance of most of his subjects to it. Προγραμμα γαρ εξεπεμψε πασα πασαν εξαρχιαν την υπο της χειρος αυτου, παντας υπογραψαι και ομνυναι του αθετησαι την προσκυνησιων των σεπτων εικονων. So John Damascenus, Op. i. 625; quoted by Gibbon.

³ His accession was Mar. 25, the Saracen attack July 15. Sismondi ii. 40.

⁴ Theophanes, on the 27th year of Copronymus, complains that whosoever said Θεοτοκε βοηθει, in address to the Virgin Mary, was punished as an enemy to the king. See the Dissertation on the Byzantine coinage in Ducange's Supplement, p. 27.

⁵ Called also the second Council of Nice.

reprobated and disavowed, and the worship of images, by a solemn act of the Catholic Church, declared lawful. It was just about this time that the Saracenic woe, though already broken, seemed as if it had received a temporary revivification. Guided by Haroun Al Raschid, (as already before intimated,) the Arab forces from Bagdad swept across the Lesser Asia, on provocation from the Greek Emperor, not once only, but eight times, bearing down all opposition before them. Was there not a memento of warning from heaven in it?—But the Eastern Church persisted. Under the influence of the empress Theodora the struggle ended finally, in the year 842, in the undisputed ascendancy and establishment of image-worship.—And what then the consequence? With characteristic forbearance, as we have seen, the Lord continued to this guilty people the interval of mitigation and of respite, through the ninth and much of the tenth century. But would He endure the provocation much longer? How long would be the respite before another woe?¹

CHAPTER VI.

PAUSE BETWEEN THE FIFTH AND SIXTH TRUMPETS.

“ONE woe is past!—Behold there come two more woes hereafter.”² Apoc. ix. 12.

When might the Saracen woe be said to have fully ended?—Perhaps we might fix on the epoch of A.D. 934, ✓ when the Caliphate at Bagdad was stripped, as has been noted, of its temporal power: quickly following on which was the period from 960 to 980 or 985, when public evidence of the fact was exhibited to Christendom, in the conquest, from those once terrible enemies, of Crete, Cyprus, Cilicia, Antioch; when the Greek arms were borne tri-

¹ Our Homily on Peril of Idolatry, Part ii, speaks similarly of the *idolatry* of professing Christendom as the cause of the Saracenic and Turkish woes.

² There is no difference of the least importance between the texts of the received and the critical editions.

umphantly eastward, even across the Euphrates; and, in the West, the last great attempt of the Moorish Saracens against the rising Christian kingdoms in Spain, was, after a temporary success, totally repulsed, and the Moslems, with continually contracted dominions, reduced finally, and almost for ever, to the defensive.¹ Let us take then this epoch, which dates, we said, near about the *middle of the tenth century*. In correspondence with it there seems to have been a pause in the prophetic representations: and perhaps too a silence from tempests in the firmamental heaven; such as that noticed as occurring before the blowing of the Trumpets.² And nothing broke it to the Evangelist on the Apocalyptic scene, but the solemn intimation, "One woe is past! Behold there come two more woes after it."

The æra that I suppose here referred to is one memorable in European history, for a panic of very remarkable origin and results, which then began intensely to agitate men's minds, especially in Western Christendom. It was supposed that with the end of the tenth century *the world would end* also. The opinion arose, doubtless, from Augustine's interpretation of the Apocalyptic *millennium*, as that *millennial* or rather *quasi-millennial* period of Christ's triumph by his Church over Satan, which, beginning at his first advent and miracles, would only terminate with Satan's re-loosing and Antichrist's manifestation, just before the consummation of all things.³ I say *quasi-millennial*, because in Augustine's own mind, we have seen, as well as in that of interpreters following him in the fifth and sixth centuries, the full definite value of 1000 years was not supposed to attach to

¹ I allude to the wars of Almanzor, Vizir of Haccham the 2nd; who for a short time almost revived the Saracen woe to the Spanish Christians. In A.D. 980, he attacked and defeated them, and destroyed Leon and Barcelona; but was in 990 and 998 defeated by Dons Sancho and Garcia: and, after the latter repulse, in despair committed suicide. "With him," says the learned writer in the English Univ. Hist. xxii. 411, "expired the fortune of the Cordovan Moors." So too Hallam ii. 4.

² See p. 325 *suprà*.

³ Mosheim (x. 2. 3. 3) speaks of the opinion as first springing up in the *ninth* century; "superiori jam sæculo ex loco Johannis Apoc. xx. 3, 4, nata." He does not however advert to Augustine's interpretation of that passage: an interpretation grounded by him on our Lord's saying, Matt. xii. 29, "No man can enter a strong man's house, &c., unless he first bind the strong man;" and which I shall have to set forth more fully in the closing Part of this Work.—So too Lücke ap. Hagenbach on Doctrines, ii. 127.

this ecclesiastical millennium. Their expectation that *the sabbatism* of the saints would ensue after the world's lasting 6000 years, and their belief in the Septuagint chronology, which reckoned 5500, or else 5350, or at least 5200, out of the 6000, to have already elapsed at the Nativity,¹ made them construe the Apocalyptic millennium as only that interval which yet remained after Christ's birth to complete the sixth millenary; perhaps 500 years, or it might be 600, or 700, or a little more.² But the Greek Septuagint with *its* chronology having, in the long interval since Gregory I, been altogether superseded in Western Europe by the Latin Vulgate, and *Hebrew* chronology there given, —and the sabbatical theory too having been probably forgotten in the darkness of those dark ages,—the main point only of Augustine's interpretation was remembered; I mean his construing the time of Satan's binding to signify that of the present supremacy of the Church over him. And the natural and reasonable alteration having been applied to this his opinion about the millennium, of its being not, as he had supposed likely, a mere fraction of a thousand years, but a thousand years fully and exactly, it was scarce possible but that, as the *tenth century* drew near, and yet more after it had begun and was advancing, the subject should be felt as one of intense personal interest. Thus it was then frequently preached on, and by breathless crowds listened to; the subject of every one's thoughts, every one's conversation. The time, they thought, was actually come; the end of all things at hand; the loosing of Satan, Antichrist's manifestation, and, what was most terrible, the day of judgment.³—Belief on such a subject

¹ See p. 396. Augustine's words are these: "Mille anni duobus modis possunt intelligi:—aut quia in ultimis annis mille ista res agitur, i.e. sexto annorum milliario, *cujus nunc spatia posteriora voluntur*, secuturo deinde sabbato quod non habet vesperam; ut hujus milliarii *novissimam partem*, quæ remanebat usque ad terminum sæculi, *mille annos* appellaverit, eo loquendi modo quo pars significatur à toto; aut mille annos pro annis omnibus hujus sæculi posuit." C. D. xx. 7. 2.

² The Vulgate was the Latin translation made by Jerome from the Hebrew; and A.M. 4000 the date of Christ's birth, as computed from it. About the year A.D. 527 *Dionysius*, a Roman abbot, computed from, and mainly contributed to introduce into use, this the *Vulgar Era*.

³ Both Mosheim, ubi sup., and Michelet, *Hist. de France*, iv. 1, furnish interesting illustrations.

1. In the records of the Council of Trosly, held A.D. 909, we read thus. "Dum jam jamque adventus imminet illius in majestate terribili, ubi omnes cum gregibus sui svenient pastores in conspectum pastoris æterni." *Hard.* vi. i. 506.

could not be inoperative. Its form of working took its character from that of the times. Under the impression of its truth multitudes innumerable, says Mosheim, having given their property to monasteries or churches,¹ travelled to Palestine, where they expected Christ to descend to judgment. Others bound themselves by solemn oath to be serfs to churches or to priests; in hopes of a milder sentence on them, as being servants of Christ's servants. In many places buildings were let go to decay, as that of which there would be no need in future. And on occasions of eclipses of sun or moon, the people fled in multitudes for refuge to the caverns and the rocks.—But the time of the consummation, fixed in God's counsels, was not yet. In the Apocalyptic chronology it was written, "One woe hath past: behold there come yet two more woes after them."—The dreaded 1000th year came and past, without any great calamity accompanying; and gradually the alarm and the expectation died away.

Yet there was woe at hand, the prophecy declared, though of another kind;—the woe of the sixth Trumpet. And *where* to fall, and on *whom*? Was it to be on *Western* Christendom: which, though not without spots less dark at times, and points of relief,² had been too universally and progressively settling down since Pope Gregory's time, last-noted,³ into the dæmonolatrous apostasy,⁴ with its pre-

2. Trithemii Chronic. A.D. 960. "Diem jam jam imminere, dicebat (Bernhardus eremita Thuringiæ), extremum et mundum in brevi consummandum."

3. Abbo, Abbot of Fleuri on the Loire, A.D. 990. (Mosheim *ibid.*) "De fine quoque mundi coram populo sermonem in ecclesiâ Parisiorum adolescentulus audivi, quòd statim finito mille annorum numero Antichristus adveniret, et non longo post tempore universale judicium succederet. . . . Fama pæne totum mundum impleverat, quòd quando Annunciatio Dominica in Parasceue contigisset, absque ullo scrupulo finis sæculi esset."

4. Guglielmi Godelli Chronic. (ap. Script. Fr. x. 260.) "A.D. MX in multis locis per orbem, tali rumore audito, timor et mæror corda plurimorum occupavit; et suspicati sunt multi finem sæculi adesse."

5. Rad. Glaber, iv. 49: "Æstimabatur enim ordo temporum et elementorum præterita ab initio moderans secula in chaos decidisse perpetuum, atque humani generis interitum." So in Michelet.

¹ Almost all the donations of this century, says Mosheim, mention* as their occasion, "Appropinquante mundi termino."—See too his notice of the panic, and its passing away, xi. 2. 4. 3.

² Such, I doubt not, were to be found in some few of the Benedictine monasteries; as well as in the more eminent exceptions of reformers, like Claude of Turin.

³ See pp. 404—414 *suprà*.

⁴ Witness, for example, Claude's account of the universal image-worship in his diocese, on his entering it about A.D. 820.

dicted accompaniments (of which more in a later chapter) of clerical fraud, avarice, superstition, and licentiousness;¹ till in the tenth century its moral debasement was such, as to fix on that century the appellation of the *iron age*?² Or was it to fall distinctively on *Rome* itself, the Western religious capital: where all these evils had been long more than elsewhere rampant;³ and where the impiety and profligacy, specially of its popes and cardinals, (witness the names of Theodora, Marozia, and John XII,) had in this same tenth century risen to such a height,⁴ as according, not to Mosheim only, but even to Baronius, might seem

¹ See for the *prediction* Apoc. ix. 20, 21, a passage which will come under full review in Part iii. chap. i; and for *historical proof* of its incipient fulfilment, before the Turkish woe, Mosheim's dark general sketches of the 7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th centuries, with the authorities in his margin.

Let me add, by way of corroboration, (as Dr. S. R. Maitland has lately given a very different colour to the period in his "Dark Ages,") a reference to the following Councils; the ixth and xvth of *Toledo*, Canons 10, 3, respectively held A.D. 655, 693; that of *Chalons*, Canons 14, 15, 18, held 813; that of *Aquis Granum*, Canon 39, &c., held 816; that of *Paris*, Canons 25, 34, 46, held 829; that of *Aquis Granum* again, Canons 11, 12, held 836; and that of *Trosly*, near Soissons, Canon 9, held 909.

In that of 836 the following statement is made respecting certain convents; a statement which will serve to introduce others similar, that will be quoted in Part iii. ch. i, with reference to a later age; "Monasteria puellarum in quibusdam locis potius lupanaria videntur esse quàm monasteria." Hard. iv. 1398. And in that of 829 there seems to be an allusion to a habit, evidently not infrequent, of the clergy being licensed to live in concubinage, for a money-price paid to their ecclesiastical superiors; which will also there be shown by me to have had its continuance and expansion in a later age.—Berengaud, a Benedictine monk of that æra, reprobates it in his *Comment* on Apoc. xviii, as a crying sin of the time: "Scelus pessimum ab iis qui archidiaconi appellantur committitur; ab adulteris presbyteris pretium accipiunt, et tacendo in malum consentiunt." The passage is well worth referring to. The Benedictine Editor refers to the Councils of Paris, Chalons, &c., in illustration. See too in D'Achery, i. 347, &c., Ratherius de Contemptu Canonum, A.D. 950.

² So Baronius; "Sæculum quod pro boni sterilitate ferreum appellari consuevit."

³ The Roman Popes in the 8th and 9th centuries had been the main agents in effecting the enactment and reception of the *idolatrous* canons of the 2nd Council of Nice.—Further, the current though mistaken belief of the existence and story of the *female Pope*, *Joan*, may suffice to characterize the *moral* state of Rome and its pontificate, in the latter part of the same 9th century.

⁴ "Romanorum antistitum qui hoc sæculo vixere historiam non hominum, sed monstrorum, scelerum, flagitiorum atrocissimorum historiam esse, optimi quique scriptores, et ipsi Romanorum pontificum patroni, fatentur." Mosh. x. 2. 2. 2.—Genebrard speaks of the Popes as rather *apostates* than *apostles*. "Hoc quidem infelix quod per annos fere 150 Pontifices circiter 50, à Joanne scilicet VIII ad Leonem IX usque, a virtute majorum prorsus defecerint; *apostatici apostaticque*, potius quàm *apostolici*." Hist. p. 552, on the beginning of the 10th Century, cited by Vitringa, p. 150. And so too Baronius, ad ann. 912.

Of the earlier half of the eleventh, or next succeeding century, let the case of *Benedict IX.* be taken as a sample:—a boy brought up in debauchery, and made Pope at the age of twelve: and of whose subsequent character in the Pontificate, Desiderius, Abbot of Cassino, afterwards Pope Victor III, thus writes; "Cujus quidem post adeptum sacerdotium vita quàm turpis, quàm fæda, quàmque execranda extiterit, horresco referre." Cited by Merle in his *Hist. de la Reform.* i. 29. (Ed. 1839.)

to have cried to heaven, like as from another Sodom, for vengeance?

No! not so! For Antichrist (supposing our presumption as to his identity with the Roman Popes correct) had not yet grown up in those Western regions to full maturity of development: and it was in God's purpose, as before said, that for this his predicted *complete development* scope and time should be given.—For the present *Eastern Christendom* was to be again the chief and primary sufferer: it being indeed sunk as deeply as the West in *apostasy*; though not, like it, subject to a single *heading Antichrist*. Here it was, I say, and *near about this time*, that the new woe was fated to fall: although certainly at the time spoken of, judging by human calculations, the probability of such a visitation might have seemed very small.

It was the second Basil who was then on the throne of Constantinople:¹ his long reign having extended from the year 976 through the first quarter of the 11th century. And when we think what, on his looking around, and considering what was and had been, must have past before him, it will be found that he might reasonably, as I said, on mere human calculations, have prognosticated prosperity and splendour, rather than woe, to the Greek empire. For let us make the review with him.—Since the æra of Haroun Al Raschid no woe, like that of the Saracens, had come near, so as to mutilate or to mar the empire of the city of Constantine.² The only irruption on Christendom that might at all be deemed a woe, that of the Hungarians, from 889 to 955,³ had scarcely been felt in the Greek

¹ He was of the *fourth* Greek dynasty subsequent to the rise of Mahommedism.—The one *first* reigning was the *Heraclian*; which continued through the seventh century, and so bore the brunt of the Saracen woe. The *next* was the *Isaurian*; which filled the eighth century, and was memorable for its part in the iconoclastic controversy. *Thirdly*, there was the less notable *Phrygian* dynasty, which continued only about fifty years: and then, *fourth*, the *Macedonian*, begun by Basil I, A.D. 867, and to which belonged also that Basil II of whom we now speak, as reigning 150 years after. It was superseded by the *Comnenian*, A.D. 1057; just in time to receive and suffer under the first *Turkish* onset.

² So Gibbon of Constantinople in the tenth century, x. 103; "Her treasures might attract; but her virgin strength had repelled, and still promised to repel, the audacious invasions of the Persian and Bulgarian, the Arab and the Russian."

³ A.D. 934 is the date of Henry the Fowler's victory over them; 955 of that of his son the great Otho.

dominions. Its course had been speedily deflected from Constantinople; followed the line of the Danube into the heart of Germany; thence sent out its ravaging detachments into Italy, North Germany, and the south of France; and been then at length utterly defeated, and repelled out of Christendom, into that ancient Dacian province, which has subsequently borne from them the name of Hungary. Thus enjoying a long comparative exemption from the desolations of foreign invasion, with a loyalty and civil union of its provinces unknown in other kingdoms, (the insurrectionary movements of the Greeks, when such there were, scarce ever extending beyond the day and the capital,) with a superiority of naval strength in the Mediterranean, and an active commerce, the source of national wealth resulting, the empire had had time and means to recover in no little measure from the effects of the tremendous Saracenic scourge.—There seemed indeed to be inherent in it a principle of vitality, and of endurance, unknown elsewhere. Unchanged itself, how many the changes that had been witnessed by the city of Constantine! Inviolable, how many assaults had she repulsed! Yea, more! She had within the last half century waked up, as with somewhat of the revived vigour of youth, to a measure of military enterprise and success.—The two immediate predecessors of Basil,—Nicephorus and John Zimisces,—had conquered Crete, Cyprus, and Cilicia from the Saracens. And Basil had himself just achieved (it was in the year 1017) a yet more important triumph, in the conquest of the *Bulgarians*:—that power of which the rise was associated with the history of Belisarius and Justinian; which had in 680 been consolidated into a kingdom; and which,—including, as it did, under its jurisdiction not Bulgaria proper only, between Thrace and the Lower Danube, but the provinces also, half peopled by its colonists, of Dardania, Thessaly, Epirus,¹—and connected too, as it was, with the kindred bands of Servians, Bosnians, Croats, Wallachians, by which in the eighth and ninth centuries the whole

¹ In the famous dispute of ecclesiastical jurisdiction between the patriarchs of Rome and Constantinople in the ninth century, the provinces of Dardania, Thessaly, and the two Epiri, are assigned to the kingdom of Bulgaria. So Baronius Ann. Eccl. A.D. 869, referred to by Gibbon x. 196.—Lychnidus, or Achrída, was the Bulgarian capital, and seat of its patriarch.

country obliquely from the Danube to the Adriatic had been occupied and Slavonized,¹—had been always, even after its embracing Christianity, like a thorn in the side to the Greek empire.² Thus circumstanced,—with victory again attending its banners, with a measure of fresh spirit infused into both rulers and people, with its dominions extended from Antioch to Belgrade,³ and from the mouths of the Danube, beyond Greece, to its subjected province in the south of Italy,—was there not reason for Basil, from considerations of *its own* present state, to augur well of the future prospects of his empire?

And certainly these anticipations might have been strengthened by a consideration of the state of *other* surrounding countries. For whence was any overwhelming woe likely to arise and fall on it? From the *western European states*? But these were but constituent parts of the Christian world: a guarantee, it might seem, almost of itself, against their falling *as a woe* on another division of Christendom. Moreover, if the *will* were theirs, the *power* seemed wanting. United though they were by that singular *religious* tie of looking to Rome as their common ecclesiastical head, (a relation to it from which the Greek empire had in the ninth century completely emancipated itself,)⁴ yet *politically* there existed no confederation, nor any likely principle of combination, for common purposes of war. And separately considered, and individually, it needed not the practised eye of a Greek politician to discern their weakness. The Anglo-Saxon dynasty in *England* had just been conquered by Canute the Dane;⁵—a new conquest that might be expected to prolong its state of civil disunion and semi-barbarism. In *France* the

¹ "As early," says Gibbon, x. 105, "as the eighth century, Greece, and even Peloponnesus, were overrun by some Slavonian bands, which outstripped the royal standard of Bulgaria." He quotes from Constantine Porphyrogenitus the statement; Εσθλαβωθη πασα ἡ χωρα, και γεγονε βαρβαρος: (Them. ii. 6 :) and from the Epitomizer of Strabo, whose date is fixed by Dodwell at A.D. 980, Και νυν δη πασαν Ἠπειρον, και Ἑλλαδα σχεδον, και Μακεδονιαν, και Πελοποννησον Σκυθαι Σκλαβοι νυμουται.—This was the *Illyrian* or *middle third* of the Roman Empire in the 4th century; on which see my pp. 363, 364 *supra*.

² In the year 903 the Bulgarian king dictated the conditions of peace, while besieging Constantinople. Anc. Un. Hist. xvii. 87.

³ Gib. x. 351.

⁴ Under the patriarchate of the famous Photius.

⁵ A.D. 1016.

Carlovingian dynasty, fallen by its own weakness, had been succeeded by that of Capet;¹ and the latter,—disorganized as the whole kingdom was, and specially paralyzed by the inroads on its north-western coasts of the ferocious Normans,—shrunk from even the attempt of subjecting the independent princes that held fiefs of the crown. In the *Germanic empire* a similar multitude of independent principalities was conspicuous; notwithstanding even their temporary combination under Henry the Fowler and Otho, for the repelling of the Hungarians. The attempt of Charlemagne to bind together his vast dominions, had proved to be premature. They were compressed by his giant grasp, not combined; and when his grasp was relaxed in death, separated necessarily into their political molecules. It was possible that out of these molecules, instinct as they were with vitality, new forms of political life and energy might in time arise. But for the present a retrogradation into barbarism was the consequence. In *Spain* the Christian nascent kingdoms of Asturias and Navarre had too full occupation for their rude valour and chivalry in the Moorish wars, to think of others far distant. And as for *Italy*, trisected as she was, (and seemed fated to be,) between the Papal estates in the centre, the Northern attached to the Germanic empire, and the Southern, now chiefly in the hands of the Greeks themselves, what could she do, except with her papal thunders, which in Constantinople and its empire were impotent?—Thus much as regarded the states of Western Christendom. To the north, the conquest of *Bulgaria* had not only removed an enemy, but restored to the empire the Danube, as its strong frontier line of defence. And the settlement of the *Hungarians* beyond it might, now that they had become Christianized,² be deemed a further bulwark; indeed all that was needed against other invaders from that quarter.—It was true that the *Russians*, a new barbarous power, half Scandinavian, half Slavonian, had explored another route in their naval marauding expeditions; and, descending their rivers from

¹ A.D. 987.

² This was in the tenth century.—The family of *Arpad* formed, and reigned 300 years over, the kingdom of Hungary; beginning A.D. 972.

the far North into the Euxine, had from time to time threatened, and sometimes humiliated, the Greek capital.¹ Moreover respecting them a singular prophecy was rife, said to be inscribed on an equestrian statue in the square of Taurus, to the effect that the Russians would in the last days become masters of Constantinople.² But their power, sufficient to annoy, seemed quite insufficient to conquer; and the prophecy idle, and to be despised.—Thus the *Mahomedan dynasties* to the East and South alone remained to be considered. And certainly, split as the Saracens had been into three hostile Caliphates, and ten or twelve fragments of kingdoms,—from those of Spain, Morocco, and Fez westward, to the principalities of the Fatimites in Egypt and Syria, and so on to the Abbassides at Bagdad, and beyond them the independent dynasties of Khorasan and Persia,—I say, thus divided as they had become among themselves, and inferior to the Christians as they had proved of late in battle, there seemed little to be apprehended from them. The only really formidable power was that, of which rumour must have told, of the Sultan *Mahmoud* of *Ghizni*, near *Caubul*, in the far East.³ But

¹ These Russian marauding excursions were continued at intervals from 865 to 1043. The Christianization of Russia began, but with very partial success, during the patriarchate of Photius. The more proper æra is that of the baptism of the Russian Queen Olga in Constantinople, A.D. 955.

² So Gibbon x. 233; "By the vulgar of every rank it was asserted, and believed, that an equestrian statue in the square of Taurus was *secretly* inscribed with a prophecy," &c. And in his Note he says that this was a brazen statue which had been brought from Antioch, and was melted down by the Latins. He refers for authorities to Nicetas Choniates, Codinus, and a writer on the Antiquities of Constantinople, who lived about A.D. 1100. "They witness," he says, "the belief of the prophecy; the rest is immaterial."

In a curious Book entitled *Vaticinia Abbatis Joachimi*, printed at Venice A.D. 1589, the Editor, Paschalinus Regisilmus, states in his Annotations at p. 1, that certain Greeks asserted their nation's propriety in Joachim's prophecies; ascribing them to one of their emperors, of philosophic turn, Leo V, A.D. 813, and reporting that they were engraved on an ancient column at Constantinople. Paschalinus rebuts the claim indignantly, as an injury to the prophetic fame of Joachim; and adduces evidence to show that no such engraved column, or statue, then existed in the Byzantine capital.—Presuming that the column or statue intended was the same with that mentioned by Gibbon, the asserted melting it down by the Latins, on their capture of the city, would account for its disappearance. That a remembrance of the prophecy itself, or some similar one, has been kept up among the Turks as well as Greeks, even till now, the author can himself testify; his Janissary having related it to him, and added that it was frequently talked of in the Turkish coffee-houses at Constantinople.—The prophecy is noticed by Mr. Forster, *Mahometanism Unveiled*, ii. 491. He refers to Wallichius, *Vit. Mohametis*, p. 158.

³ Cities that have of late years been the scenes of the triumph, and once of the catastrophe, of British armies. The question seems natural, Can it be without some

this was far distant. He had almost absorbed himself in the great enterprise of the subjugation of India; and he was now moreover in his old age, and the empire likely to fall to pieces at his death.—Thus even to that quarter Basil might have looked without any great apprehension. Political security, and even prosperity, seemed assured to his Greek kingdom, on the most considerate review that he could make of the then state of the world. No woe seemed from any side to threaten; least of all from the Euphrates and Bagdad. Could a power so fallen be resuscitated? Could religious fanaticism be rekindled from its embers, and under a new commission become again terrible?

So might the royal Basil have naturally thought within himself. Devoted as he was to the Greek superstitions, it is not likely that the guilt of image-worship, and of its many accompanying corruptions, such as, we shall presently see, still flourished unchecked in the empire, would have weighed upon *his* mind, as that which must needs bring down again God's vengeance. That fearful declaration against them that receive not the love of the truth, "God shall send them strong delusion that they shall believe a lie," had already begun to have its fulfilment.—But with real Christians, such as St. John represented on the Apocalyptic scene, the impression must have been most different. As they had seen one woe already sent to punish the apostate nation, so there must have sounded in their ears a foreboding sound of other judicial woes yet to come. For self-delusion was not security. In fact, even while men were saying, Peace and safety, sudden destruction impended on the Greek empire; and that from the very quarter least looked to with apprehension. The agencies were prepared: the Trumpet blown again: and *the four angels*, under a new commission to destroy, let loose *from the Euphrates*.

high object in the divine counsels, that the *British* from the far West have, in this latter age of the world, advanced their Indian empire to the confines of Cabul and Ghizni?

CHAPTER VII.

THE SIXTH, OR SECOND WOE TRUMPET.

“AND the sixth angel sounded; and I heard one¹ voice from the four horns of the golden altar which is before God, saying to the sixth angel which had the trumpet, Loose the four angels that are bound at the great river Euphrates.² And the four angels were loosed; which were prepared for (or *after*)³ the hour and day and month and year,⁴ to slay the third part of men. And the number of the armies of the horsemen were [two] myriads of myriads:⁵ I heard the number of them. And thus I saw the horses in the vision, and those that sate on them, having breast-plates of fire, and of jacinth, and brimstone. And the heads of the horses were as the heads of lions: and out of their mouths issued fire, and smoke, and brimstone. By these three was the third part of men killed, by the fire, and by the smoke, and by the brimstone, which issued out of their mouths. For the power of the horses⁶ is in their mouths, and in their tails. For their tails were like to serpents, having heads: and with them they do hurt.”⁷—Apoc. ix. 13—19.

§ 1.—THE OCCASION, LOCAL ORIGIN OF, AND NATION COMMISSIONED IN, THE SECOND WOE.

“And I heard one voice from the four horns of the golden altar which is before God, saying to the sixth angel which had the trumpet, Loose the four angels that are bound by

¹ *μιαν φωνην*. Compare Acts xix. 34.

² *τους δεδεμενους επι τη ποταμω*. On the above rendering of the *επι* compare Matt. xxiv. 33, *εγγυς εστιν επι θυραις*, he is near at the door; Thucydides, iii. 99, *περιπολιον επι τη Αληκι ποταμω*, by the river, &c. It is 'Tregelles' rendering.

³ So Mede; “*post diem, &c.*” I shall observe on it afterwards.

⁴ *εις την ωραν και ημεραν και μηνα και ενιαυτον*.

⁵ *δυο μυριαδες μυριαδων*. So the *textus receptus*. Tregelles reads *δυσμυριαδες*. Griesbach and Michaelis prefer altogether to reject the *δυο*, as I shall have to mention afterwards.

⁶ *Η γαρ εξουσια των ιππων εν τη στοματι αυτων εστι, και εν ταις ουραις αυτων*. Griesbach, Tregelles, &c.

⁷ There are no other variations in the critical editions from the *textus receptus*, but those that have been specified.

the great river Euphrates!—And the four angels were loosed: which were prepared . . . for to slay the third part of men.”

I. The thing most observable in *the voice* here spoken of is *the point whence it issued*; viz. the *four horns of the golden altar of incense*. Now, when a voice of command, whether as here for the *commissioning* of judgment, or as elsewhere for its *arrest*, proceeded from the throne in the inner temple, from the heavenly Spirit, or from some divinely-sent angel,¹—in cases like these the meaning is plain. It was an intimation that it originated from God. But what when proceeding (which is more seldom the case) from some other local scene or source? In every such example we shall find, if I mistake not, that the locality whence the voice invocative of judgment proceeded, was one associated with the sin or guilt to be punished. So in the history of Cain, Gen. iv. 10; “The voice of thy brother’s blood crieth unto me from the ground.” So in Job’s protestation of innocence, xxxi. 38; “If my land cry against me, or that the furrows thereof complain; if I have eaten the fruits thereof without money, or caused the owners thereof to lose their life.” So in Habakkuk’s denunciation against Babylon, ii. 11; “The stone shall cry out of the wall, and the beam out of the timber shall answer it; Woe to him that buildeth a town with blood, and establisheth a city by iniquity:” and, yet again, in the denunciation by St. James, v. 4, against the Jews of his time; “The hire of the labourers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth.” Once more in Isaiah lxvi. 6, (an example more exactly parallel with that before us,) we read; “A voice of noise from the city! a voice from the temple! a voice of the Lord that rendereth recompence to his enemies:” and we find this preceded by an appalling statement of the manner in which not only otherwise had the Jewish citizens done evil against God, but even in the temple itself had provoked Him, by profaning its holy sacrifices and services. “He that killeth an ox is as if he slew a man; he that offereth

¹ Compare Apoc. iv. 5; xvi. 17; xiv. 13; vii. 2, &c.

an oblation as if he offered swine's blood: he that burneth incense as if he blessed an idol." So that in that case the very incense-altar and altar of sacrifice, profaned as they had been by the Jews, were scenes of their guilt; and scenes consequently from which, as well as from the city of their iniquitous lives, a voice issued denouncing vengeance against them:—"A voice from the *city*; a voice from the *temple*; a voice of the Lord rendering recompence!"—Just similarly, though with an inversion of the reasoning, in the case before us, since a cry was heard announcing and commissioning judgment against the third part of men, from the *incense-altar*, in the Apocalyptic temple of vision, it was to be inferred that that mystic incense-altar had been a scene of special sin, (whether through profanation or neglect,) on the part of the above-noted division of the men of Roman Christendom.

But this explanation is only partial. The Evangelist does not in mere general phrase describe the voice as issuing from the *incense-altar*, but specifically from the *four horns* of it: "I heard one voice from the four horns of the golden altar which is before God." It would seem therefore as if there had been guilt contracted, in respect of some such particular ritual as these *horns* of the altar were one and all alike concerned in. And what, we inquire, the rites of this character? I believe there were just *three* services in the Mosaic ritual, and only three, in which, agreeably with the divine injunction, this altar's horns were thus used. The two first were the *occasional atoning services* for sins of ignorance, when brought to light, either of the priests as priests, or of the people collectively as a people; the third that of the stated and solemn *annual atonement*, for the sins both of priests and people, on the great day of expiation.¹ Thus the *object* of the three

¹ On the rite of atonement for the priest's sins of ignorance see Levit. iv. 3—7; on that for the people's, ib. 13—18; on that of the great day of atonement, Lev. xvi. 1—18.—The original command of the last-mentioned rite was given in Exod. xxx. 10. It had been previously said, with reference to that part of the usual ritualistic service with which the incense-altar was associated, "Aaron shall burn sweet incense thereon every morning, . . . and at even; . . . a perpetual incense before the Lord throughout your generations. Ye shall offer no strange incense thereon." So that three points were herein enforced; the offering morning and even,—the doing it by the Aaronic priesthood,—and the offering sweet incense; besides what was added elsewhere, (Lev. x. 1, 2,) using fire from the great altar of sacrifice: in any of which

services was similar: and, with the exception of what was peculiar to the great day of atonement, in the high priest's entering into the Holy of Holies and the rite of the scape-goat, there was much of similarity in the ceremonials. In each case the hands of the party seeking reconciliation and forgiveness were to be laid on the head of the victim, and his sins told over it; then, after the sacrifice of the animal victim, its blood to be sprinkled by the priest seven times before the veil of the sanctuary, and then some of the blood to be put upon the *horns* of the altar of incense. So was an atonement to be made for the sins of the transgressors, especially for their sins in respect of holy things; and so it was promised that their sins should be forgiven them, and that the holy place, tabernacle, and altar should be cleansed from the uncleannesses of the children of Israel, and reconciled.—It was thus that king Hezekiah, with all solemnity and earnestness, made atonement for Israel, after its notable apostasy under the reign of his father Ahaz.¹ For they had, both priests and people, for years previous, forsaken the house and altars² of the Lord, and sacrificed and burnt incense to other gods in every city of Judah; in spite alike of severe national chastisements, sent to bring their sin home to them, and of the remonstrances of Isaiah and other holy prophets. But, this rite of atonement having been performed, the promised reconciliation with God followed. From the temple, and altar, and each blood-bedewed horn of the altar, a voice as it were went forth, not of judgment, but of mercy; of mercy through Him whose expiatory blood-shedding, and its application by Himself to purify and to reconcile, the whole ritual of atonement did but typify. Instead of summoning destroying armies against Judah from the Euphrates, it staid them, when thence advancing to its invasion under Sennacherib:³ (thus direct was the contrast between Israel's

points there might be transgression. Then it is added, verse 10; "And Aaron shall make an atonement upon the *horns* of it, once in a year, with the blood of the sin-offering of atonements: once in the year shall he make atonement upon it throughout your generations. It is most holy unto the Lord."

¹ See 2 Chron. xxix. 20—24. Compare also Ezek. xliii. 20. In these cases however it would seem as if the *brazen* altar was that of which the horns were blood-sprinkled.

² i. e. the brazen altar and golden altar of the temple.

³ 2 Chron. xxxii. 21; Is. xxxvii. 33, 34.

case under Hezekiah, and that of Christendom as here figured in the Apocalyptic vision :) it staid them, I say; and, with authority not to be resisted, bade them back.

Such were the particulars common in these three rites of atonement; and with their real and spiritual meaning, just as with that of the rest of the Levitical ritual, St. John, we know, like his beloved brother Paul, was well familiar.¹ It was by this knowledge that he had been prepared to understand the intimations given from time to time, respecting the religious state of the Christian Church, in the mute but significant language of what was enacted on the Apocalyptic temple-scene: specially, for instance, how at the time correspondent with the first preparing of the trumpets of judgment, the large majority in Roman Christendom would have forsaken the great High Priest of their profession, in respect of his connexion with either altar; in other words, both as their atoner for sin, and as their intercessor, mediator, and offerer of their incense of prayer, on the golden incense-altar before God.² And now then, when, after the judgments of five successive trumpets against them, he heard a voice denouncing judgment yet afresh from the *four horns* of the *golden altar*,—that *altar* which was appropriated to the true priest's offering the true incense,—those *horns* of which the one and only use was in the *rite of reconciliation* for a transgressing priesthood and people,—what could he infer from the figure but this, that in spite of the fearful previous rebukes of their apostasy from heaven, neither the priesthood nor the collective people, at least of this third of Christendom, would have repented and returned; but the offer, the means provided, and critical occasion of respite given for *reconcilement*, been let to pass unimproved and unheeded. More particularly, as the rite had special reference to the sins connected with the incense-altar itself, it was to be inferred that *those* sins would be persisted in: to wit the abandonment of Christ, in his character of the one great propitiatory atonement, for other kinds of propitiatory merit; and in his character of

¹ How beautiful the allusions to the Levitical rites in his first epistle, i. 7, 9; ii. 2; iii. 5; v. 6; &c.

² See on Apoc. viii. 3, pp. 326—334, *suprà*.

High Priest over the house of God, for other intercessors and mediators; just as we have seen was the very fact throughout the previous times of the Saracenic woe:—that thus the sin would be graven even on *the four horns of the golden altar*; and their one and common voice,¹ or that of the intercessorial High Priest himself from the midst of them, forced to pronounce the fresh decree of judgment, “Loose the four angels to slay the third part of men!”—Such, I say, as it appears to me, would be his interpretation of the voice in question.² Issuing from the points whence it did, I think there could be no other meaning put upon it, accordantly with the spirit of the Levitical ritual: as also that no other imaginable typical action on the temple-scene could so accordantly with that spirit, and at the same time so simply and definitely, have intimated the important fact.—And alas! if the intent of the prefiguration was thus clear to St. John, there were answering facts in the religious character and state of Greek Christendom, at the time we speak of, equally clear to the discerning Christian. The offered opportunity for repentance and reconciliation, in regard more particularly of those crying sins against Christ of which I have been speaking, did pass unheeded. Neither the bitterness of the former woe, nor the taunts of the Mahomedan foes, nor the reclamations of their own iconoclastic princes, or of certain purer witnesses for Christ amongst them,³ had the effect of bringing home a sense of their sin either to the priesthood or people. The guilt of *inveterate* antichristian apostasy was fixed upon them. It was stamped on their ritual-worship. It was stamped on

¹ *μία φωνή, one common voice.* So in Acts xix. 34, (referred to p. 480,) *φωνή εγενετο μιὰ ἐκ πάντων*, said of the one cry in common of the Ephesians. So, again, in Martial's epigram on Vespasian's amphitheatre, and the crowds of spectators visiting it;

Vox diversa sonat, populorum est vox tamen una :

Cum verus patrie diceris esse pater.

Perhaps too, as the four horns pointed to the four different corners of the land, it might be signified that all parts of the land had been alike guilty.

² Daubuz, alone of the commentators that I have seen, explains the passage under consideration by reference to these Jewish rites of atonement. But he does not particularize the special sin connected with the altar of incense.—He at the same time supposes a reference to the horns of the altar, as a *place of refuge* for criminals. But in this supposition he seems to be in error. It was the horns of the *altar of sacrifice*, not of the *altar of incense*, that were thus used. See 1 Kings i. 50—53; where the expression “brought down from it” implies height and ascent.

³ I allude to the Paulikians; of whom I shall have to treat in my 2nd Volume, as among the Witnesses for Christ at the time referred to, in Eastern Christendom.

their hearts. It was stamped,—not to speak of other and earlier monuments,¹—on that of their very coinage. Witness the specimens here set before the reader; a visible memorial of the fact that has been preserved to our own later age.²

¹ Let me mention one curiously illustrative of the manner in which the Greek apostatizing Church and people, in order the better to insure the protecting influence of its *δαίμονια*, imitated sometimes the precise form of the *Gnostic Abraxas*, or *amulets*.

In these latter the *seven vowels*, in their various permutations, often appeared prominent: a strange virtue being supposed (as Irenæus, i. 10, intimates) to attach to them; especially when thus mysteriously mingled together. Walsh, *Essay on Ancient Coins*, pp. 49, 51, gives illustrative engravings of some.

In the external wall of the ruined theatre at Miletus a large inscribed stone is still seen, divided into six columns: at the head of each of which stand the *seven Greek vowels*, in various permutations, and underneath in each the words, "O thou Holy One, preserve in safety the city of the Milesians, and all its inhabitants."—Judging from the rude form of the letters, the inscription may probably have been as late as the seventh, eighth, or ninth century.

ΙΕΙΟΥΑΗΩΙΑΩΑΙΕΟΥΑΗΩΙΑ ΕΗΟΥΙΑΩΙΗΕΟΥΕΗΟΗ* * * * *					
ΑΕΩ ΟΥΩ ΑΩΕΑΓΙΕ ΦΥΛΛΑΞΟΝ ΤΗΝΠΟΛΙΝ ΜΙΛΗΣΙΩΝ ΚΑΙΠΑΝΤΑΣ ΤΟΥΣΚΑΤΟΙ ΚΟΥΝΤΑΣ	ΕΗΙΟ ΥΩΑ ΑΓΙΕ uti prius.	ΗΙΟΥ ΩΑΕΑΓΙΕ uti prius.	ΙΟΥΩ ΑΕΗΑΓΙΕ uti prius.	ΟΥΩ ΑΕΗΙΑΓΙΕ uti prius.	Α * * * Α * * * ΦΥΛΛΑΞ[ΟΝ] ΤΗΝΠΟΛΙΝ ΜΙΛΗΣΙΩΝ ΚΑΙΠΑΝΤΑΣ ΤΟΥΣΚΑΤΟΙ ΚΟΥΝΤΑΣ
ΑΡΧΑΓΓΕΛΟΙΦΥΛΛΑΣΣΕΤΑΙΗΠΟΛΙΣΜΙΛΗΣΙΩΝΚΑΙΠΑΝΤΕΣΟΙΚΑΤ					

It struck me, when I saw it, as very affecting. Angels, archangels, and saints had been invoked to save the city; not the *Lord* of saints and angels. And the result was apparent. Ruins only surrounded the theatre; and nothing remained to speak to the traveller in the once splendid city of Miletus, but this remembrancer both of its sin and punishment.—Chandler gives the inscription in his *Inscriptiones Antiquæ*, p. 16, and notices its Gnostic character. Hug, too, notices it in his *Introd. to the N. T.* ii. 459.

Compare what Whitby says on Col. ii. p. 222, as to the worship of angels, and especially of Michael, in that part of Asia. "Theodoret (of the 5th century) and Œcumenius (of the 9th) observe that the worship of angels continued long in Pisidia, Phrygia, and Laodicea."

² Of these numismatic memorials of the Greek established *Mariolatry* and *Hagiolatry*, during both the Macedonian and the Comnenian dynasties, before the Latins' capture of Constantinople, and that of the Palæologi, after the Greeks' recapture of it,* Eckhel thus writes. Tom. viii. p. 506. "Maximus in hujus ævi numis honos

* The *Macedonian* dynasty, as already stated, p. 474, lasted near 200 years, from Basil I, A.D. 867, to Michael VI Stratioticus, A.D. 1057. It included Nicephorus Phocas, John Zimisces, and Basil II, to whom reference was made in the preceding Chapter.

The *Comnenian* dynasty, of 12 or 13 princes, lasted from 1057 to near the Latins' capture of Constantinople in 1204. It began with Isaac I Comnenus; and included Romanus IV Diogenes, who was defeated and taken by the Turks in 1070, as mentioned by me afterwards: also Alexius I Comnenus, the reigning emperor during the first Latin Crusade, John Calo-Johannes, and Manuel.

II. "And I heard a voice from the four horns of the golden altar, saying, Loose the four angels that are bound by the great river Euphrates! And the four angels were loosed, which were prepared . . . for to slay the third part of men."—The question now comes before us, Who, or what, might be these angels:—angels *four* in number;—angels *commissioned in the work of judgment*, specially, in the present case, for the destruction of the third part of the men of the Roman Christendom;—angels that had been *bound* previous to the blast of this 'Trumpet,'¹ apparently as if in action before the act of binding;—and whose binding had begun

habitus *Virginis Deiparæ*. Pingitur in numis placido ac tranquillo statu, aut stans expansis ad protegendum manibus, vel sedens, et infantem Christum in sinu gerens. Inscriptiones sunt Δεσποίνα Σωζοίς, in numo Constantini XII, Monomachi; vel Θεοτοκ. Βοηθ. Ῥωμανῷ, Romani IV Diogenis. Frequentissima est sigla MP. ΘΥ, id est Μητηρ Θεου. Singularis est imago Deiparæ mœnibus urbis Constantinopolitanæ circumdata; quam vide in numis Michaelis VIII, et Andronicii II, Palæologorum.—*Sanctis* quoque locus in monetâ honorificus datus. Ac primum quidem *Archangelo Michaeli* in numo Theodori I Lascaris, aliisque nonnullis, scripto Ὁ Ἅγιος Μι. vel Ἅγιος Ἀρχ. Μι: deinde *S. Georgio*, . . in numis Alexii I Comneni, Johannis II Porphyrogeniti, &c.—Hi tantum Ducangio fuerunt cogniti. Serius emerunt *S. Eugenius* . . et *S. Demetrius*."

The coins I have engraven are those, 1st of John Zimiscees, who reigned from 969 to 976, the immediate predecessor of Basil II: 2ndly of Romanus III, from 1028 to 1034: 3rdly of Andronicus II, from 1328 to 1341. They are in the collection of the British Museum; and are described in Mionnet, as well as Eckhel.

Thus we may regard the specimens given, as characteristic of the Constantinopolitan coinage and superstition, from just before the times of the *Seljukian* Turks to the temporary capture of Constantinople by the Latin Crusaders, A.D. 1204; also, subsequently to its recovery from the Latins, during those of the *Othmans*. The superstition still continued in full force to the very last. During the final siege of Constantinople by the Othman Turks, and just before its storming, the divine *image of the Virgin* was brought out, and exhibited in solemn procession, as the last and best hope of the Greeks.

With regard to the device on the coins of John Zimiscees, we read the following illustration in history. It seems that after defeating the Russians in Bulgaria, he placed on a triumphal chariot an image of the Virgin of great reputed sanctity, "adorned with the spoils of war, and the ensigns of Bulgarian royalty;" and made with it his public entry into Constantinople. Gibbon x. 238.

On the general subject of the Byzantine *Mariolatrous* coinage let me refer further to the Dissertation annexed to Du Cange's Supplement p. 27, and Plates 3 and 7:—also, on the *nimbus* round the Virgin Mary's head, in the coin of John Zimiscees, to Eckhel viii. 502—504. It would seem from his statement that the word originally signified the *nubes divina*, or bright nebula, which was often anciently depicted as encircling the heads of the heathen gods; and then of the deified emperors. So first on the coins of Antoninus Pius; then (strangely) of the Constantinian emperors; then of Christ, and the Virgin Mary, and Saints.

¹ τούς δεδεμένους. Of this perfect passive participle the precise and full sense, I believe, is, those which having been previously bound are still bound.

The *Palæologian* dynasty of seven princes lasted from Michael Palæologus A.D. 1260 (who in 1261 recovered Constantinople from the Latins) to the taking of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453. It included, among others, Andronicus II, John Palæologus, his son Manuel, and the last Constantine.

and continued *by the great and famed river Euphrates?*—I say, by the *actual famed river* so called. For that the local appellative is to be taken thus *literally* seems clear to me, alike from that common Scriptural habit of intermixing such literal local designations with symbolic prophecies, which I have sometime since remarked on and illustrated;¹ and also from the evident unreasonableness of attaching any figurative sense to it, so as some have done, as if the figurative river of *Rome*, the figurative *Babylon*:² seeing that *Babylon* is but one out of three Apocalyptic designations of *Rome*; the other two being *Sodom* and *Egypt*;³ and consequently the *Nile*, just as fit as the *Euphrates*, to be made its figurative river.—But who then, I repeat, or what, these angels?—The notorious fact of *Turks* from the Euphratean frontier having subverted the empire of Eastern Christendom, has naturally and reasonably suggested a reference to *them*, as the grand subject of the sixth Trumpet-vision. And, led by this conviction, the majority of Protestant interpreters,—I mean of those who regard the Apocalypse as already in great measure fulfilled,—have sought to explain the four angels of *four Turkman*, or, at least *four Mussulman powers*, which, in succession, or contemporaneously, took part in this work of destruction. But the interpretations are found on examination to be, one and all, inadmissible. As the commissioning and loosening of the four angels in vision was but *a single act*, so the agencies symbolized must necessarily have been *at one and the same time* loosed or commissioned: by which consideration alone all such *successions* of destroying agencies seem excluded, as *Vitringa*, and after him *Woodhouse*, have suggested in explanation.⁴ And as to *contemporary Turkman*

¹ See pp. 357, 358 *suprà*. The appropriateness of the example from Ps. lxxx. 11 will be evident: "She (sc. the *symbolic* vine) sent out her boughs unto the sea, and her branches unto the river:" i. e. the *literal* river Euphrates. A representation historically verified in 1 Kings iv. 21, 24.—So too in Jeremiah's symbolic prophecy, through burying his girdle by the literal Euphrates. Jer. xiii. 4—6.

² So Dr. Wordsworth of late in his Apocalyptic Commentary, p. 214.

³ Apoc. xi. 8.

⁴ *Vitringa* proposes the *Saracens*, the *Seljukian Turks*, the *Tartars* under *Zenghis* and *Tamerlane*, and the *Othmans*. (p. 545.) So too *Woodhouse*; they being four Mahomedan nations, he says, memorable near the Euphrates. But,—besides the decisive objection mentioned above,—it is plain that the *Saracens*, having been the subject of the former Trumpet, cannot be figured here. Moreover, after they became a

MARIOLATROUS COINS.
of the middle age Greek Byzantine Empire.


John Zimiscees.



Romanus III.



Andronicus II. & Michael IX. Paleologus.



dynasties, whether we refer to the list given by Mede and Bishop Newton after him, or that by Faber and Keith from Mills and Gibbon,¹ there is no quaternion of them that can be shown either to have combined together in the destruction of the Greek empire,—to have been all locally situated by the Euphrates,—to have had existence at the time asserted to be that of the commissioning of the four angels,—or to have continued in existence up to the time of the completion of the commission given, in the destruction of the Greek empire.² In short, the manifest inconsistency

Euphratean power, they ceased to be a destroying woe to Christendom. As to the *Tartars* under Zenghis, and then Tamerlane, how did they help to destroy the Greek empire? The *former* destroyed, not the Greeks, but the *Seljukian* Turkish dynasty, that was long the chief enemy of the Greeks. The *latter* overthrew *Bajazet*, Sultan of the *Othman* Turks, another most deadly enemy of their empire; and thereby delayed its fall, instead of accelerating it, (as will soon appear,) for perhaps half a century.

¹ Mede's list gives us the dynasties of Bagdad, Damascus, Aleppo, and Iconium; founded, he says, from 1055 to 1080, A.D.; and of which the three last, I may observe, were founded during Malek Shah's life, and were dependent on him. So Bishop Newton also. The list given by Faber and Keith is the quaternion into which Malek Shah's empire split on his death, A.D. 1092; viz. Persia, Kerman, Syria, Roum.—The two lists are nearly similar: there being this difference however, that *Kerman* has place in the *latter*, not in the *former*; and that Mede's *Aleppo* and *Damascus* are supposed in the *latter* to have coalesced into the one kingdom, if so it be called, of *Syria*.

² That decisive objections exist against these lists, and such as these, objections alike *chronological*, *geographical*, and *historical*, will thus appear. 1. *Chronological*: That Mede's four dynasties did not all come into existence till some time after A.D. 1057,* whence he and Keith compute the hour, day, month, and year, follows from the various dates of their founding, from 1055 to 1092, given in the Note preceding. Again Faber's *Kerman* dynasty perished above a century before 1301, his date of the loosing.† 2. As to *geographical* situation, *Kerman* was separated from the *Euphrates* by 500 miles of space at the nearest, and by the intervening kingdom of Persia; *Roum* (or *Iconium*) by the *Halys* and *Mount Taurus*; *Damascus* by the desert. So far were the four from being all watered, as Keith represents, by the *Euphrates* and its tributaries. 3. *Historically* considered, neither *Kerman* nor *Persia* had anything to do with the Turkish wars against the Greek empire. And as to the *Syrian* Moslem dynasty, whether under *Noureddin* or *Saladin*, though it had much to do with the Latin crusaders, it had little concern with the Greeks. I may add that *Syria* was not united to the *Othman* Turkish power till Sultan *Selim's* time, A.D. 1517, long after the taking of Constantinople.—It was the Turkish dynasty of *Roum*, or *Iconium*, that was alone charged with the commission of slaying the third part of men.

Foxe—the earliest interpreter I have seen that applies this prophecy to the Turks—expounds the four angels of the Turks from Persia, Tartary, Arabia, Seythia. *Martyrs*, iv. 102. To this theory similar objections apply.

Mr. Cuninghame, after mentioning each of these solutions, and his dissatisfaction with them, finally takes refuge with Woodhouse in the number *four* as a sacred and complete number! *παντα εν τη τετραδι*.

Mr. Foster in his "Mahommedanism Unveiled," i. 223, cites what follows from

* This is Mede's and Keith's date of Thogrul Beg's investiture; but it should be A.D. 1058, as will hereafter be shown.

† Gibbon x. 369, Note 47.

with historic fact of every such attempted solution has been hitherto, in the minds of the more thoughtful and accurate prophetic students, like as it were a mill-stone about the neck of the whole Turkish theory of interpretation.

But *who* then, we must repeat, or *what*, these four angels? And does the impossibility of finding four Turkman powers answering to the four angels, affect the truth of the general reference of the vision to the Turks? By no means. We need only, I think, to look at the nature and use of *angels*, as represented in the Apocalyptic figurations, to have suggested to us a view of the point in question very different, and one that will leave the rest of the Turkish interpretation altogether unencumbered.

For in the Apocalyptic prophecy, just as in all other revealed Scripture, the angels figured as acting on earth seem to mean, almost uniformly, *superhuman angelic intelligences*, bearing commission from God as the executors of certain defined purposes in his providential government; and in execution of them making use of, directing, controlling, and over-ruling certain earthly and human agencies subordinate.—In such case the *number* of angels specified is not conformed to the number of earthly agents subordinately employed, whether national or individual. For example, the circumstance of its being *one* angel, (Apoc. xiv. 6,) that was seen flying in mid-heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach to every nation under heaven, (and the remark applies to the other two angels also that in succession followed,) did not imply that it would be *one individual*, or *one nation* only, that would furnish the earthly agency. Many probably might be co-operators in the work. Again, the specification of *four* angels in Apoc. vii, as appointed to desolate the Roman empire, was no in-

the Abbot Ekkehard's Chronicle, (a Chronicle composed about the year 1117, and given in Martene and Durand's Vet. Mon. Collect. T. v, p. 514,) in evidence of four other Seljukian powers answering to the prophecy. "Inito per annos aliquos consilio, emergerunt ab aquilonari plagâ de terrâ Gorizauâ præscriptorum Paganorum [sc. Turcorum] copiæ multæ, quæ sub quatuor Sultanis divisæ (sic enim satrapas suos nominare solent) uni tantùm Persico imperatore pene divini cultûs more subiecti, per Armeniam, indeque Cappadociam, totamque Romaniam atque Syriam, diffusi sunt." But is the terra Gorizana by the Euphrates? or did the Syrian branch take part in the destruction of Constantinople?

timation of *four nations*, exactly and only, being intended to combine in that desolation. Rather the number four was chosen in accordance simply with the *propriety*, or what older commentators call the *decorum*, of the figure. The thing intended to be figured being that from every side fierce tempests of invaders would fall on the devoted empire, in the course of the then about commencing 'Trumpet-judgments, *four angels* of the winds was the number depicted on the Apocalyptic scene; in correspondence with the well-known fact that *four winds* from the *four corners of the heaven* are the proverbial representatives of *all* the winds.¹ ✓

From the above there follows this obvious inference, with respect to the passage before us, that there is no necessity to suppose four *earthly* powers to be prefigured as combining in the work of the sixth Trumpet, because four *angelic* agencies are represented as concerned;—rather that the number of the latter may have been chosen from considerations altogether different. Moreover there is suggested yet further a suspicion that, as the number of judgment-angels *here* mentioned is the same with the number mentioned in Apoc. vii, (and it is mentioned, let me add, nowhere else in the Apocalypse,) so it is not unlikely that they may be, the one and the other, the *very same identical quaternion* of angels. Which idea once suggested, it will I think only need that we trace out the characteristics either stated or implied respecting the first-mentioned quaternion, and compare them with those stated or implied respecting the other, in order to recognise their identity, and to see that this is indeed the true and simple solution of the whole matter.

With regard then to the *four tempest-angels* of Apoc. vii, the nature and range of the executive commission given them under the sixth Seal, was thus defined, “to hurt the *land, trees, and sea*,”² of the Apocalyptic Roman world. A commission this, let us observe, of very general and large import, in so far as that world was concerned; and one possibly of long duration too, perhaps even as long as that of

¹ Jer. xlix. 36; Ezek. xxxvii. 9; Dan. vii. 2; Matt. xxiv. 31, &c.

² Apoc. vii. 1.

the 144,000 sealed, by way of protection from them : though liable of course to arrests and interruptions, such as in fact checked them at their time of first appearance ; more especially in subordination to Christ's purposes and provision for the preservation and good of that his election of grace. —Which being their commission, and the angels figured as ready, with the winds in leash, to execute it, that instant that restraint was withdrawn,—it could not surely be but that the process and results of their acting it out would enter into the subsequent figurations.¹—Admitting which, and considering that on the next or seventh Seal being presently after opened, the judgments thereupon inflicted on the apostate world were pictured under the several *tempest-like* figures,² first and introductorily, of thunderings, lightnings, and an earthquake,³ then, on the two first trumpets sounding, of hail and volcanic fire, affecting (as it is expressed with singular coincidence of phrase) “the *land*, and *trees*, and *sea*,”⁴—considering this, it must, I think, be deemed scarce credible but that these selfsame judgments were the primary results of the acting of *the above-mentioned four tempest-angels*.—And, if so, why suppose their commission and their action to terminate with the second Trumpet? Why not rather to go on under the third Trumpet, and the fourth ; seeing that it is still the same third of the Roman world which is the scene of the infliction ; and that the meteoric judgment of the third Trumpet, at least, is as notoriously associated as those preceding, alike in poetic figure and in nature, with winds and tempests?⁵—Thus have we advanced to the fifth Trumpet ;

¹ The circumstance of the angels themselves not being again mentioned in the subsequent figurations of judgments no more negatives this fact, than the subsequent silence, after the first mention of *their* loosing, about the angels from the Euphrates ; whom yet we certainly know to have been the spirits, whether seen or unseen afterwards, that impelled and directed the woe of the Euphratean horsemen.

² As to the *thunderings*, *lightnings*, and *hail*, of the seventh Seal's introductory Vision and first Trumpet, it is needless to show the connexion of *winds* with them. It is notorious. With regard to their association with *earthquakes* and *volcanic fire*, as under the second Trumpet, I may suggest Isa. xxix. 6 and xxx. 30, for Scriptural examples ; and further beg to refer to authentic accounts of most great volcanic eruptions, in illustration. For example, in that at Sumbawa, (noticed by me p. 369 *suprà*.) Daubeny says ; “Between nine and ten, ashes began to fall ; and soon after a violent *whirlwind* ensued, which blew down nearly every house in the village of Sangir,” &c. Daubeny on Volcanoes, p. 34.

³ Apoc. viii. 5.

⁴ Apoc. viii. 7, 8.

⁵ So Virgil, *Georgics*, i. 365 ;

and have only once more to inquire why, if the four destroying angels were in action thus far, we should negative the idea of their acting still; so as in fact, gathering round,¹ to have brought the locusts on Christendom:² especially considering that the same body of Christ's sealed ones, that were originally noted in association with the four tempest-angels, are referred to as on the scene now also;³ and the same care implied in the charge given to the *earthly* agency of the scorpion-locusts, that these sealed ones of Christ should not be harmed in the infliction, as in the tempest-angels' original commission. Nor can I see any reasonable ground for pronouncing against this view.

Thus much as to the probable *acting* of the four tempest-angels.—Then as to their *restrainings* let two things

“ Sæpe etiam stellas, vento impendente, videbis
Præcípites cælo labi,” &c.

And with the obscuration of heavenly luminaries, such as in the fourth Trumpet, the winds are also associated; as in Matt. xxiv. 29.

¹ The view taken supposes the combined action of these angels under each of the Trumpets,—just as of the four winds let loose against Elam in Jeremiah xlix. 36, of the *παντοιοι ανεμοι* of Homer, and the “*Unà eurusque notusque*,” &c. of Virgil,—to introduce and direct the judgment-woes.

² So Exod. x. 13; “The east wind brought the locusts.” Compare the extract from the Pseudo-Methodius of Patara, given by me p. 439 *suprà*: “*tanquam locustæ in multitudine, quæ congregantur à vento.*”

Similar is their association also with *river-floods*; such as appear from Apoc. xvi. 12 to have been the accompaniment of the lion-headed horses, that issued at the blast of the sixth Trumpet from the swellings of the Euphrates against Christendom. So Matt. vii. 25, &c.

Let me further observe here, that the action of these angels of the winds as *God's* commissioners, is not inconsistent with the contemporary action, though in another way, of a *spirit* or *angel from hell*:—such, I mean, as in the fifth Trumpet is described as acting in and influencing the locusts: or, again, such as is spoken of in the xiii Apocalyptic chapter as urging on the Gothic invasions; they being there represented as a flood out of the mouth of the dragon, though in the viith figured as tempests raised and directed by the *angels of the winds*. I say there is in this conjunction of the two agencies no inconsistency. For it is but an exemplification of a truth uniformly taught in the Bible; viz. that evil angels are permitted to act in this world's political affairs, as well as good: in such wise, however, as that the former are overruled and controlled by the latter; and that nothing can result which is not according to the will and foreseen purpose of God.—See what is said in Apoc. xii. 7, of the action of *the devil and his angels*, as well as of *Michael and his*, in the affairs of this world. Compare too the striking narrative in Job i, ii; and also Dan. x. 12, 13.

Compare Jer. xlvi. 8, 9; “Egypt riseth up *like a flood*, and his waters are moved like the rivers: he saith, I will go up, and cover the earth. . . Come up, ye *horses*; and rage, ye *chariots.*”

³ Apoc. ix. 4; “It was said to them that they should . . . only hurt those men that had *not* the seal of God on their foreheads:” a charge implying the existence of, and the protective care over, those that had it.

be observed. The *one* is, that in any case of the restraint being long and entire, (so, for example, as when the Saracen woe ceased,) the figurative phrase *bound* would be perhaps the most fitting of all others to designate it, considering the element they impersonated; whether judged of by classical or Scripture usage.¹—The *other* is that, supposing the local spot of their arrest, and cessation to act,—in other words, that of the *earthly* agency directed by them lapsing into quietude,—to be one very marked, then it would just be accordant with Scriptural analogy to represent them as bound *at that particular spot*. So, for example, in the memorable instance of the angel of pestilence, commissioned against David and Israel. His course having advanced with the pestilence from Dan to Beersheba, he is described as with hand outstretched locally over Jerusalem to destroy it, at the time when the plague was there commencing to destroy; and also to have been *arrested* and *stayed* locally by the threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite, when *at that very spot*, presently afterwards, the plague was stayed.²—Now then apply we this Scripture mode of speaking of angelic agencies, to the case of the Saracen locust-plague figured in the fifth Trumpet. And, supposing the four angels of Apoc. vii to have both acted in it during its progress, and ceased acting when it ceased, the locality at which their *arrest* might be fitly described as taking place, could be no other than that where the plague itself received its arrest, viz. *Bagdad by the Euphrates*:³ the place where they might be said to

¹ So Virgil depicts the tempest winds as *bound* when inactive. Æn. i. 52;

Hic vasto rex Æolus antro
Luctantes ventos tempestatesque sonoras
Imperio premit, ac vinclis et carcere frenat.

He also speaks, in similar figure, of their being *loosed*, when afresh raging; ib. 63;

qui fœdere certo
Et premere, et *laxas* sciret dare jussus *haben*as.

In all this Virgil follows Homer.—Compare also Prov. xxx. 4; “Who hath gathered the winds in his fists?” where, as in Virgil, the winds of all the four quarters are depicted as gathered and held in *one* spot: also Psalm cxxxv. 7.

² 2 Sam. xxiv. 15, 16, &c.; 1 Chron. xxi. 15, 16, &c.

³ It has been already mentioned (see p. 461) that Bagdad was built on the Tigris, within some twenty or thirty miles from the Euphrates; and had in the twelfth century, according to Benjamin of Tudela, a canal from the Euphrates falling into the Tigris at that very spot. In the course of years changes have taken place, and some

have *remained* afterwards *fettered and bound*, no other than that where the power of the Saracenic caliphate remained paralyzed in its declension, and had at length its temporal power of the sword formally taken from it;—still the same *Bagdad by the Euphrates*.

In fine the conclusion we are forced to is this;—that both in respect of the local spot of their implied previous arrest, and in respect of the local spot of their subsequent continued restraint, a Scriptural description of those *four tempest-angels* of judgment, of whose original commission we read in Apoc. vii. 1, must at this point of time, (on the hypothesis of the prolongation of their commission and their acting,) have exactly answered to what was said, or implied, at the sixth Trumpet's sounding, respecting *that quaternion of angels that were to act in the new commencing woe*:—they too being said to have *been bound*, (after an implied period evidently of *previous acting*,) and to have also *continued bound, by the great river Euphrates*.

Thus the characteristics of the one quaternion of angels and of the other agreeing, it seems to me that they may be reasonably considered identical.¹ And the *Turkish* inter-

of the canals been dried up. But it may be well to add a statement or two from both ancient authors and modern, to show that the level of the Tigris there has been always lower than that of the Euphrates; and the intervening land such as to allow of the Euphratean water, whether by canal or otherwise, finding its way to Bagdad or its neighbourhood. 1st. *Arrian*, who says, vii. 7; ὁ μὲν Τίγρης πολὺν τι ταπεινότερον ῥέων του Ευφρατου, διωρυχας πολλας εκ του Ευφρατου ες αυτον δεχεται.—2. *Dion Cassius*, lxxviii. 28; ὁ Ευφρατης πολὺ ὑψηλοτερος του Τιγριδος εστι.—3. *Julian* by a canal brought down his fleet from the Euphrates to the Tigris. So *Gibb*. iv. 180.—4. *Buckingham*, in his *Mesopotamia*, p. 495: "Near the bend of the Tigris, about two hours below Bagdad, we were shown the marks of an inundation all the way from the Euphrates; rafts even coming over from one river close to the other by its waters. This . . . proves that the bed of the Euphrates is higher at Felugiah, than that of the Tigris at Bagdad, in the line of east and west."

² Since this was written my attention has been directed by a "friend to the words *αεμιους* and *αεμιοι*, instead of *αγγελους* and *αγγελοι*, among Griesbach's various readings, as readings in the Codex N. 30. *Heinrichs* ad loc. also mentions it; and adds both that it had evident reference to the four angels of Apoc. vii, and also that Knittel approved it. "Indubie ex capite vii. 1 à corrigentis manu invecum est; probante autem Knittelio."—In my *History of Apocalyptic Interpretation*, given in the Appendix to my Vol. iv, it will be seen that both *Primasius* and *Ambrose Ansbert* so read or understand the clause.

[I observe too that Prof. Lee p. 328, and Dr. Wordsworth pp. 214, 218, in their late prophetic works affirm the identity of the two quaternions, as I do. 4th Ed.]

Heinrichs thus objects. "Istos quatuor angelos, qui vii. 1 nominantur, cave cum his confundas. Sunt illi nature *bonæ*, hi *malignæ*; illisque locus prorsus diversus à nostro assignatur." But surely what is told us about the first quaternion's destroying

pretation of the sixth Trumpet being thus freed from the difficulty of showing four Turkman nations answering to the four Euphratean angels, which has so long encumbered it, it only remains, in explanation of so much of the prophecy as stands at the head of this Section, that I show respecting the *Turkman power*, or new *earthly* agency, as I presume, employed under the *angelic*,—

IIIrdly, the two points following :—1st, that the *locality* where it received *its* commission, was the same as that where the preceding Saracenic scourge was arrested and bound, viz. *Bagdad by the Euphrates*; 2ndly, that its people and power, then and there commissioned, *continued thenceforward in political life and action*; so as, in due time, to effect the work assigned to the Euphratean horsemen in vision, *of slaying the third part of men*.

And to prove these two points, nothing more will be necessary than to trace, in brief narrative, the history of the Turkman nation, from its first commissioning as a Moslem power against Christendom, to the time of the fall of Constantinople.

1. In my sketch of the state of the world, contemporaneously, given in the last Chapter, as that which might have suggested itself to the mind of the second Basil at the commencement of the eleventh century, the name of *Mahmoud of Ghizni* was mentioned as the only reigning potentate, whose power could reasonably have been deemed formidable to the Greek empire. It was also noted, as that which might allay apprehensions of danger from that quarter, that Mahmoud seemed absorbed in his Indian conquests; that he was then in his old age; and that his empire was likely, in all human probability, to fall to pieces at his death.—We now proceed to observe, that, as it might

commission will agree with what is said of the destroying commission of the latter; whatever the nature of the angels employed. And of course good angels, when so employed, are just as subject to recall or restraint as bad angels. Compare the case of the temporary arrest of the four angels of Apoc. vii themselves; “Hurt not till,” &c.: also, as to the place of their restraint, the case of the pestilence-angel checked at Araunah’s threshing-floor, mentioned in the text. As to Heinrichs’ argument in favour of the four Euphratean angels being “*malignæ naturæ*,” because of certain Rabbinical traditions assigning to daemons a place in the most remote places of the East, or deserts by the Euphrates, it is not worth refuting.

then have seemed probable, so it happened. In the year 1028, three years after Basil's own death, Mahmoud died : and, on his death, forthwith his vast empire began to fall to pieces. Among his subjects had been numerous *Turkman* tribes,—descendants of those Turks of Mount Altai from whom, in the seventh century, the Avars had fled, and with whom the emperor Justin had negotiated:—tribes whom it had been Mahmoud's policy to move southward to Khorasan, a country between the Himalaya and the Caspian; thereby to separate them more entirely from their countrymen beyond the Oxus and Jaxartes. It was these that were now to become a woe to Christendom. Soon after Mahmoud's death (it was in the year A.D. 1038) they rose in assertion of their independence; chose *Togrul Beg* of the house of *Seljuk* as their chief; defeated and killed Mahmoud's son Massoud; drove the Ghiznivite nobles eastward to the banks of the Indus; and stood forth before the world as the chief power in central Asia.—Originally idolaters in religion, they had lately, both prince and people, embraced with fervour the religion of Mahomet: and, thus become co-religionists, they were called in the year 1055 to his assistance by the Prophet's Vicar, the *Caliph of Bagdad*, on occasion of some threatening danger of domestic factions. And then the following memorable consequence resulted. (I state it in brief, because the history must be given by me more in detail in the next Section.) After the quelling of the factions, and the extinction of the weak dynasty of the Bowides, who had ruled since A.D. 933 in Persia, the Turkish chief, Togrul, was appointed by the Caliph *his Lieutenant*; (the inauguration being performed soon after with solemnity suited to the importance of the occasion;) and the Turk thereby legitimately constituted temporal lieutenant of the Prophet's Vicar, and head of the secular power of Islamism.¹ Then, and thence, was the reviving and reloosing of the long quiescent Moslem power against *Roman Christendom*.² And

¹ Cosri speaks of the "regnum Edom et regnum Ismael," i. e. "Christianorum et Turcarum," about A.D. 1100: so making the Turks the continuators and representatives of the Saracenic power.

² So Turner in his *History of England*, Vol. i. p. 307. "Togrul Beg produced . . . a revolution still more momentous to the mind and fortunes of mankind. Under his

I must here pray the reader well to mark the *place*; as I shall in the next Section call on him to mark the *time*. For it was the very place noted in the prophecy, as that from whence the destroying angels, under the sixth Trumpet-blast, were to be loosed and re-commissioned to destroy, —*Bagdad, by the Euphrates.*

This was *one* point that we were to prove in respect of the Turks. It only needs to pursue their history to see in it the fulfilment of the *other*.

2. Thus invested then, and with a freshness of fanatic fervour which spoke them animated by the same *spirit from hell* as their early Arab precursors, a holy war against Greek Christendom was speedily resolved on, in the very spirit of their commission. The chief Togrul himself dying, it fell to his nephew *Alp Arslan*, the successor to the office, title, and spirit of his uncle, and “with his name, next after that of the Caliph, similarly pronounced in the public prayers of the Moslems,”¹ to execute the project. Bearing in the very name of Alp Arslan, “the Valiant Lion,”² both his own character and that of his army, (according to the prophetic symbol, “I saw in the vision the heads of the horses as the heads of *lions*,” of which more in the next Section,) “he passed the Euphrates,” A.D. 1063, “at the head of the Turkish cavalry:” and the loss of the kingdom and frontier of Armenia, A.D. 1065, “was the news of a day.”³—But mightier change seemed portended by the then glaring comet in the heavens.⁴

reign the great Turkish nation adopted the religion of Mahomet. And, professing it with all the energy of their native character, and all the zeal of recent converts, they became its fierce champions at that precise æra when it was losing its hold on the human intellect; and, but for the support of their simple, rude, uncriticizing, credulous, and vehement spirit, might have quietly expired.” I copy from Mr. Forster’s *Mahomm. Unveiled*, i. 221.

¹ “The Turks deem no Sultan legitimately inaugurated until the Hutbe prayers, on a regularly-appointed Friday, shall have been solemnly offered up, for the health and prosperity of the new sovereign.” Faber, S. C. ii. 297. Also Whiston on Rev. p. 207; who cites as authority Leunclavius *Hist. Mussulm.* Col. 151.

² This kind of title, which reminds one of those of the American Indians, seems to have been common among the Turkmans. So *Kizil-Arslan*, the *red lion*, (as D’Herbelot, iii. 370, in the Article on *Tucash*, explains it,) a chief contemporary with Thogrul Beg: and again, *Kilidge Arslan*, the Sultan of the Turks encountered by the Franks of the first Crusade, at Nice.

³ Gibbon x. 352.

⁴ In 1066 appeared *the great comet*; great as never seen before. “The appalled multitude,” it has been said, “gazed night after night at the messenger of evil; the

The emperor Diogenes Romanus, (successor, after two or three brief reigns intervening, to the second Basil spoken of in the preceding chapter,) hastened to the defence of his empire. Franks, Normans, Bulgarians, mingled with the Greeks to add strength to his army; and the invisible tutelage of the Virgin Mary was invoked too, as we have seen, to his succour.¹ But succour came not to the Mariolatrist. In the fatal field near Malazgerd (A.D. 1071) his army was defeated, himself taken prisoner, and the fate of the Asiatic provinces sealed irretrievably.—The victorious career of Alp Arslan himself against Greek Christendom was indeed cut short by assassination. But it was followed up under *Malek Shah*, the greater son of a great father: him of whose empire we read that it extended, in its *final* amplitude, from the Chinese frontier, west and south, as far as the neighbourhood of Constantinople, the holy city of Jerusalem, (now just taken from the Fatimites,) and the spicy groves of Arabia Felix.²—I say the victorious career of the Turks against Greek Christendom was continued under him. For it was under the shadow of his sceptre, as the Asiatics express it, that *Suleiman*, one of the many Seljukian subordinate princes, achieved in 1074 the conquest of Asia Minor; and, with *Nice* as his capital, founded what was then the *dependent* principality of *Asia Minor*, or *Roum*. This was indeed, remarks the historian, “the most deplorable loss that the church and the empire had sustained since the first conquests of the Caliphs.” Nor did the severity of the scourge end at Malek’s death. For though three out of the four kingdoms into which his dominions then split, I mean those of Persia, Kerman, and Syria, had nothing to do with the fated desolation of the Greek empire, the destiny of the fourth, *Roum*, now become an independent kingdom, was different.—It seems that *Suleiman* had been originally urged to the war against the Christian infidels by the voice of the Caliph, as well as of the supreme Sultan: and as he deserved from them the

long-haired star darting its awful splendour from the horizon to the zenith:”—a portent that “with fear of change perplexed monarchs.” *Quart. Rev.* Oct. 1844, p. 301.

¹ See the coin of this emperor in my plate p. 486 *suprà*.

² *Gibb.* x. 365. His reign was from 1072 to 1092 A.D.

title of *Gazi*, or *Holy Champion*, by the vigour and success with which he conducted it, so by the manner also in which he continued to make it subservient to the propagation of the Mahomedan faith. Throughout the whole extent of the new kingdom, from the Euphrates to Constantinople, mosques were built, the laws of the Koran established, the mission of Mahomet preached, Turkish manners and language made to prevail in the cities, and Turkman camps scattered over the mountains and plains. On the hard condition of tribute and servitude the Greek Christians might enjoy the exercise of their religion. But their most holy churches were profaned, their priests insulted, thousands of the children circumcised, and of their brethren multitudes induced to apostatize. Alexius trembled on the imperial throne of Constantinople, and in plaintive letters implored the succours of Western Europe :¹ for, unless some great intervention should occur to prevent it, it threatened to extinguish his empire, and kill the third part of men.

And such an intervention did in fact arise. The *Crusades* began, (as I shall again have to notice in the next Section,) and continued for two centuries; not indeed so as to avert the destruction, but to delay it. And what I wish, at the present point of our inquiry, to call the reader's attention to, is this; that throughout those two centuries,—a period memorable in the historic page, as comprehending within it the rise, progress, and end of the Crusades from Western Europe,—the *Turkish Sultany of Roum*, in spite of the hostility thus aroused against it, still all through *preserved its vitality*. The host of the *first* Crusaders indeed, having taken Nice, (A. D. 1097,) and once and again defeated the Turkman hordes, forced them to move back the capital of their now contracted territory into the interior, to Iconium.² But in 1147 the leaders of the *second* Crusade, Conrad and King Louis VII, had in melancholy strains to relate to their countrymen that the power and spirit of the Anatolian Sultan remained unquenched; and how the bones of their Christian hosts lay bleaching among

¹ See the history in Gibbon, 370—375, whose words I chiefly use.

² Gibbon xi. 57, 104.

the Pamphylian hills, a monument of the continued sharpness of the Turkish arrows. Yet again in the *third* Crusade, A. D. 1189, the Emperor Frederic 1st, traversing the same route to the Holy Land, found every step of his fainting march besieged by the still innumerable hordes of the Turkmans: till, in desperation, he stormed Iconium, and forced the Sultan to sue for peace.¹—It was not until the next century that a power of a different character, and from a different quarter, viz. that of the *Moguls* under one of the generals of *Zenghis*, sweeping across Anatolia, broke the kingdom of Iconium: and then in manner, and with results, such as not to extinguish the *Turkman power* in Asia Minor, but only the *Seljukian dynasty* that had ruled over it.

Not, I say, the Turkman power. For so it had been ordered by an overruling Providence, that, just before this destroying Mogul irruption, a fresh band of Turkmans from Charisme and the Oxus, under Ortugrul and his son Othman, fleeing from the Moguls, had in A. D. 1240 engaged themselves in the service, and become subjects of the kingdom, of Aladin the then Sultan of Iconium.² And when the Seljukian dynasty had been extinguished, as before stated, one of these, reuniting some of the broken fragments, furnished a new head to the Turkmans of Anatolia. Gradually, but continuously, this process of reunion went on under the Othmans: the decline of the Moguls, and death of Cazan of the house of Zenghis, having, as Gibbon says,³ given free scope to the rise and progress of the Ottoman Empire. And at length, in the course of the 14th century, every fragment having been united by them, and the whole of Anatolia (including both Iconium and Nice, the more ancient and the later capital) embraced in their dominion, even as in the earlier and palmy days of Suleiman's greatness,—with the same manners, language, and laws remaining to it as before, as well as the same religion, and with an armorial memento too, as I believe, of

¹ Gibb. xi. 112—115.

² "Ortugrul became the soldier and subject of Aladin; and established at Surgut, on the banks of the Sangar, a camp of 400 families, or tents, whom he governed fifty-two years (A. D. 1247—1299), in peace and war." Gibb. xi. 432. ³ xi. 431.

the Seljukian ensign, in the crescent that gilded and surmounted its banners,¹—it might truly be said, as Gibbon remarks with his usual accuracy, that the ancient kingdom of the Seljukians had again revived under the Ottoman princes. The ruling dynasty was indeed different; and a brief interval of anarchy had passed before the revival: but not so (let the reader well mark the point) as to affect the unity and continuity of the Turkman Anatolian kingdom. Just as the Visigothic power in Spain was continued under Pelayo and his successors, or as the Frank kingdom, after

¹ The origin and date of the adoption of the *crescent* as a Turkish ensign has been a subject of much difference of opinion among the learned. Many suppose that it was not adopted till the taking of Constantinople; and then because of its having been a symbol of old Byzantium. So Franciscus Menenius and Busquebius; towards whose opinion Paulus Pater leans, as I am informed, in his Dissertation entitled “*Insignia Turcica* ;” though allowing the uncertainty of the question. Von Hanmer too thinks it not improbable that European writers (among whom are Gibbon, Hallam, Mills, &c.) may have been guilty of anachronism; and have spoken of the crescent, as waving on the banners of Saladin and the Seljukian Turks, *by anticipation*.

On the other hand, Sir Harford Jones Brydges, whose Oriental knowledge is well known, and who has been engaged in a *Life of Saladin*, gives it as his opinion on the subject, (as I learn through the kindness of Sir Robert Inglis,) that the crescent was one of the earliest bannerial distinctions used by the Sunni Mahommedans. Thus he thinks that Saladin, for example, (who was a Sunni,) carried a crescent marked on a *green* flag, the Abbassides of Bagdad on a *black*.

For my own part I cannot but strongly incline to the latter view. For 1st, it seems little credible to me that the Turks should have gone back above 1000 years to the antiquities of the old Byzantium for an ensign. 2nd, I read in D’Herbelot, on the word *Tacash*, that in a poem composed by one Kemaleddin in honour of his prince, a Chorasman Turkman, after his defeating the Seljukian Thogrul Beg, there occurs in it the passage following: “Takash will raise the religion and state of the Mussulmans as high (as the Seljukidæ themselves). The *crescent*, which glitters above his pavilions, has already received the homage of the greatest princes on earth.” So that at that early date, about A.D. 1070, it is spoken of as a *Mussulman* ensign. 3rd, In the conquest of Muscovy, about 1250 A.D., by Tartar detachments from Zenghis Khan, we read that, on converting the churches of the country into mosques, they fixed the *crescent* as the badge of Mahommedanism upon them: and that when, 200 years after, John Bascovitch delivered his country from the Tartar yoke, and restored the churches, he left the crescent standing, and planted a cross over it.—See Rees’ *Encyclopædia*, on the word *Crescent*.

Hence on the whole I infer that it was, as a *Mussulman* ensign, common to various Mussulman nations, as early as the 11th century; and so to the Seljukian Turks, the chief of the Mussulmans.—Considering the Turks’ (I might say the Moslems’) reverence for the new moon, of which Purchas speaks in his *Pilgrimage*, p. 295, the ensign was very natural.

Mr. Forster in his late work on *Arabian Geography*, i. 340, assuming that the crescent was a *Saracenic* banner, suggests the passage *Judg.* viii. 21, “Gideon took away the *ornaments* (Marg. *ornaments like the moon*) that were on the camels’ necks,” (sc. of the Midianites Zeba and Zalmunna,) in illustration. “The regal crescent,” he says, “on the war-camels of the Midianitish kings would naturally pass into the standard of the nation, and hence become the standard of Mahomet and his followers.” He allows, however, that no mention of the *crescent* occurs in the early history of the Saracens. And I believe it was a *Turkman* ensign, not *Arabian*.

the dissolution of the Carolingians and anarchy consequent, was yet kept up in the new line of Hugh Capet,—just as, (to take a biblical example,) Judah, when revived under Nehemiah or the Maccabean princes, after the longer or shorter periods of interregnum consequent on the invasions of Nebuchadnezzar and Antiochus, was still regarded in Scripture prophecy and promise as the same Judah,—so is the identity of the Ottoman with the old Seljukian empire demonstrable, on this reorganization of the Turkman power.¹ And, as under the one dynasty it began the fulfilment of the prophecy of the sixth Apocalyptic Trumpet, so under the other, as I must now briefly notice, it completed it.

Although indeed, as to the rest, what need it to tell the well-known history? Of the Sultans Othman and Orchan, Amurath and Bajazet,² who knows not; and of the passage of their victorious armies across the Hellespont? Who knows not how, from the Danube to the Adriatic, the European provinces of the empire were then, one after another, rent from it by the ruthless foe, until its vitality was almost confined to the city of Constantine: just as vegetable life sometimes dies down to the root: or, where the limbs are dead, the animal life may still beat at the heart? Then at length, says the historian,³ for the first

¹ Foxe in his *Eicasmī in Apocalypsin*, explaining this Trumpet of the *Turks*, similarly traces the continuity of the Seljukians and Othmans. “Turcos post 192 annos Tartari attracti ab Armeniis, A.D. 1240, deturbatos principatu, . . . sibi parere coegerunt. Etsi Turci ipsi, noudum prorsus aboliti, sparsim quedam retinuerunt in Cappadociâ, Galatiâ, et Bithyniâ. Principe tamen caruerunt; donec, Tartarorum imperio paulatim labefacto, circâ A.D. 1300 pristinam denuo potentiam sub principe Othmanno recuperarunt.”

So too Mills, *Hist. of Mahomedism*; “The Seljuks of Iconium and the Chorasman Tartars became one people, known in history by the common name of *Ottoman Turks*; and the sword and sceptre of power were transferred from the sluggish Seljukian princes to their ambitious and enterprizing generals.” p. 261. Cited by Faber, ii. 288.

I believe the title *Tartar* is here incorrectly given to the Ottoman Turks. M. Klapproth distinguishes between Turks and Tartars; considering the former as of Caucasian, the latter of Mongol race.

² The dates of the reigns of the four first Ottoman princes are as follows: Othman, A.D. 1299—1326; Orchan, A.D. 1326—1360; Amurath, A.D. 1360—1389; Bajazet, A.D. 1389—1403.

It was about the time of the decline of the Moguls, and a little before the accession of *Othman*, that the Latin Crusaders were finally driven out of Palestine. 1291 was the date of that event.

Orchan subdued the Asiatic provinces to the Bosphorus and Hellespont, consummating the captivity or ruin of the seven Asiatic Churches; and was the first also to cross into Europe.

³ Gibbon xi. 445.

time for above 1000 years from its foundation, Constantinople was surrounded both on the Asiatic and European side by “the arms of the same hostile monarchy.” The four tempest-angels seemed to have occupied each its corner of the heavens, whence to destroy : and the Turkman Sultan, *Mahomet the 2nd*, furnished the *earthly* agency for the consummation of the catastrophe.—On the particulars of this catastrophe it is not my present purpose to dwell. There are various most interesting points of detail, which will call for notice in the next Section. Suffice it in the present to have shown, as I proposed, the *national continuity of these Turkmans*, from the time of their first commissioning, and the loosing of the Moslem power under them against Roman Christendom, down to that of their destroying the Greek empire. And, in conclusion, let me only remark how by their official titles and appellatives the Turkman Sultans seemed almost to proclaim before the world their identity on those points with the prefigured agents of the second woe. *Slayer* as he was, in Apocalyptic phrase, *of the third of the men* of Christendom, the Sultan called himself *Hunkiar*, the *slayer of men*.¹ Reviver and relooser as he was, agreeably with the Apocalyptic prophecy, of the long dormant spirit of the preceding woe, i. e. of the spirit of the old Moslem Caliphate, he had soon the *caliphate*, or *spiritual headship* of the Moslem world, yielded up to him,² (as, long before, its *temporal* headship,) and added it also to his titles. Finally, having in 1530 united Bagdad to his dominions,—just as if to direct the attention of an enquirer to *that city by the Euphrates*, as the *local source* whence, as here foretold, his primary commission issued,—he inserted it prominently into the list of his proud titles of empire. “I Sultan of Sultans,” was his style of writing, “Governor of the earth, Lord of Mecca, Medina, and Jerusa-

¹ See Dallaway's Constantinople, p. 41, and Thornton's Turkey, p. 95. Thornton explains this of the Sultan's right of slaying *his own subjects*. But is this probable?

² It was solemnly assigned in the year 1517 to the Turkish Sultan Selim, by the Sherif of Mecca, after the overthrow of the Circassian Mamelucs in Egypt. His was at that time the chief *quasi-caliphate* remaining : the Abbassidean caliphate at Bagdad having been extinguished by the Tartars in the year 1258; that of the Fatimites A.D. 1171; and that of Cordova yet earlier, before the middle, I believe, of the eleventh century.—Hence the Sultan's title of Imam ul Muslimim, Chief Pontiff of Mussulmans; and the almost divine sacredness of his character in their eyes, in consequence. See Gibb. xi. 128, 418; Univ. Hist. xii. 263; and Thornton pp. 93, 94.

lem, &c. &c.,—and more particularly of *the capital of the Caliphs, BAGDAD.*"¹

§ 2.—FURTHER CHARACTERISTICS OF THE NATION
COMMISSIONED IN THE SECOND WOE.

In the preceding Section the two first noted and most prominent particulars, designative of the people that were to be God's scourge under the second woe, viz. their receiving their commission from the same locality where the former or Saracenic woe had been bound, i. e. *by the Euphrates*, and their *destroying the third part of men*, the Greek empire, have been shown to apply to the *Turks*,—the Seljukian and Ottoman Turks. And it surely needs not to say that they can apply to no other nation whatsoever. In order, however, yet more distinctly to fix the application, there are added certain other characteristics of the people intended; describing their *numbers*, their *personal appearance*, the particular *instrumentalities* used by them *in destroying and injuring*, and the *period of time* (a period very singularly defined) within which they were to execute their commission of slaying the third part of men. These I proceed now to consider—the simpler points more in brief; the difficult and the most important more at large.

1. And, *first*, as to their *numbers*. "The number of the armies of the *horsemen*," it is said, "was *myriads of myriads*:"²—a numeral phrase indefinite, but, according to its natural and not infrequent use in Scripture,³ expressive

¹ Ferrario, Part iii. See also Thornton's Turkey, p. 54; who gives the list as heading a Treaty of A.D. 1790, with the king of Prussia.

² Many manuscripts read *δυο μυριαδες* or *δυσ μυριαδες*. These our translators have followed. Griesbach, on *external* evidence, prefers the more simple reading *μυριαδες μυριαδων*; which seems to me preferable on *internal* also. So too Michaelis, in his Introduction to the New Testament, ch. xxxiii. § 11. (Marsh's Translation.) He thinks the *δυο* "very improbable." So too the Translator of Hug on N. T. Introd. p. cxxv.

³ Compare Gen. xxiv. 60; *γινου εις χιλιαδας μυριαδων*. "Be thou the mother of thousands of myriads:"—Num. x. 36; *επιστρεφε Κυριε χιλιαδας μυριαδας εν τη Ισραηλ*. "Return to thy thousands of myriads (Heb. myriads of thousands) in Israel;" an example strikingly to the point, as the numbers of Israel are mentioned, in the census of Num. i. 45, 46, to have been only 603,550 above twenty years old:—Dan. vii. 10: *μυριαι μυριαδες παριστηκεισαν αυτη*. "Myriads of myriads stood before

of large numbers ; and of which the applicability characteristically to the Turkman armies, more especially as it is not mere numerousness of *soldiers* that is noted, but numerousness of *horsemen*, is to a student of the history of the times notorious. Numerous indeed were the contemporary armies of Western Europe, at the close of the 11th century ; though not innumerable like the Turks. But herein was a greater distinction. With them the cavalry or knights were comparatively few ; the bulk of the army being foot-soldiers : whereas of the Turkman, as of the Saracen armies before, (and who so well knew the fact as the Greeks and Franks that encountered them?) the numbers numberless were cavalry.¹—Further it has been suggested by Daubuz,² and I think not without reason, that there may be probably an allusion also in the *form of expression* to the Turkman custom of numbering by *tomans* or *myriads*. For though not unused among other nations,³ yet there is probably none with whom it has been from early times so prevalent as with the Turkmen and Tartars. Thus, as the same author adds in illustration, the population of Samarcand was rated at seven *tomans*, because it could send out 70,000 horsemen warriors. Again, the dignity and rank of Tamerlane's father and grandfather was thus described, that they were the hereditary chiefs of a *toman* of 10,000 horse.⁴ So that it is not without his usual propriety of language that Gibbon speaks of “the *myriads* of the (Seljukian) Turkish horse overspreading the Greek frontier, from the Taurus to Erzeroum :” or of the cavalry of the earlier Turks of Mount Altai “being, both men and horses, proudly computed by *millions*.”⁵ He had doubtless the Turkman phraseology and mode of numbering in

him :”—and the same nearly, Rev. v. 11 : *ην ὁ αριθμος αυτων μυριαδες μυριαδων* i. e. according to Griesbach's reading. Compare Procopius' *μυριαδων μυριας*, (Gibb. vii. 424.) said of the numbers that fell by the plague under Justinian.

¹ e. g. The forces of the *Seljukian* Sultan Soliman, encountered by the first Crusaders at Nice, are stated by the Christians, says Gibbon, (xi. 60.) at 200 or even 360 thousand horse. Again Knolles states the number of the Timariot horsemen of the *Othman* Turkish empire, as alone amounting in his time, i. e. in the earlier half of the 17th century, to above 700,000.

² p. 442.

³ e. g. Of the inhabitants of Nineveh there are said in Jonah, iv. 11, (Septuag.) to have been twelve myriads.

⁴ Gibbon, xii. 4.

⁵ Gibbon, vii. 287, (where note the expression “both men and horses,” conjointly, just as in our prophetic figuration,) x. 351.

his mind, when he penned the two sentences; and, in the last of them, their proud habit of exaggeration also. And wherefore then may we not suppose a similar reference, since the turn of the phrase is similarly apt and characteristic, in the Apocalyptic notice of number before us?

It is added, "And I *heard* the number of them." And, considering the pointedness of the declaration,—appended as it is to the notice of the numbers previous, in an order and form unusual,¹—and also John's *representative* character on the Apocalyptic scene, I cannot but think that it may have been meant to betoken that the report of the 'Turkmans' might and numbers would fall *with more than common impressiveness* upon the ear of the Christian Church.² If so, it surely needs but a glance at history to see the realization of the intimation. Passing over the terrors of the Turkman name to the *Greek* Christians, we know that by Peter the Hermit personally, and by the letters also of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, the report was carried to all the princes and churches in Western Christendom. "Jerusalem has been besieged, taken, sacked, razed, triumphed over. What may the rest of Christendom promise itself? The strength of the Turks is daily increased: their forces are fiercer and stronger than the forces of the Saracens: they have already devoured the whole world in hope. We call on you for help, as Christians not in the name and profession only, but in heart, soul, spirit. Ere the tempest thunder, ere the lightning fall on you, avert from yourselves and children the storm hanging over your heads!"³

¹ The usual and simple mode of expressing the thought would have been; "And I heard the number of them, myriads of myriads;" the notice of hearing being prefixed to the statement. Compared with which the emphasis of the actual expression, "the number of them was myriads of myriads;—and I heard the number of them:" will be evident.

² Compare a somewhat similar, though less emphatic use of the expression in 1 Sam. xiii. 3, 4: "Jonathan smote the garrison of the Philistines that was in Geba; and the Philistines heard of it. And Saul blew the trumpet throughout the land, saying, Let the Hebrews hear! And all Israel heard say that Saul had smitten a garrison of the Philistines; and that Israel was had in abomination with the Philistines." So too 1 Sam. xvii. 23, &c. It marks *impression*.

Compare too in "the burden of Babylon," seen by Isaiah, what was imprest on his ear in vision;—"The noise of a multitude in the mountains, like as of a great people: . . . the Lord of hosts mustereth the host of the battle." Isa. xiii. 4. Also 2 Kings vii. 6: "The Lord hath made the host of the Syrians to hear a noise of chariots, and a noise of horses, even the noise of a great host:" &c.

³ Observe here the Apocalyptic figure of a *tempest*; a figure agreeing with the supposition of the four tempest-angels being the invisible directors of the woe.

Deliver us : deliver your religion ; and God shall requite you." So as Knolles relates,¹ the report was echoed and thrilled through Western Christendom :—among the *true*, as well as the *false*, that bore the Christian name : the former having as yet not formally, or in a body, separated from the Church visible. And what followed? The Council of Clermont : the fermentation through Christendom : and then its precipitation in the crusades against the Euphratean horsemen. All was but the result of that hearing of the bruit of the Turkish might and terribleness from Jerusalem. " And *I heard* the number of them."

2. The next descriptive trait represents to us their *personal appearance and array*. This is a point not forgotten, as we have seen, in the figurative prophetic descriptions, whether of the Old or New Testament. So, for instance, in that of the Assyrian lovers of Aholah in Ezekiel ; " Horsemen *clothed with blue*, riding upon horses, captains and rulers :"² and again, turning to the Apocalypse, in that of the Saracens with man-like faces, but hair as the hair of women, just preceding ; and in that of Papal Rome and its hierarchy, as typified by the *scarlet-coloured* Woman, yet to come.³ So here of the Euphratean armies : " I saw the horses in the vision, and them that sate on them, having breast-plates of *fire*, (i. e. of *fire-colour*,) and *jacinth*, and *sulphur* ;" or of red, blue, and yellow. On which it is the just remark of Mr. Daubuz,⁴ " that from their first appearance the Ottomans have affected to wear war-like apparel of scarlet, blue, and yellow : a descriptive trait the more marked from its contrast to the military appearance of Greeks, Franks, or Saracens contemporarily." And, indeed, I may add that it only needs to have seen the Turkish cavalry, (as they *were* before the late innovations,) whether in war itself, or in the djerrid, war's mimicry, to leave an impression of the absolute necessity of some such

¹ See the Patriarch's Letter in Knolles' History of the Turks, p. 13 : also Gibb. x. 385 ; who says, " A nerve was touched of exquisite feeling ; which vibrated to the heart of Europe."

² Ezek. xxiii. 6.—So again in Ezek. xxvii. 7, of Tyre ; " Fine linen with brodered work from Egypt was that which thou spreadest forth to be thy sail ; blue and purple from the isles of Elishah was that which covered thee." Also Nahum ii. 3, &c.

³ Apoc. xvii. 4.

⁴ p. 444.

notice of their rich and varied colourings, in order to convey in description at all a just impression of their appearance.

The word *hyacinthine*, let me observe, seems to fix the *primary* meaning of the other two words *fire-like*, *sulphur-like* thus, as signifying *colour*. At the same time the singularity of the words used to figure it,¹ cannot but strike us. And the general *appropriateness* of Scripture emblems, —an appropriateness largely evidenced and exemplified in a former chapter,²—may suggest the suspicion of *fire* and *sulphur* having been things in some peculiar and characteristic manner connected with the Turkish armies:—a suspicion confirmed, and also explained, by a subsequent mention of fire and sulphur in the emblematic figuration of them; and of which this twofold notice tends to show the importance.

3. To this point, then, let us next direct our attention. “The *heads* of the horses,” the Evangelist proceeds to observe, “were as the heads of *lions*: and out of their mouths goeth forth *fire*, and *smoke*, and *sulphur*. By these three was the third of men slain;—by the fire, and the smoke, and the sulphur that proceedeth out of their mouths. For their power is in their mouths, &c.”—The horses and their riders are here evidently a composite symbol: the *riders* being mentioned just once, as if, like the *human resemblances* in the Arab scorpion-locusts, to notify *man’s agency* in the scourge;³ but all the principal characteristics, including such as must needs refer not to animals, but to men, being said of the horses. So in the clause, “their *heads* were as the heads of *lions*.” On which let me just observe, in passing, that as the *heads*, being unnatural, are of course symbolic, and the symbol, according to its all but constant use in Scripture,⁴ to be interpreted of leaders of the Eu-

¹ We may indeed compare the *πυρινος* in this sense with the *πυρρος* of Apoc. vi. 4 and xii. 3; but the *θειωδες*, *sulphur-like*, is not used elsewhere in Scripture to denote colour.

² See p. 420, &c., *suprà*.

³ The “decorum” of the symbol *here*, but not *there*, admitting of *this* mode of introducing the *human* element.

⁴ E. g. Isa. vii. 8; “The head of Syria is Damascus, and the head of Damascus is Rezin.” Dan. ii. 38; “Thou art the head of gold.” Judges xi. 11; “They made

phratean armies,—it might seem a preintimation that to these leaders the same lion-like destroying character would attach, as to the Saracens before them. And we have seen that there was an answering, in respect not of character only, but even of title, in the Alp Arslans and Kilidge Arslans, the Valiant Lions and Noble Lions, of the *Seljukians*; and in the pretensions and character of the *Othman* Sultans also.¹—But it was specially of *the new destroying agency*, predicated of them, that I was to speak, as the really characteristic point in the description. “Out of their mouths,” says St. John, “issued *fire*, and *smoke*, and *brimstone* :”² it being added, as if to limit and define their instrumental use; “By these three *was the third part of men killed*, by the fire, and by the smoke, and by the brimstone, which issued out of their mouths.” Now that there is in this, as Mede suggests,³ an allusion to the modern *artillery* used by the Ottomans against Constantinople, seems to me so obvious and so striking, that I cannot but wonder that any one, as Dean Woodhouse, should have objected to, or even, as Vitringa, hesitated about it.⁴ Wherefore could the Dean speak of the interpretation as a force on prophetic language, unworthy of respectable names? If the arms of a nation be often elsewhere noticed in prophetic Scripture, why not here?—And where, indeed, and on what other occasion, did ever the arms employed bear so memorable, so all-important an influence, on the great catastrophe? For I would wish strongly to impress this point on the reader’s mind. It is marked prominently in the prophecy before us. It is marked prominently also in the history. It was to “the fire and the smoke and the sulphur,” to the artillery and fire-arms of Mahomet, that the killing of the

him to be a head and governor :” *κεφαλὴν καὶ ἀρχηγόν*. Again in Rev. xiii we read in this sense of the seven heads of the Beast; and in Psalm lxxiv. 13, 14 of the heads of Leviathan and the Dragon. So again Psalm xviii. 43, “Thou hast made me to be the head of the heathen.”

¹ So Rycart on the Turks, chap. xxi : “The Turks compare the Grand Seigneur to the *lion*, and other kings to little dogs.”

² Or *sulphur*.

³ So too Brightman before, and Daubuz after Mede.

⁴ “An mysticè hic alludatur ad morem bellorum gerendorum per machinas flammam ex incenso pulvere sulphureo evomentes, . . fidenter asseverare non ausim.” p. 541.—Probably Vitringa’s hesitation on the subject arose out of his unfortunate exposition of the four angels, as meaning four *successive* Mussulman powers that attacked the Greek empire; of whom none but the *Turks* used cannon.

third part of men, i. e. the capture of Constantinople, and by consequence the destruction of the Greek empire, was owing. Eleven hundred years and more had now elapsed since her foundation by Constantine. In the course of them, Goths, Huns, Avars, Persians, Bulgarians, Saracens, Russians, and indeed the Ottoman Turks themselves, had made their hostile assaults, or laid siege against it. But the fortifications were impregnable by them. Constantinople survived, *and with it the Greek empire.*¹ Hence the anxiety of the Sultan Mahomet to find that which would remove the obstacle. “Canst thou cast a cannon,” was his question to the founder of cannon that deserted to him, “of size sufficient to batter down the wall of Constantinople?” Then the foundry was established at Adrianople, the cannon cast, the artillery prepared, and the siege began.—It well deserves remark, how Gibbon, always the unconscious commentator on the Apocalyptic prophecy, puts this new instrumentality of war into the foreground of his picture, in his eloquent and striking narrative of the final catastrophe of the Greek empire. In preparation for it he gives the history of the recent invention of gunpowder, “that mixture of saltpetre, sulphur, and charcoal:” tells of its earlier use by the Sultan Amurath; and also, as before said, of Mahomet’s foundry of larger cannon at Adrianople: then, in the progress of the siege itself, describes how “the volleys of lances and arrows were accompanied with the smoke, the sound, and the fire of the musketry and cannon:” how “the long order of the Turkish artillery was pointed against the walls; fourteen batteries thundering at once on the most accessible places:” how “the fortifications which had stood for ages against hostile violence, were dismantled on all sides by the Ottoman cannon, many breaches opened, and, near the gate of St. Romanus, four towers levelled with the ground:” how, as “from the lines, the galleys, and the bridge, the Ottoman artillery thundered on all sides, the camp and city, the Greeks and the Turks, were involved in a cloud of smoke, which could only be dispelled by the final deliverance or destruction of the

¹ I have not particularised the Latin capture of Constantinople, A.D. 1203, because the Latins had a party among the Greeks.

Roman empire :” how “the double walls were reduced by the cannon to a heap of ruins :” and how, the Turks at length “rushing through the breaches,” “Constantinople was subdued, her empire subverted, and her religion trampled in the dust by the Moslem conquerors.” I say it well deserves observation, how markedly and strikingly Gibbon attributes the capture of the city, and so the destruction of the empire, to the Ottoman artillery.¹ For what is it but a comment on the words of our prophecy, “By these three was the third part of men killed ; by the fire, and by the smoke, and by the sulphur, which issued out of their mouths.”—Indeed by a Turkish historian, describing the same catastrophe, the destroying instrument of war is described under a very similar figuration to the Apocalyptic. “The Moslems placed their *cannon* in an effective position. The gates and ramparts of Constantinople were pierced in a thousand places. The flame which issued from the mouths of those instruments of warfare, of brazen bodies and fiery jaws, cast grief and dismay among the miscreants. The smoke which spread itself in the air rendered the brightness of day sombre as night ; and the face of the world soon became as dark as the black fortune of the unhappy infidels.”²

4. Next as to the appearance of the *horses’ tails*.—And in this, according to what I cannot hesitate to regard as its true interpretation,—though to support it we have not, as before, the authority of many consenting interpreters, but by all of them that I have seen, except Dr. Keith, it is not so much as hinted, and by him only glanced at allusively, and in a Note,—I say there seems to me in this descriptive point a symbol as remarkable and as characteristic of the Turks, as even that on which we last commented:—I might perhaps say more so. For what are the terms of the description? “The horses’ power (ἡ

¹ Gibbon xii. 62, 197, 210, 211, 221, 228, 229, 231.—I observe that the same point is noted somewhat strikingly in the narrative of the Byzantine historian Chalcocondyles. He calls the cannon *τηλεβολος*.

² Cited appropriately by Dr. Keith (in Apoc. Vol. ii. p. 46) from the *Tadg al Tivarikh* (or *Diadem of Histories*) of Saadeddin, “the preceptor and historiographer of Murad 3, and prince of Ottoman historians,” as translated in David’s *Grammar of the Turkish language*.

εξουσια των ιππων) is in their mouth, and in their tails : for their tails were like unto serpents, having heads,¹ and with them they do injury." Now had it been simply said, "their tails were like serpents, and with them they injure," the case would have resembled that of the scorpion-locusts' tails of the plague preceding;² and might be presumed to have indicated here, just as there, the injury merely, and venom of a false religion accompanying it, done by the new agencies of woe. But there is mentioned, in addition, the peculiarity of these *serpent-like horse-tails*,³ seen in vision, *having heads*. And thus, according to the usual well-known prophetic use of the symbol of a *head*, as already a little while since observed,⁴ the further idea is naturally, I may almost say necessarily suggested, of *rulers*, or *governing authorities*,⁵ in association with the horse-tails. But how so? The *crown* seems a sufficiently natural symbol to denote a *conquering emperor*, the *diadem* a *monarch*, the *sword* a *military prefect*, the *balance* an *administrator of justice*. But a *horse-tail* to denote a ruler! Strange association! Unlikely symbol! Instead of symbolizing au-

¹ εχουσαι κεφαλαι: i. e. the ουραι, or tails of the horses.

² Apoc. ix. 10; "They (the locusts) have tails like scorpions, and stings were in their tails."

In describing the emblem under consideration there is much inexactness among expositors. E. g. Bishop Newton: "They (the horses) very much resemble the locusts; the tails of serpents, with a head at each end, being attached to the horses." And Dr. Hales; "The horsemen sting with scorpions' tails." By this misapprehension of the prophetic statement these interpreters seem to me to have blinded themselves and their readers to the singular significancy of the symbol. The tails, according to the prophetic language, were still *horse-tails*: but serpent-like, through having serpent-like heads at their extremity; and with the hairs of the tails intertwined, so as to give to the whole horse-tail a serpent-like form and appearance. The word οφειν, let it be observed, is *masculine*; the ουραι and εχουσαι feminine.

Since so writing I see that Hengstenberg, in Apoc. Vol. i. 371, notices this point in the figure. "It is not said of the tails of the serpents that they had heads, but of the tails of the horses." He strangely adds; "These resemble serpents, which have grown to the tail, and have the head free for biting." (!)

³ In illustration of this *serpent-like* allusion in the symbol I may observe that, at the time of the first rise of the Seljukian Turks, it was said of them by one of his Omrahs to Massoud, son of Mahmud of Ghizni; "Your enemies were in their origin a swarm of ants. They are now *little snakes*. And, unless they be instantly crushed, they will acquire the venom and magnitude of *serpents*." The above is quoted by Gibbon x. 343; and illustrates, in respect of the *serpent-like* form of the Apocalyptic horse-tails, not the figurative sense only, but in a manner also the national appropriateness of the symbol.

⁴ See Note 4, p. 509, supra.

⁵ αι εξουσαι αυτων, "their *authorities* are in their tails," is the notable reading in some MSS. The word is similarly used in the plural Luke xii. 11, Rom. xiii. 1, &c.

thority and rule, the *tail* is in other Scriptures put in direct contrast with the *head*, and made the representative rather of the subjected and the low.¹ Besides which it is not here the lordly lion's tail, but that of the horse. Who could ever, *à priori*, have conceived of such an application of it? And yet among the *Turks*, as we know,—i.e. among the Euphratean horsemen who were to kill the third part of men,—that very association had existence, and still exists to the present day. It seems that in the times of their early warlike career the principal standard was once lost, in the progress of battle; and the Turkman commander, in its default, cutting off his horse's tail, lifted it on a pole, made it the rallying ensign, and so won the victory.² Hence the introduction and permanent adoption among the Turks throughout their empire of this singular ensign;—among the Turks *alone*, if I mistake not, of *all the nations that have ever risen up on our world's theatre*:³ and this as what was thenceforward—from the prime vizier to the governors of provinces and districts—to constitute each ruler's badge, mark his rank, and give him name and title. For it is the ensign of *one, two, or three horse-tails* that marks distinctively the dignity and power of the *Turkish Pasha*.⁴—Marvellous prefiguration! And who but HE could have depicted it, to whom the future is clear as the

¹ So Deut. xxviii. 44; *Ὁὗτος ἐστὶ ἐνς κεφαλὴν, σὺ δὲ ἐσὶ ἐνς οὐραν*. “He shall be the head, and thou shalt be the tail.”

² So Tournefort Travels, Letter 13; also Ferrario. The following is Ferrario's account of the origin of the ensign. “An author acquainted with their customs says that a General of theirs, not knowing how to rally his troops that had lost their standards, cut off a horse's tail, and fixed it to the end of a spear; (*pomo d'una lancia*;) and the soldiers, rallying at that signal, gained the victory.” *Costumi, &c.*, i. 126.—He adds further, that whereas, “on his appointment, a Pasha of three tails *used* to receive a drum (*tamburo*) and a standard, now for the *drum* there have been substituted three horses' tails, tied at the end of a spear, round a gilded haft. One of the first officers of the palace presents him these three tails and a standard.”

³ The Hetman of those Cossacs that migrated to Poland is also stated, I have somewhere read, to have been presented by the Polish king with a *horse-tail*, among other ensigns of authority. But these Cossacs were but a small tribe; and it seems likely that they borrowed this military ensign, as they did many of their military terms, from the Turkmen.

⁴ In Blackwood's Magazine for August, 1842, the writer of the Chapter on Turkish history thus appropriately makes use of the figure. “The recent overthrow of the Mameluk power by the Ottomans had extended the *shadow of the horse-tails* far along the coast of Africa.” He is speaking of the times of Barbarossa.

And in that same North of Africa we still find the figure used, by the remnant-few of the once mighty Turkish empire there remaining. On General Bugeaud's summoning the tribe of Mascara to submission, the answer began thus; “*The horse of submission has no tail.*” *Semaphore de Marseilles*, June 12, 1841.

TURKMAN STANDARD OF THREE HORSE-TAILS.



present; and who, in his Divine prescience, speaks of things that are not as though they were?

“And with these they do injustice:” *αδικουσι*. There seems a certain antithesis in this to what is predicated of the heads *in front*. With the lion-like fire-breathing heads in front the symbolic horses were to *kill* the third of men; i. e. to kill them in their political or national character. With these *heads* behind they were *afterwards* to *injure* and *oppress* the individuals of the remnant left; while also diffusing around them the poison of their false religion.—And alas! turning to historic records for illustration on this point, where is the *writer* on the Turkish conquests and administration that does not tell of the oppression of the Christian subject rayahs by these Turkman Pashas? As Knolles, in his Sketch of the Turkish Greatness, expresses it; “His Bassaes, like ravening harpies, as it were suck out the blood of his poor subjects.” And where is the *traveller* through European Turkey, (at least if his travels dated before the late Greek revolution,) that has not with his own eyes witnessed the same?—Even now the scene rises in memory before the author, of the long train of a Turkish Pasha proceeding to his Pashalik in Greece; which past him by, winding in picturesque array up one of the defiles of Mount Othrys, near where that mountain-chain frowns over Thermopylæ. And bright, he remembers, shone the sunbeams on the varied colourings, the “red, blue, and yellow,” of the horses, horsemen, and foot-retainers, in the procession; and proudly the ensign was borne before the Turkman of *two horse-tails*, to mark his dignity. But associated with the remembrance there rise up other recollections also:—the scene of a village which, on entering it a few days before with his companions, he had found deserted, though with marks of recent habitation; and from which, as a straggler emerging from his hiding-place informed them, men, women, and children had fled to the mountains, to escape from the visit, on some errand of oppression, of one of the officers of a neighbouring Pasha. Nor again can the scene be forgotten of other permanently deserted villages, such as the traveller’s path each day almost had to pass by; and often with nothing but the

silent grave-yard in its loneliness, to tell the tale of former life and population. Thus was there set before his eyes how the inhabitants had failed before the oppressions of the Turkman Pashas. And, long ere he thought of entering on the direct investigation of prophecy, the singular aptitude and truth of this symbol, as applied to them, fixed itself on his mind; "*The horse-tails were like serpents, having heads; and with these they do injury and oppress.*"

So ends our analysis, and identification with the Turkman destroyers of Greek Christendom, of what was visible in the details of the Apocalyptic symbol. It is a symbol, we see, thoroughly Asiatic in character, to figure a thoroughly Asiatic subject. Yet, as involving so much admixture (i. e. according to my view of it) of the literal and the symbolic, objections might be anticipated, and have been made, against the explanation. And I feel it right that the reader should see and consider them.¹ But the truth of the coincidences that have been affirmed between symbol and fact remains unshaken. And the utter flatness and unmeaningness of the sacred symbol, according to these objectors' counter-view of it, seems to me only to add confirmation strong, though most unintended on their part, to the correctness of the Turkish solution.

5. There remains for explanation but one point more in the prophecy; viz. the *time* within which, as measured from the loosing of the four angels at the 6th Trumpet's sounding, their commission *to destroy the third part of men* was to be accomplished. A point this of great interest, and some difficulty. For, though freed by our explanation of *the four angels* spoken of, and of *their binding near the Euphrates* previously to the 6th Trumpet-blast, from various difficulties which have caused no little embarrassment to many former expositors,² it is yet one that needs careful consider-

¹ See my Paper on the objections to the Turkish solution in the Appendix to this Volume.—The Paper referred to, and also the above-written Paragraph in the text, first added to the 4th Edition of the *Horæ*, were the result of certain controversies that I had to carry on, with reference to the 6th Trumpet, subsequently to the publication of the previous Editions.

² Nothing, I conceive, can well be clearer, as to the *chronological* intimation contained in the prophecy, than these three things:—1st, that the four angels must have been in existence both at the earlier time of their binding, and at the later time of their loosing:—2. that the time of their loosing must have been at the sounding of

ation, in order to the satisfactory fixing of the meaning of the phrase in which the chronological term is announced. This settled, the historical fulfilment will soon appear.

As to the *chronological term* it is expressed as follows: "And the four angels were loosed; which were prepared, *εις την ωραν και ημεραν και μηνα και ενιαυτου*, to slay the third part of men." I conceive its meaning to be, that the slaying should continue *for*, or rather be completed *at the end of*, the mystical term of an hour day month and year, *aggregated together*. Hence both my view of the *aggregation* of the nouns of time, and my view of the sense of the *preposition εις*, governing them, are the first things to be here explained and justified.

Now as to my construction of the nouns of time *collectively*, and *in the aggregate*, I so understand them on two accounts. 1st, because that which is the only alternative construction appears to me on every account inadmissible: I mean that which, taking them each separately, would render the clause thus; that *at the destined hour, and destined day, and destined month, and destined year*, they should slay the third part of men.¹ For,—to say nothing of the want of the article prefix to three out of the four

the sixth Trumpet:—3. that the predicted period of the *hour day month and year*, (if those words be meant to signify a continuous period,) must have been the interval between the angels' loosing, and their accomplishment of the stated subject of their loosing, viz. to slay the third part of men. ✓

But what say expositors on this point, who, like Mede and Newton, Faber and Keith, explain the four angels to mean four Turkman Euphratean powers? As they cannot find any such four to have been constituted, or to have *had existence*, till about A. D. 1080 or 1090, (see my Note p. 489 *suprà*), they therefore necessarily look for some later event than this to answer to the *binding* of the angels. And they think to find it in the *restriction* of the Turkman power by the crusades; and the angels' *loosing* consequently, (and that of the 6th Trumpet's sounding,) in the cessation of that restraining power somewhere between the years 1280 and 1301; a time when the curbing power of the crusades had ceased, and the Othmannic Turkman come to the supremacy. But mark! at this epoch neither Mede's quaternion of kingdoms, nor Faber's, were any longer in existence.—Further, the period of the *hour day month and year* being made to end by Mede and Keith, where I think the Apocalypse really intends it to end, viz. at the capture of Constantinople by the Turks, and fall of the Greek empire, this period is necessarily from its very length made by them to begin about 1055; i. e. 250 years before *their epoch* of the sixth Trumpet's sounding.—On the other hand Bishop Newton and Mr. Faber, rightly deeming that its true *commencing* epoch ought to be that of the Trumpet's sounding, and of the angels' loosing, do yet make it *end*, in consequence of *their date* of the sounding, 250 years after the slaying of that third part of men, the Greek empire, which was to be the prophetic period's terminus. So too Hales. ✓

I have thus reverted to, and expanded, my chronological argument at p. 489, from a sense of the importance of the point involved in it.

¹ So, or nearly so, Vitringa, Daubuz, Heinrichs, M. Stuart, &c.

nouns, a prefix needed, I conceive, for such a rendering,¹—it will be obvious that it explains the clause as made up of tautologies: tautologies such that every successive word after the first, instead of strengthening, only weakens the supposed meaning; and which bring out, at last, as the result of their accumulation, nothing more than this, that the destruction spoken of should be effected *at the time appointed*. Do the inspired Scriptures ever speak in this way?—2ndly, I so take them, because in another complex chronological phrase, and one, in respect of its enigmatic form, perhaps the most nearly parallel to the present that prophetic Scripture offers, we have the exposition of inspiration itself, interpreting the constituent terms of the phrase as to be taken in the aggregate. I allude to the well-known clause in Daniel, (xii. 7.) *εις καιρον, καιρους, και ημισυ καιρου*, “for a time, times, and half a time,” or year, years, and half a year: which chronological formula, being made the equivalent of 1260 days,² i. e. of three years and a half, must consequently be a period of a year, two years, and half a year, *aggregated together*.—In this view of the clause now before us, the *article* prefix, standing at its head, may be understood not only to govern all the accusatives that follow, so as we find done elsewhere,³ but also to be a means for the better uniting of them, *as it were under a bracket*, as an hour day month and year, all added together: at the same time that it may mark them also as together making up *the period*; i. e. the period fore-ordained and fore-shown in the divine councils.

As to the rendering of *the preposition εις*, whether in the sense of *for*, or else *after, at the expiration of*, it must of course depend very mainly upon the sense attached to the verb *αποκτειναι*, *to kill*. If that verb may be taken in its less natural sense of a *continued* slaying of the inhabitants of Greek Christendom, until completed at length in the political slaughter of them as a national corporate body,⁴ then the preposition before us will have its more

¹ So Matt. xxv. 13; *ουδε την ημεραν, ουδε την ωραν*.

² Compare Dan. xii. 11; Rev. xii. 6, 14, &c.

³ *την δυναμιν και πλουτον και σοφιαν και ισχυν*, &c.; Apoc. v. 12. More generally the article is repeated; as ib. 13; *η εβλογια, και η τιμη, και η δοξα*, &c.

⁴ Less natural, because the slaying predicated is that of *the third part* (το τριτον)

common sense of *for*, or *during*, attached to it. If, on the other hand, *αποκτειναι* be deemed a verb denotative rather of the grand completed act of politically slaying the third part of men, i. e. the Greek empire,—then it seems necessary to take the preposition in its less common sense of *after*, or, *at the expiration of*.—As regards the first-mentioned chronological sense of the *εις*, (and I may suggest generally that in its application to *chronological* periods, or statements, the varied meanings of the word seem all borrowed from those which attach to it in its primary reference to *place*),¹ I say in regard of my first-mentioned

of the men of Roman Christendom *collectively*, and *nationally*. Were it the slaying of the individual members of that third part, then a *continuous* acting out of the slaughtering commission would be natural. Just as in Homer, Il. A. 15±, *Αιεν αποκτεινων επετ' Αργειοισι κελωνων*.

¹ The original meaning of the preposition *εις*, and that from which those relative to *time* are derived, is one implying *motion towards a place*, as its term and object;—motion which may be incomplete and that of *progress*, or completed by *arrival*; very much as represented in the English equivalents, *unto*, *at*. *Πορευομενος εις Ιεροσολυμα* going to or towards Jerusalem: here the movement is incomplete. *Κατελθων εις Καισαριαν* having come to, or arrived at, Cæsarea: here it is completed in arrival. To which latter class belong those cases in which actions, transient or continuous, are done at the place *after* arrival; as in, *Δει με ποιησαι την εορτην εις Ιεροσολυμα* "I must keep the feast at Jerusalem:" *Επισχε χρονον εις την Ασιαν* "He stopped a while at or in Asia."* Because, when the sentences are filled up, this would be the form of them; "Having arrived at Jerusalem, I must there keep the passover:"† "Having arrived in Asia, he stopped there."

From these meanings of *εις* that refer to *place* the transition is easy to ideas of *time*: and the English *until*, *up to*, or *at* the point of *time* limiting, answer here, in the rendering, to the English *unto*, *up to*, or *at*, in the cases just given of motion to a *local* limit. *Εις οτε*; until when? *Εις ηλιον καταδυντα*, till sunset.‡ *Εθεντο εις τηρησιν εις την αυριον* "they put them in ward till the morrow."§ In all these the implied motion to the fixed point of time limiting is *incomplete*.—*Ηλθον εις την ωραν ταυτην* "I came to, or have arrived at, this hour:" *πληρωθησονται εις τον καιρον αυτων* "My words shall be fulfilled at, or when arrived at, their season."|| Here the progress toward it is supposed to be *completed*.

To which general observations this must now be added: that whereas, in cases of a *local* term or limit, the *part nearest* of that *local limit* is yet at a certain distance from the original point of motion, and allowing consequently of progression towards it, there are sometimes, on the other hand, *chronological* cases in which the *term of time* limiting, (being not a fixed moment, but a term of some extent,) is in its *nearest* point in actual conjunction with the time then present, or that from which the progression is to be reckoned. In such cases the limiting point is necessarily the *end* of the term, not the *beginning*; and the meaning of the *εις* either *up to* that *end*, in the sense of *duration through the whole term* mentioned, or *at* the end, according to the nature of the action noted. So, first, in cases like those cited in my text: *Σπονδας εις ενιαυτον* "a truce for a year," i. e. "up to the end of a year, dated from the time then present: *κειμενα εις ετη πολλα* "goods laid up for, or to the end

* Luke ix. 53; Acts xviii. 21, 22; xix. 22.

† Compare Matthiæ on *εις*; p. 1006. (Bloomfield's ed. 1832.)

‡ Homer Odys. ii. 99; iii. 138.

§ Acts iv. 3.

|| John xii. 27; Luke i. 20. So again Phil. ii. 16; *καυχημα μοι εις ημεραν Χριστου*. Job xii. 5; *ητοιμαστο πεισιν εις χρονον τακτον* &c.

chronological sense of the *εις*, as *for* or *during*, applicable in the case of the *αποκτειναι* being meant of a continuous slaying of the men of Greek Christendom, illustrative parallel cases abound. So, for example, *Σπονδας εις ενιαυτον*, a truce *for* a year: *Κατισχυσε Ροβοαμ εις ετη τρια*, Rehoboam was strong for three years; &c.¹ Just similar to which also is *one* use of the analogous adverbs of time, *εως* and *αχρι*.²—In regard of the other suggested meaning of *εις*, as *after*, or, *at the expiration of*, a meaning needed in the case of *αποκτειναι* being taken in the sense of the individual momentary act of *killing*, or *destroying the national existence of*, the third part of men, the following two examples occur in illustration. 1st, according to the usually received punctuation of the Septuagint copies, Dan. xii. 7: “He said; How long (*εως ποτε*) shall it be to the end of these wonders? And he sware by Him that liveth for ever and ever, *οτι εις καιρον καιρους και ημισυ καιρου, εν τω συντελεσθηναι διασκορπισμον, γνωσονται παντα ταυτα* they shall know these things *at the end* of the aggregated time, times, and half a time.” But the punctuation here seems more than doubtful.³ In verse 12, however, of the same chapter we have an example not to be questioned: *Μακαριος ο υπομενων, και φθασας, εις ημερας χιλιας τριακοσιας τριακοντα πεντε*. “Happy is he who arrives (not at the *beginning*, but) *at the end* of the 1335 days.” A use of the *εις* precisely similar again to that of the analogous adverbs *εως* and *αχρι*.⁴

of, many years:” * *εις αι* “for ever, or to the end of the *αιων*, or world:” *Ζων ειμι εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων* “I am alive for, or to the end of, the ages of ages.” † All these are examples of *duration through*, or *up to the end of*, the period.—In cases of the other rendering, *at the end of*, there may be applied a similar principle of explanation.

¹ 2 Chron. xi. 17. Sept.

² Save only that *αχρι* and *εως* have a genitive following, the preposition *εις* an accusative. So *εως*, Dan. vii. 25; “They shall be given into his hand *εως καιρου και καιρων και γε ημισυ καιρου*” i. e. up to the end of the aggregate period, and through or during it.—The same too with *αχρι*. So *αχρι καιρου*, Luke iv. 13; “the devil left him *for*, or *up to the end of*, a season:” and again Acts xiii. 11; where we are told of Elymas being blind *αχρι καιρου*, for a season.

³ Surely a *full stop* should follow the *καιρον*; and the *εις*, before the terms of time, be construed in the sense of duration. Thus: “It shall be for a time, times, and half a time. At the end of the dispersion they shall know all these things.”

⁴ Of the *αχρι*, as in Acts xx. 6; *ηλθομεν προς αυτους εις την Τρωαδα αχρις ημε-*

* Luke xii. 19.

† Apoc. i. 18. Similarly 2 Peter iii. 18; *Αυτη η δοξα, και νυν και εις ημεραν αιωνος*.

After which last example when we turn to the passage we are discussing, "And the four angels were loosed, οἱ ἡτοιμασμενοι εἰς τὴν ὥραν καὶ ἡμέραν καὶ μῆνα καὶ ἐνιαυτον, ἵνα ἀποκτείνωσι τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀνθρώπων," the probability must suggest itself of the preposition being here too intended in the same sense; and of the true meaning of the phrase being that *after*, or *at the expiration of*, the *aggregated term* of an hour day month and year, (calculated from the time of the angels being re-commissioned and loosed,) "they should slay the third part of men."¹—Supposing however the other value of the εἰς to be preferred, in connexion with the other value of the ἀποκτείνωσι, "they were prepared *for* an hour day month and year, to *go on slaying* the third of men," i. e. until the slaughter was completed in the destruction of their national existence,²—the sense of the passage will come practically to the same thing: the chronological term in either case giving the interval between the epoch of the angels loosing, and the epoch of their *completed* killing of the third of men.

What the exact length of this period, and how many prophetic days it would in all make up, depends of course on the value that we attach to the ἐνιαυτος, the year mentioned: whether we prefer to consider it as, like the καιρος, a year of twelve months of thirty days each, i. e. a year of 360 days, not counting in the supplemental days added to make it accord with solar time; or whether as the actual current year, of near 365 days 6 hours. The latter value is attached to it by Mede and others: and there is, I think,

ρων πεντε: "We came to them at the end of five days;" i. e. of five days of travelling.* Of ἕως, as Matt. xxvii. 64; "That impostor said, After three days (μετα τρεῖς ἡμέρας) I shall rise again: command therefore that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day; ἕως τῆς τρίτης ἡμέρας." Where "*until the third day*" answers to "*after three days*;" and consequently means not until the *beginning*, but until the *end*, of the third day. So again Dan. xii. 6: 'ἕως ποτε το περας ὧν ειρηκας των θαυμασιων.

¹ I have the rather elaborated the foregoing criticism because of the importance of the point it relates to: and partly too because of the difficulty felt by some commentators respecting it; and the hasty, and, as it seems to me, incorrect criticisms passed on it by others. See Woodhouse, Faber, &c.—Mede construes the εἰς as I have, "*after*;" but does not support his translation.—Keith makes the whole time that of the *preparation* of the four angels: as if the participle were in the *present*, ἡτοιμωμενοι, *preparing*; not in the *past*, ἡτοιμασμενοι, *prepared*.

² So Mr. Birks in his *Mystery of Providence*.

* So Hoogeveen translates it (p. 83), "Venimus *intra* quinque dies; i. e. "In eo itinere consumpsimus quinque dies."

à priori probability in its favour from the adoption of the word *ἐνιαυτος*, in the place of *καιρος*, here, and here only in prophetic Scripture; a word signifying etymologically *that which returns into itself*.¹ At any rate the question is an open one; and the agreement of historic fact (as we shall show) with the calculation, as thus made, may be considered as deciding in its favour.—Thus estimated, then, the length of the period will be found to amount on the *year-day* system to 396 *years* 118 *days*; reckoning 12 hours to the prophetic day, on the principle some time since stated.² This was the period at the end of which, as measured from the epoch of their loosing, on the sixth Trumpet-blast, from the Euphrates, the horsemen of the vision, it was foretold to St. John, were *to destroy the third part of men*. And, convinced as we have been that the **TURKS** were the horsemen that acted under the guidance of the four angels in the matter, what now remains for us to do is only to look at historical dates: and, so calculating, to compare with the aforementioned prophetic period the actual historic interval between the first *loosing from the*

¹ Compare Wintle on Daniel, Preliminary Dissertation, p. xlix. After observing that the Babylonians and Persians, as well as Jews, held the division of the year into twelve months each of thirty days, he adds; “But Daniel adopted the name of *times* (יָמִים) for his periods, instead of calling them by the name of *anni*; which more properly applied to the *full annual revolutions of the sun*.” And then he appends a Note as follows. “*אָנִי, anni*, from *הָיָה, iterare*; wherein the sun reiterates his course, and returns to the same point whence he set out: or, according to Buxtorf, ‘in re suâ per vestigia semper volvatur et redeat.’ So the Greek *ἐνιαυτος*, from his revolving in himself (*ἐν ἑαυτῷ*): and hence the Egyptian hieroglyphic of a serpent with its tail in its mouth.” Similarly Gesenius on *הָיָה*

² As the Julian year equals 365 days 6 hours, the correspondent Apocalyptic period would, on the *year-day* principle, be in amount as follows:

A year	=	365 $\frac{1}{4}$ days	=	365 years	+	$\frac{1}{4}$ of a year.
A month	=	30 days	=	30 years.		
A day	=		=	1 year.		

Years 396.

$\frac{1}{4}$ of a prophetic day, or year,	=	91 days,	}	= 88 days.
Deduct Gregorian correction of 3 days,*				
An hour = $\frac{1}{24}$ of a prophetic day or year †				= 30 days.

Total = years 396 + 118 days.

* The exact length of the year is 365 days, 5 hours, 48 minutes, 57 seconds; or about 11 minutes less than 365 $\frac{1}{4}$ days; a difference which in about 130 years amounts to a day. Hence the necessity of retrenching a day from the Julian year every 130 years, or so, in order to keeping true time.

† See p. 325 *suprà*. Mr. Barker has suggested, Mr. Birks adopted, this view of the hour. “Are there not twelve hours in the day?”

Euphrates of the Moslem power, after revivification through connexion with the Turkmans, and the *taking of Constantinople*, and *destruction of the Greek empire*, by the Turks under the 2nd Mahomet.

In regard to the circumstances and the date of the former important event, and epoch, we may be thankful that we have full and authentic information in the two well-known Arabic historians Abulfeda and Elmakin; and indeed in the earlier and fuller historians, Al Bondari and Emad Eddin.¹ From them I borrow my statements and chronology in what follows.

It has been already noted² that in the year 1055, or of the Hegira 447, the Bagdad Caliph wrote to Thogrul Beg to come to his assistance against some threatening danger; the *Bowid* chieftain, who was at this time the secular head under him, having proved altogether an inefficient protector. Thogrul immediately answered to the summons, and gave the protection asked for: then, on occasion of some civic tumult occurring, seized on and imprisoned the Bowid Chief, thus extinguishing the supremacy of the Bowides, after it had lasted, says Elmakin, 127 years.³ He was now by the Caliph appointed, and publicly proclaimed in the mosques, "Protector and Governor of the Moslem empire;" the secular authority of the caliphate delegated to him; and his name recited, next to the Caliph's, in the public prayers.⁴—All this occurred in the month of Ramadan of that same year; that is in December A.D. 1055. This is the epoch noted by both Abulfeda and Elmakin, and not without reason, as that of the commencement of

¹ See the notice respecting these authors, pp. 525, 526 *infra*.

² See p. 497; also on the origin of the Bowid rule at Bagdad, p. 466.

³ He adds as to *date* and *publicity*; "Et cessavit oratio ejus in fine Ramadani; atque ita desiit imperium Boijtarum:"—the *oratio* that he speaks of, being that same public prayer for the Bowid, as chief lord of the Moslems, which I noticed in reference to the Othmans, p. 498 *suprà*.

⁴ After stating that it was in that year that the power of the Bowides ended, and was transferred to the Seljuks, Abulfeda adds; "Eo enim (sc. anno, A. II. 447) primus Togrul Bec, ut summus post Chalifam princeps, imperique Muslemici protector atque gubernator, per templa proclamatus piisque votis decoratus fuit." He also says; "Consensu et jussu Chalife preces ipsi Bagdadi publicæ fieri incipiebant die vicesimo secundo nonæ mensis hujus anni;" i. e. the *Hutbe* prayers for Togrul Bec.

De Guignes observes, of the same circumstances and period, "Il fut revêtu de toute l'autorité."

the Seljukian empire at Bagdad: the inauguration and investiture celebrated some two years after, or a little more, being only a more splendid solemnization of that appointment to his high office, which now already took place. Thus appointed, then, Thogrul Beg fixed his head-quarters in the citadel of Bagdad; and stayed there thirteen months: meanwhile establishing his authority,¹ and cementing his connexion with the Caliph, both otherwise, and by giving him his sister in marriage. The effect of the connexion was, as regarded the Turkman army and people, to give them a character of religious consecration to the service of Islamism: while, on the other hand, the power of the Moslem caliphate, so long paralyzed at Bagdad, was *prepared* by it with new energies; and revived, as it were, to act again in the cause of its false faith.

And now we are directed by the terms of this prophecy, to mark the time when the Moslem power, thus revived, was *loosed* from the Euphrates: in other words, when, under its new Turkman head, it went forth from Bagdad, on the career of victory and aggrandizement thenceforth afresh destined for it. The date is given by Abulfeda; the 10th of *Dzoulcaad*, A.H. 448. That was the day in which Thogrul with his Turkmans, now the representative, as we have said, and head of the power of Islamism, quitted Bagdad to enter on a long career of war and conquest.—The part allotted to Thogrul himself in the fearful drama soon about to open against the Greeks, was, like the military part enacted long previously by Mahomet in regard of Christendom, preparative. It was to extend and establish the Turkman dominion over the frontier countries of Irak and Mesopotamia; that so the requisite strength might be attained for the attack ordained in God's counsels against the Greek empire. His first step to this was the siege and capture of Moussul; his next, of Singara. Nisibis, too, was visited by him: that frontier fortress which had in other days been so long a bulwark to the Greeks. Everywhere victory attended his banner; a presage of what was to follow. And, on his return after

¹ Thogrul Becus domicilium fecit in arce imperiali; fuitque ei Bagdadi stabilitum imperium." Elmakin. So too Abulfeda.

a year's campaign to Bagdad, for the purpose of the more solemn inauguration that we spoke of,¹ (an inaugurative ceremony celebrated in Oriental history,²) the result

¹ The date of the investiture is fixed by Abulfeda as on the 25th Dzoulcad, A.H. 449: with which date Elmakin's narrative perfectly agrees.

² As regards this ceremonial Elmakin thus speaks; "Chalifa induit principem Togrul Becum veste imperiali, eumque coronavit, et torque atque armillis oruavit, scripsitque ei auctoritatem consignatam de præfecturâ aulæ suæ." Abulfeda adds that the Chalif committed the charge of the empire to him in words like these: "Mandat Chalifa tuæ curæ omne id terrarum quod Deus ejus curæ et imperio commisit; tibi que civium piorum, fidelium, Deum colentium, tutelam sublocatorio nomine demandat."

In De Guignes' abstract of the history the date is printed 25th Dzoulcad, A.H. 448, simply by an error of the press for 449. That it is a misprint is plain; for De Guignes dates Thogrul Beg's quitting Bagdad the 10th Dzoulcad 448; then speaks of his besieging Moussul for four months, then Singara, and *not till after these events*, returning to go through the ceremony of investiture at Bagdad. Unfortunately Dr. Keith did not observe that it was a misprint, or consult original authorities; and building his calculations and exposition of this Apocalyptic period upon it, built on a foundation of sand.

As the ceremonial was very notable, it was one that might not improperly have been made an epoch of commencement to the prophetic period, if its chronology had answered. At the same time it must be remembered, *first*, that we date a reign from the *accession* of the monarch, not from his *coronation*: (and both Abulfeda and Elmakin, as the reader has seen, assign Thogrul Beg's *appointment*, or *accession*, to the office of secular Head of the Moslem empire to the year A.H. 447:) *also* that the epoch noted in the prophecy is that of the *reloosing from the Euphrates* of the power that had been bound there, not of its *re-invigoration*.

De Guignes' fuller narration is borrowed from *Al Bondari's* Arabic History of the Seljukides: about whom Gibbon says in a Note, when referring to *De Guignes*, Vol. x. p. 349, "I am ignorant of *Bondari's* age, country, and character." As the subject described is a curious and interesting one, both to the general reader and the prophetic student, and I found, on reference to our University Libraries and the British Museum, that the same want of information still continued with regard to this the chief author on whom we have to depend for the narrative, it seemed to me worth while to make inquiries at the King's Library at Paris; where I doubted not *Bondari's* manuscript would be found. In reply *M. Reinaud* (of the Library) obligingly gave me the following information on the manuscript and its author. "*L'ouvrage est une Histoire des Sulthans Seljoukides, écrite en Arabe par Emad-eddin, secrétaire du grand Saladin. (Voyez sur Emad-eddin ce que j'ai dit dans mon Introduction aux Extraits des Historiens Arabes des Croisades, Paris 1829, en 8vo.) Cet ouvrage fait partie des manuscrits Arabes de la Bibliothèque Royale, fonds St. Germain, No. 327. Comme il était écrit dans un style poétique et plein d'emphase, un compatriote d'Emad-eddin, le Sheikh-Fath, fils d'Aly, fils de Mohammed, al Bondary, al Ispahany, l'abregea, et le reproduisit sous des formes plus simples. La rédaction d'Al-Bondary se trouve parmi les manuscrits Arabes de la Bibliothèque, ancien fonds, No. 767, A. C'est celle-ci dont De Guignes a fait usage.*"

He was so good as to forward at the same time a French translation of Emad-eddin's account of the ceremonial at Bagdad, made for me by *M. Munk*, an eminent Oriental scholar at Paris; which the literary reader will, I am sure, thank me for subjoining.

Retour de Togrulbeg à Bagdad.—Il se présente devant le Khalife.

Il retourna à Bagdad victorieux, et dans toute la plénitude de la puissance. Le Khalife lui donna une audience, le jour de Samedi 25 de Dhou'l Kaada (de l'année 449.)* Il s'embarqua sur le Tigre, faisant courir son esquif sur l'onde du fleuve,

* L'année 449 n'est pas indiquée par *Bondari*; mais on la trouve à la fin du chapitre précédent dans l'ouvrage original, dont celui de *Bondari* n'est qu'un extrait. Le chapitre suivant commence dans les deux ouvrages par l'année 450.

is thus described by Elmakin ; “ There was now none left in Irak or Chorasnia who could stand before him.”¹

And what then the interval between this epoch of the loosing of the united Turco-Moslem power from the Euphrates, and that of the fall of Constantinople ; in other words, between the 10th Dzoulcad A.H. 448, and the

jusqu'à ce qu'il arriva à la porte de miséricorde de la sublime cour, et du palais. Là on lui présenta un coursier qu'il monta ; et il entra à cheval jusqu'au vestibule du palais de la paix * et de la citadelle d'Islamisme. Ensuite il descendit, et marcha à pied ; et les Emirs marchèrent devant lui, sans armes, jusque là où residait la majesté, et où la direction (de la foi) subsistait par Kaiem : lieu digne de la mission (prophétique), siege perpétuel de l'Imamat ; où la prophétie ne cessait d'être héréditaire, et où renaissait sans cesse la valeur. Un rideau plein d'éclat était suspendu sur le pavillon, et la pureté de la grandeur était empreinte sur cette magnificence. Al-Kaiem-biamr-Allah était assis derrière le rideau, sur un trône élevé ; dans un portique qui était bien fait pour donner séjour à la grandeur, et dans un palais dont le sol était un ciel pour la gracieuse réception. Sur ses épaules, et dans sa main, on voyait la Borda et le sceptre du prophète, arrosés de l'eau (de l'éclat) pure de Mohammed. Lorsque Togrulbeg se fut approché du sublime siege, et des marches voilées, lorsque le rideau du pavillon fut levé, et qu'il vit briller le visage du Khalife, comme la lune dans les tenebres du trône sublime, il s'acquitta de ses devoirs (de respect), et se prosterna. Ensuite il se releva ; et debout devant Kaiem, il attendait les ordres qui lui seraient donnés. Le supreme Reïs monta sur un siège élégant. Le Khalife lui dit : Fais monter Rocn-eddaula † auprès de toi. Avec lui se trouvait Mohammed-ben-Mansour al Condari, qui lui servait d'interprète. On plaça un siège pour Togrulbeg. Il s'assit, et Amid-al-mule ‡ lui lut l'acte d'investiture du Khalife. § Ensuite Togrulbeg se leva pour aller à l'endroit où il devait recevoir sa haute dignité, et être revêtu du manteau d'honneur (Khilâh) || . . . On lui mit des bracelets et un collier, et on le revêtit de six *Khilât* noires, montées sur un seul bord (autour du cou), et par lesquelles on lui confia à la fois le gouvernement des sept climats. Il fut paré d'un turban musqué et doré ; et il portait à la fois les deux couronnes des Arabes et des Perses ; ce qui lui fit donner les surnoms de *Motawwedi* (couronné) et *Moammem* (orné d'un turban). ¶ On lui ceignit une épée ornée d'or. Puis il sortit, et revint s'asseoir sur le siège. Il voulut se prosterner ; mais il ne le pouvait pas, à cause de la couronne Impériale qu'il portait. Il demanda la faveur de baiser la main du Khalife. Celui-ci la lui donna deux fois : il la baisa, et la porta sur ses yeux. Le Khalife lui fit ceindre une autre épée qu'il avait devant lui ; et par les deux épées il se voyait investi du gouvernement des deux royaumes. Le Khalife l'appela *Roi de l'Orient et de l'Occident* ; et, ayant fait apporter le diplôme, il lui dit, “ Voici notre diplôme, dont notre ami Mohammed-ben-Mansour va vous donner lecture. Nous le déposons entre vos mains. Gardez-le bien. C'est un lien sur, et qui merite toute confiance. Et maintenant levez vous. Que Dieu vous accorde sa protection, et que son œil veille sur vous ! ” **

¹ “ Nec in utrâque Irace et Chorasmiâ quisquam fuit reliquus qui litem ei moveret.”

* Allusion au nom de la ville de Bagdad, qui s'appelait aussi *Ville, ou Habitation, de la Paix.*

† *Soutien de l'empire*, titre d'honneur de Togrulbeg.

‡ Ministre de Togrulbeg residant à Bagdad. Voyez Aboulf. Annal. Moslem. Tom. iii. p. 161.

§ L'énumération de tout ce que le Khalife lui confia en le nommant Emir-al-Omora.

|| Je supprime ici quelques mots qui ne s'accordent pas dans les deux manuscrits. Ils ne renferme qu'une paraphrase poétique de la *Khilâh*.

¶ [N.B. Compare this notice of the *Arab gilded turban, or crown, with the Apocalyptic “ crowns like gold,”* said of the locusts. See p. 438 supra.]

** Lit. gardé par le calme de Dieu, et regardé par l'œil de sa protection.

29th of May A.D. 1453, on which day the siege (begun on the 6th of April previous) fatally ended? And how does it correspond with the prophetic period before us?—The calculation is soon made. The 10th Dzoulcad, A.H. 448, corresponds with January 18, 1057 A.D.¹ From this to January 18, A.D. 1453, is 396 years; and to May 29 of that same year, 130 days more. Such is the exact *historical* interval.—And now, turning to the *prophetic* interval, since its hour and day and month and year amounts, as has been already shown, on the most exact calculation to 396 years, and 118 days,² we find that it falls short of the whole historic interval by but 12 natural days, or *less than half a prophetic hour*: so that, in fact, had the prophecy been expressed as “two hours and a day and a month and a year,” it would have overleaped the real epoch of the fall of Constantinople by near three weeks.—Nor this alone. We may trace the fulfilment yet more exactly. The precise day of the Apocalyptic period’s expiring, and consequently that “*after which*,” according to it, the third of men was to be slain, was May 16, the *fortieth day of the siege*. And is then our usual Apocalyptic expositor, Gibbon, silent about it? Not so. We find him marking that last crisis in the siege, when Mahomet, by transporting his war galleys across the isthmus of Galata into the inner harbour, and with their aid planting batteries against the long river defences, had completed the investment of the devoted city; and, without a hope remaining to it any longer, was preparing his final assault. Then follow the unintended expository words; “After a siege of *forty days* the fate of Constantinople could be no longer averted.”³ That fortieth day was the day of the death-warrant of the Greek empire.

¹ In the Latin translations of Abulfeda and Elmakin, the date by the Christian Æra is noted marginally, as well as the year of the Hegira. But the reader who has not access to these works will find in Sir H. Nicholas’s volume on Chronology, in Lardner’s Encyclopædia, both a Table of the Turkish months, and a simple rule for turning Turkish time into that of the Christian Æra. The Turkish year, being lunar, is 11 days short of the solar. Of its 12 months *Ramadan* is the 9th, *Dzoulcade* the 11th.

² See p. 522 *suprà*.—In support of my view of a prophetic *hour* as $\frac{1}{24}$ th of a prophetic *day*, i. e. a year, I omitted to observe at p. 325, that Ezekiel’s “day for a year” was evidently one of 12 hours only, not including the night.

³ Gibbon xii. 221. Gibbon does not here give his authority: but it seems to be from Chalcondylas, Lib. viii., that he has taken this precise date of time. Καὶ ἐπὶ

Such is the result of our investigation. And surely it must be deemed most remarkable. For my own part, when I consider the length of the period embraced by the prophecy, scarce less than 400 years,—and when I consider further, that of all symmetrical chronological formulæ, such as symbolic prophecy alone makes use of,¹ there does not seem to be one that could express the interval with anything like the same exactness as that before us,—I cannot but partake of Mede's feeling of admiration,² and marvel greatly at it. Who but He could have announced the period who knoweth the times and the seasons, and foreseeth the end from the beginning?—Nor let me forget to add, with reference to that singular *mystical form* in which the period is exprest, “the hour and day and month and year,” that *even this* would seem very singularly to have had in it a something of *Turkish* character. The only term of time similarly exprest that has ever met my eye in historic record, is that which defined the truce granted to our Richard the Ist by the *Turkman* chief Saladin;³—“*three*

τεσσαρακοντα ἡμερας τοις τηλεβολοις ετυπτε το τειχος ισχυρωσ, και καταβαλε μεγα μερος. This he says, after an account of Mahomet's transportation of a small fleet of his war-ships from the Bosphorus into the inner harbour, whereby he became master of it; then building a floating bridge, and planting batteries on it; and thence cannonading the long line of wall and towers hitherto unscathed, which skirted the Western water line of the harbour. (In all which Phranza corroborates him.) Then, adds Chalcondylas, it was evident that the Greeks were in bad case; *συνεβαινει οὕτω πανταχῆ πολιορκεισθαι την πολιν, και τα της πολεως ταυτη πραγματα, και τῶν ἑλληνων, ασθηνη γινεσθαι.*

Further it would appear from Ducas (see Univ. Anc. Hist. xvii. 213) that at this crisis the Greek Emperor in despair sent to offer the Sultan to hold Constantinople and the Greek empire as his vassal and tributary, if he would raise the siege and spare it; but had his offer rejected by Mahomet. Whereupon it only remained to the unhappy Emperor to sell his life and city dear; what remained of the defence being but to him the agony of dying hard.

¹ e. g. a time, times, and half a time; forty-two months; 1260 days; 70 weeks. The only way of expressing the period to the *end* of the siege as exactly as the Apocalyptic formula is by computation of the whole in hours. The actual interval amounts to $4755\frac{1}{4}$ prophetic hours, the Apocalyptic to 4755. Would the former rude expression have accorded with Scripture use or beauty? Reckoned to its *virtual* ending the prophetic formula, as we have seen, is absolutely exact.

² Mede, like his follower Dr. Keith, dates indeed from the epoch of the *inauguration* of Thogrul Beg; and is, like him, incorrect in his calculation, although in a different way. He knew the true *year*, A.H. 449, of the inauguration, from Elmakin, but not the *month*: and, supposing it might be the *very beginning* of that year of the Hegira, inferred a coincidence between the historic period thus commenced, and the prophetic, which did not exist. But this is a comparatively unimportant difference. The main point is the reference of the commencement of the prophetic period to the Turkman's connexion with the caliphate under Thogrul Beg. Of this Mede is the originator. And certainly it was due to Mede, on the part of Dr. Keith, to have so mentioned him.

³ “The truce was concluded for *three years, three months, three weeks, three days,*

hours, and three days, and three weeks, and three months, and three years :” all nouns of time to be added together, let us observe, just as here, and taken in the aggregate.

and three hours : a magical number which had probably been devised by the European.” So Hume, in his Richard I, Vol. ii. p. 21. Now that this was a form of the Turkman *Saladin's* devising, not King Richard's or other European's, appears from the fact that *Saladin* dictated the terms of truce ; which was negotiated with him by *Saladin's* brother *Saphadin*, from friendly regard to Richard, in his illness and difficulties.

As to his original authority for so stating the period, Hume specifies none. Nor does the French “*Biographie Universelle*,” Tom. xxxvii. p. 540, when similarly stating it ; “*Il se vit obligé de conclure avec Saladin une trêve de trois ans, trois mois, trois semaines, trois jours, et trois heures.*” And I have had some difficulty in ascertaining the point.—Generally the Chroniclers, both European and Oriental, speak of the time of truce, as one for three years from a certain day. So *Vinisauf*, (p. 422) : “*Saphadin sollicitè tales sub hâc formâ procuravit inducias : viz. ut Ascalon . . . dirueretur, à nullo hominum reparanda ante terminum trium annorum, ad Pascha proximum sequentium vel incipientium ; sed post tres annos quisquis superiori vigeret potentiâ cederet Ascalon eam occupanti :*” and again ; “*inducias in tres annos.*” So again similarly *Roger Hoveden* ; “*treugas à Paschate proximo venturo per triennium :*” and *Matthew Paris* ; “*treugæ inter Christianos et Paganos, . . à Paschâ subsequenti usque ad terminum trium annorum.*” Otherwise *Bohadin*, in his *Life of Saladin*, p. 259 : “*Conditiones pacis in tres annos, quæ initium sumeret à die Mercurii, 22 Sjabani, anni 588 (=A.D. 1192) :*” adding that “*die Mercurii, 22 Sjabani illuscente, omnes ad regem [Ricardum] se sistere jussi. Ejus acceptâ manu, jusjurandum quoque exegerunt.*” From which same day *Abulfeda** says that it was for three years and three months. “*Induciis ansam præbuit morbus regis Angliæ, longâ jam fessi militiâ. . . De induciis transactum est die Sabbati 18 Sjabani, ejusdemque mensis 22, qui Mercurii erat dies, jurejuratum. . . Communes terrâ marique pactæ induciæ, quæ tres annos et tres menses durarent, inciperentque ab Elulo, qui congruit in 21 Sjabani.*” And *Richard of Devizes* (a contemporary of King Richard) in his *Chronicle*, § 93, states the period precisely as Hume and the French Biographer. “*The Council was assembled before his brother Saladin : and, after seventeen days of weighty argument, Saphadin with difficulty succeeded in prevailing on the stubbornness of the Gentiles to grant a truce to the Christians. The time was appointed, and the form approved. If it please King Richard, for the space of three years, three months, three weeks, three days, and three hours, such a truce shall be observed between the Christians and the Gentiles, &c.*”

Now at first sight there will appear to be in these various reports such direct inconsistency as to the exact length of the truce granted by *Saladin*, that it may seem scarcely warrantable to take for granted, so as do Hume and others, the correctness of *Richard of Devizes's* statement ; notwithstanding even its important, though only partial, confirmation by *Abulfeda*. In fact the well-known modern French Historian of the Crusades, *M. Michaud*, resting implicitly on *Vinisauf*, does not hesitate to state the length of the truce at 3 years and 8 months : his 8 months expressing the interval from the time of signing the truce to the next ensuing *Easter*, which festival he evidently supposes *Vinisauf* to have meant by the “*Pascha proximum ;*” and his 3 years being *Vinisauf's* three years, beyond and after that *Easter*. †

After however considering and comparing the several reports, I perceive clearly that there is a way of reconciling them ; and this, one that quite justifies and corroborates the statement of *Richard of Devizes*.—First, it is evident, as regards that chronicler, that he understood his remarkably express period of the truce, as meant to be reckoned from the time when it was signed by *Richard*. Now we know both from *Bohadin* and *Abulfeda* that this time of signing was Wednesday morning, at day-dawn, on the 22nd of the Turkish month *Sjaban* A. H. 588 : i. e. as *Abulfeda*

* *Ibid.* 55, 56.—*Abulfeda* was a descendant of *Saladin's* brother. *Gibbon* xi. 131.

† So too *Bohn's* English Translation of *Vinisauf*, p. 330.

There is just one thing that I must not omit, ere I conclude this head and chapter. I mean to impress upon the reader's mind how remarkable, and contrary to all human probability, after once the Turkman woe had been let loose, was the protraction of its accomplishment of the work of destruction assigned it, to this far distant æra. Ere 40 years had elapsed from Thogrul Beg's inauguration, Constantinople and its empire were on the very verge of ruin by the Seljukian Turks: and nothing less than an almost miraculous intervention seemed capable of averting it. But the intervention occurred. The *crusades* from western Europe, however ultimately ineffective in Syria, yet so crippled the Seljukian power, as for 200 years to aid in uphold-

explains it, the 2nd Elul, or 2nd September A.D. 1192; seeing that the Syrian month Elul answered entirely to the September month of the Latin Calendar.* Next, and with reference to the other chroniclers, it will be found that the word *Pascha*, which occurs in their definition of the time of truce, was not one exclusively applied by the middle-age ecclesiastical writers to the Feast of *Easter*; but also to the other two great Christian festivals of *Christmas* and *Whitsuntide*, specially the former.† Which considered, it may well suggest itself, even à priori, as most probable that the *Pascha proximum* meant by our chroniclers, when writing of a transaction in *September*, would be the next *Christmas* festival. Let us then calculate the period on this hypothesis, and compare it with the other. And, since from September 2nd to December 2nd is 3 months, from December 2nd to December 23rd 3 weeks, from December 23rd to December 26th 3 days, it results that Vinisaufr's, Matthew Paris', and Roger Hoveden's 3 years of truce "post Pascha proximum," i. e. "after the next Christmas," added to the previous interval of truce from the time of signing, corresponds quite to exactness with Richard of Devizes' period of 3 years, 3 months, 3 weeks, and 3 days; the 3 hours additional fixing the expiration of the truce at about 9 A.M. on the day after Christmas-day, 1195.‡

* So Sir H. Nicholas, in his *Chronology of History*, p. 10. Speaking of the Seleucidæan Era, "which prevailed not only in Seleucus' dominions, but among almost all the people of the Levant," he says that "the Julian year, formed of the Roman months, to which Syrian names were given, was used;" and that the Syrian month *Eloul* answered to the Roman *September*: also that the Greeks of Syria generally commenced the year with September 1.

Bohadin's and Abulfeda's date of the truce well agrees with the other Chroniclers' report of what preceded and followed. The last previous date in Vinisaufr is the day of St. Peter ad Vincula, or August 1. On that day occurred King Richard's relieving Joppa; and shortly after a dangerous conflict, in which Richard repulsed his assailants, but afterwards fell ill from the fatigue. Which illness gave occasion to the negotiations for a truce. The truce concluded, he embarked for Western Europe on Thursday Oct. 8. So Hoveden: "post festam S. Michaelis, octavo Idus Octobris, feriâ 5."

† So Ducange in his *Mediæval Dictionary*, on *Pascha*. "Quodlibet magnum Festum in quibusdam provinciis vocari *Pascha* observat Durandus. Certè constat hodiè omnes majores festivitates *Paschata* Italos et Hispanos vocare." And so Sir H. Nicholas *ibid.* p. 128: "Pâque de Noël, *Christmas-day*: formerly called *Pâque* without any addition; distinguished from the Feast of the Resurrection by the latter being called *Les grandes Pâques*."

‡ If we count from the 1st of Elul, as perhaps does Abulfeda, then the truce would expire at 9 A.M. on the *Christmas-day*, 1295.

ing against it the Greek empire.¹ Then the *Moguls* under *Zenghis* yet further crippled, and delayed the resuscitation in its strength, of the 'Turkish power.—And, after it had at length risen up in all its pristine vigour, under the Amuraths and the Bajazets of the new Othman dynasty, and when, some fifty years and more before the hour day month and year had come to a completion, Constantinople and the empire were again on the verge of destruction ;—when the chivalry of the West, vainly intervening, had been broken in the battle of Nicopolis, and the victorious Bajazet thus addressed the emperor, “ Our invincible scymitar has reduced almost all Asia, and many and large countries in Europe, excepting only the city of Constantinople : resign that city, or tremble for thyself and thine unhappy people ; ”—when, I say, the slaying of the third part of men seemed thus imminent, full half a century before the prophetic period had elapsed that fixed it, what was there that could occur to prevent the catastrophe ? Behold, from the far frontiers of China, *Tamerlane* was brought against him. “ The savage,” says Gibbon, “ was forced to relinquish his prey by a stronger savage than himself : and by the victory of *Tamerlane* the fall of Constantinople was delayed about fifty years.”²—But when the predicted period had elapsed, and the Sultan Mahomet was pressing the siege, like some of his predecessors before him, then no intervention occurred to delay the catastrophe, either from the East or West, from the crusaders of Christendom or the savage warriors of Tartary. On the dial-plate in heaven, the pointing of the shadow-line told that the fatal term had expired, the hour and day and month and year. Then could no longer the fate of the unhappy Greek be averted. And the artillery of the Othmans thundered irresistibly against Constantinople : and the breach was stormed : and the city fell :—and, amidst the shouts of the conquering Turkmans from the Euphrates, and the dying groans of

¹ The Latins weakened indeed the Greek empire but not so as to interfere with their delaying its destruction by the Turks. So Gibbon, xi. 105 ; “ The first crusade prevented the fall of the declining empire.”

² Gibbon xi. 460, xii. 26. The date of Bajazet's defeat by *Tamerlane* was *July* 28, 1402 ; the place *Angora*.

the last Constantine, the third of the men were slain, the Greek empire was no more !¹

¹ It is the observation of Aristotle, Polit. iv. 14; ἡ γὰρ πολιτεία βίος τις ἐστὶ τῆς πόλεως the same figure of *life* being applied by him to *political constitution and independence* as here.—Scriptural examples occur elsewhere. So Hosea xiii. 1; “When Ephraim offended, then he *died*.” So too the Christian father Jerome, of Rome and its empire, when first threatened by Alaric; “Roma vitam auro redimit.”

APPENDIX TO VOL. I.

No. I.

NOTICE OF THE ARGUMENTS OF PROFESSORS LÜCKE AND M. STUART FOR THE GALBAIC OR *NERONIC* DATE OF THE APOCALYPSE.

(See Page 48.)

SUBSEQUENTLY to the printing of the greater part of my second Edition Professor Moses Stuart's *Apocalyptic Commentary* came into my hands; the result, it is said, of some twenty years' thought and labour: ¹ and, after the publication of that Edition, the "*Einleitung*" to a *Commentary* there promised by Professor Lücke.² And I have carefully looked into both the one and the other to see by what new evidence or argument they might seek to justify the *Neronic* date, on which in fact their systems are alike mainly based. The argument occupies in M. Stuart from p. 263 to p. 284 of his first Volume; in Lücke the Sections 29 and 44, beginning at pp. 245, 403, respectively. The greater part of the ground I have already gone over; but there are some points new. And, as the subject is so important, the advocates on the side I oppose so well known for ability and learning, their assertion of the correctness of their view so dogmatic and positive, and moreover a movement of mind among some of the more literary in this country, especially of the dissenting body, has been lately manifested in unison with the German and American Professors,³ I

¹ So the *Bibliotheca Sacra*.

² Ed. Bonn, 1832. I know not whether the intended *Commentary* was ever published.

³ I infer this from an Article in the *Eclectic Review* of Dec. 1814, entitled *Theory of Prophetic Interpretation*, followed by another in *Kitto's Biblical Cyclopædia* on the word *Revelation*; both, it seems, by Dr. Davidson of the Lancashire Independent College: and from an Article entitled "On the Date of the Apocalypse," in the *Biblical Review* and *Congregational Magazine* of March 1846.

In our own Church *Professor Lee* has also advocated a date prior to the destruction of Jerusalem. But in his recently published elaborate work on *Prophecy* (London, 1849), he does not enter on the argument from historic testimony: simply saying, p. 237; "It is true tradition makes Patmos the place of John's exile *under Domitian* ;

think it right to put the reader in full possession of their arguments and evidence:—of Professor Stuart's more particularly; as having written latest, and perused and made use of Lücke. Their argument embraces of course both the *external* evidence, (that of *historical testimony*,) and the *internal*. Let me notice what seems noticeable in it under either head.

I. Professor Lücke's and Stuart's *external*, or *historical*, evidence.

1. And here, in his opening summary,¹ Professor Stuart admits distinctly in the first instance the futility of the attempts that have been made to get rid of *Irenæus'* famous testimony asserting the *Domitianic* date, by supplying another nominative case, instead of *Αποκαλυψις*, to the verb *εωραθη*, so as I have stated at p. 33 *suprà*: whether *Ιωαννης*, on *Wetstein's* principle; or *ονομα*, on *Knittel's* and *Storr's*; or *the Beast*, on that of *the Latin translator*. An admission in which Lücke preceded him.² And really the true construction with *Αποκαλυψις* is so palpable, that one is astonished at this time of day to find any respectable writer so bewildering himself, as to attempt the revival of the absurdities that Professor Stuart thus rejects.³ Also he here admits, (though afterwards, we shall see, recalling or modifying that admission,) as *probably* to be construed the same way with *Irenæus'* testimony, that of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and that of *Tertullian*, given by me at pp. 33, 34 *suprà*: fairly observing that Eusebius and Jerome, at least, distinctly so understood and represented the testimony of those early fathers. Nor does Lücke materially differ from him.⁴ Further he adds, on the same *Domitianic* side, the direct testimonies of *Victorinus*, *Eusebius*, *Jerome*, *Sulpitius Severus*, Augustine's friend

but *this seems to have no better authority than that of conjecture.*" A most strange statement surely, and strange omission: considering, on the one hand, the notorious strength of historic testimony in favour of the *Domitianic* date; on the other, the fact of the Professor's whole system of *Apocalyptic* interpretation depending upon proof of its falsehood!

¹ i. 263.

² p. 298.

³ So however the writer in the *Biblical Review*, referred to in a preceding Note, who adopts *Wetstein's* view.—Let me put a parallel case. Suppose a writer at this present time noticing some enigmatic allusion in the imagery of Coleridge's *Christabel*, and then observing, "Had it been necessary it might have been explained to us by him whose poetic eye saw pictured before it the imagery of the poem; *having been seen not very long since*, but almost in our own generation, shortly before the end of the reign of George the 3rd," what should we think of a critic arguing that it was the writer's meaning that *Coleridge himself* was then seen; (qu. as *an apparition*?) not the imagery of the poem?

⁴ At least as regards *Clement*. See his p. 405.

Orosius, and that of the author of a Greek work on the twelve Apostles, vulgarly ascribed to *Hippolytus* :¹ to which, let me observe, we may probably add that of *Gregory Nyssen*.²—Against all which weighty and strong evidence what has he to oppose? Excepting a dubious passage from *Origen*, of which, as most important, I deem it best to take notice by itself afterwards, and an anonymous Latin Treatise, supposed to be of the date 196, and acknowledged by him to be nearly worthless,³ there is nothing more than the old names of *Epiphanius*, the *Syriac Version's Title-Page*, *Andreas*, *Arethas*, and *Theophylact* :—*i. e.* of *Epiphanius*, advocating a *Claudian* date, not a *Neronic* ; and exposing in it withal, as I have shown, his own self-contradiction and absurdity :⁴—of the *Syriac Version*, against the generally-admitted lateness of which, as being the *Philoxenian* of about A.D. 500,⁵ Professor Stuart has only to state that this “is somewhat doubtful ;” and “that it would rather seem that there was a Syriac Version of the Apocalypse earlier than the Philoxenian,” because Ephrem Syrus of the 5th Century often appealed to the Apocalypse, and “is generally supposed not to have understood Greek :” (an hypothesis on an hypothesis :)—of *Andreas* of the 6th Century, from whose statement that there were some who applied Apoc. vi. 12 (though he himself did not) to Titus' destruction of Jerusalem, our American Professor argues that “they of course believed that the

¹ All cited or referred to by me pp. 34—36 *suprà*, except that of the pseudo-Hippolytus, which I omitted as worthless.

² He calls the Apocalypse *τελευταία της χάριτος βιβλος*. Tom. iii. p. 601. I borrow this from Dr. Wordsworth's recent Apocalyptic Commentary, p. 1. I presume the *τελευταία* has reference to the time of the Book's composition ; which would hardly have been regarded as a clear fact by Gregory, unless he had judged it to have been written under the *Domitianic* persecution, not the *Neronic*.

³ “A fragment of an ancient Latin writing, probably about A. D. 196, first published by Muratori in his *Antiq. Ital.* iii. p. 854, and attributed by many, yet without good reason, to the presbyter Caius. C. F. Schmidt has copied it. It contains a kind of catalogue of the N. T. Scriptures : and, among other things, says ; ‘Paulus, sequens prædecessoris sui Johannis ordinem, non nisi nominatim septem ecclesiis scribit ordine tali.’ John therefore was Paul's predecessor, according to this writer : and, as John wrote only to seven churches by name, so Paul, following his example.” So Professor Stuart, p. 266 ; adding : “No great reliance can be placed on this incondite composition.”—And with good reason. For what does the writer make St. Paul do ? Since John did not (even on the *Neronic* theory) return from Patmos, and publish the Apocalypse, till *after* Nero's death, and Paul suffered *before* Nero's death, by making Paul to have written his Epistles, or settled the number of them, after St. John's publication of the Apocalypse, our author makes him to have done *so after his own death ! !*

⁴ See my pp. 38, 39 *suprà*. So Lücke 406 : “Diese Meinung, so singular und unwahrscheinlich, . . . folgt Niemand weiter.”

⁵ See my quotation from Michaelis, p. 39, Note ².

Apocalypse was composed before that event : whereas, since Andreas also states that there were expositors who explained the successive Seals of Christ's birth, baptism, ministry, and burial,¹ he might equally well argue that those expositors believed the Apocalypse to have been composed *before Christ's birth* :—of *Arethas*, whom Professor Stuart states to have been also of the 6th Century, whereas I have proved him to have been as late at least as the 8th or 9th;² and whose self-contradicting testimony, and recognition of the *Domitianic* date of St. John's banishment to Patmos, (also cited by me),³ the Professor states but in part, and therefore unfairly :⁴—also finally of *Theophylact*, a writer of the xith (!) century.

Such, I say, is Professor Stuart's own list of the opposing historic testimonies. And, in reviewing and comparing the two lists, what might we expect to be his judicial sentence as to their comparative weight and value? Surely this, that there is in reality no comparison whatsoever between them: the one being so strong, not in respect of *number* only, but of *age, weight of character, and consistency*; the other in every respect so weak. Instead of this, however, we have the amusing statement; "If now the *number* of the witnesses were the only thing which should control our judgment, we must, so far as *external* evidence is concerned, yield the palm to those who fix on the time of Domitian:"—there being added, in order to make the other side seem even to preponderate, the assertion that "a careful examination of the matter shows that the whole concatenation of witnesses in favour of the Domitianic date hangs upon the testimony of Irenæus;" and moreover a most unwarranted depreciation (in spite of certain expressions of respect) of Irenæus' own testimony.—I say a depreciation of Irenæus' testimony. For it is spoken of as that of a man who lived, or wrote, some 100 years after Domitian; and only inferred what he tells about the Apocalyptic date from the Apocalypse itself ill-understood.⁵ Yet did not Irenæus pass his youth, and learn his lessons about St. John, as he himself tells us, at the feet of John's own disciple *Polycarp*; which latter was martyred within little more than a *half century* from the Domi-

¹ See my notice of Andreas' Commentary in the Appendix to my Vol. iv.

² See p. 39 *suprà*; also the notice of Arethas in the Appendix to my Vol. iv.

³ See Arethas' Note on Apoc. iii. 10, cited in my Vol. iv. *ibid*; where he expressly states this as his own opinion.

⁴ p. 268.—Lücke states the thing more fairly, p. 409.

⁵ So Stuart pp. 281, 302; in sequence of Lücke p. 411 "Irenæus lebte hundert Jahre nach Domitian; also ziemlich fern von der Abfassungszeit der Apokalypse."

tianic persecution?¹—As to the asserted dependency of all the other testimonies on that of Irenæus, how does it appear? Does Clement then confess to this? or Tertullian? or Victorin? or even Eusebius, Jerome, Sulpitius, or Orosius? By no means. But because “their evidence is little more than a mere repetition of what Irenæus has said.” So the Professor at p. 269: whereas at p. 271, only two pages in advance, he urges that there are *such varieties as to detail* in the testimonies on the Domitianic side, (Tertullian having apparently placed St. John’s return from Patmos before Domitian’s death, Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius, and Jerome, on Nerva’s accession after it, and Victorinus added the statement of St. John’s being “in metallum damnatus,” condemned to the mines or quarries,²) as “make strongly against any uniform and certain historical tradition, with regard to the subject before us.” The Professor here answers himself too well to need any other answer. But I cannot pass from the argument without observing that there seems to me to be (somewhat as in the case of the Evangelists) just enough variety to mark independence in the testimony; nothing of such variety as to affect its truth.

¹ Who a better refuter of M. Stuart’s own arguments on this point than M. Stuart himself? Read what he says at p. 301, on the value of Irenæus’ testimony respecting St. John’s *authorship* of the Apocalypse, as in fact representing Polycarp’s own. “Could Irenæus have believed in the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, if Polycarp had not believed the same? And must not Polycarp have certainly known what was the fact in regard to the authorship of the Apocalypse? . . . In his remarks on Rev. xiii. 18 (about the *number* of the Beast) Irenæus speaks of the testimony to the reading $\chi\xi\tau$, as being delivered by *εκεινων των κατ’ οψιν του Ιωαννην εφρακτων*. Is not Polycarp included among these? And, if not, does not the testimony necessarily imply, that *some* of the personal acquaintances of John had ascertained *from him* what the reading in question was, and told Irenæus?” Why, this is the very passage in which Irenæus tells of the *time* of the Apocalyptic vision in Patmos, as seen under Domitian. See the extract in my p. 32. So Professor Stuart would have it that Irenæus must needs have had Polycarp’s or St. John’s own testimony, to *one* of the points that he affirms about the Apocalypse, viz. St. John being its author; and yet have learned nothing whatsoever, and heard nothing whatsoever, as to that other important point that he affirms, of its having been seen under Domitian!!—Stuart himself (p. 281) dates Irenæus’ birth about A.D. 100.

² “Condemned to the mines (?) in Patmos.” So writes Professor Stuart, p. 271, with a note of interrogation: implying apparently the sceptical question, “Were there then *mines* in Patmos?” But *metallum* signifies *marble quarries*, as well as *mines*: such quarries as are not in Paros and Antiparos only, but in many other of the Ægean islands. So Statius Silv. iv. 3. 98;

Arcus belligeri ducis trophæis,
Et totis Ligurum nitens metallis.

I have observed a note in Burmann De Vectigal, p. 108, to exactly the same effect. He says; “Sub *metallis* etiam *lapidicinæ* habentur: marmora enim, et saxa, et aurum, et cætera metalla ex terrâ effodiuntur. Hinc in Codicum Titulis de *Metallariis* pleræque leges de lapidibus loquuntur.”

2. But now comes the testimony of *Origen*; one which, from the importance attached to it alike by Lücke, Stuart, and others of the same school,¹ and also as having not at all noticed it in my own sketch of evidence, I have thought best, like Professor Stuart himself, to reserve for separate consideration. The passage is as follows. "But the king of the Romans, as tradition teaches, condemned John, who bore testimony for the word of truth, to the isle of Patmos. And John informs us respecting his own testimony; (or martyrdom;) not stating who condemned him: saying in the Apocalypse these things; '*I John, your brother, &c. was in the island that is called Patmos for the word of God:*' and he seems to have seen the Apocalypse in that island." I subjoin the original, with the immediately preceding context.²—On this passage Professor Stuart and his followers thus argue. Origen could not but know Irenæus' declaration as to *Domitian* having been the king that banished John. Yet, knowing this, he refers not to it as decisive, nor to tradition as according with it; and even says that John himself has not decided the question, who the king was that banished him: thereby evidently showing that in his judgment the thing was doubtful, and not to be decided in any way that Origen knew. A fact most important, considering that "Origen was the greatest critical scholar of the first three centuries."³—Now there is just one little question which an intelligent and reflective reader would wish to put, before acquiescing in this view of the passage itself, and of Origen's meaning in it. Does it occur in a discussion, like our own, on the subject of the date of the Apocalypse; or in any critical sifting of the evidence about it, such as might lead to a "*decision*," on the side of the one Roman king, or the other, as the actual banisher,—Nero or Domitian? To which question the simple answer is, *Nothing of the kind!* Origen had been speaking of Christ's saying to the two sons of Zebedee, James and John, that "*they should drink of his cup, and be baptized with the baptism he was baptized with.*"

¹ Lücke p. 404, Stuart 271. It is also noted, and argued from, in the Numbers of the Eclectic Review and Biblical Cyclopædia already referred to.

² Πεπωκασι δε ποτηριον, και το βαπτισμα εβαπτισθησαν, οι του Ζεβεδαίου υιοι· επειπερ 'Ηρωδης μεναπεκτεινεν Ιακωβον [του αδελφου] Ιωαννου μαχαιρα, ο δε 'Ρωμαιων βασιλευς, ως η παραδοσις διδασκει, κατεδικασε τον Ιωαννην, μαρτυρουντα δια τον της αληθειας λογον, εις Πατμον την νησον. Διδασκει δε τα περι του μαρτυριου εαυτου Ιωαννης, μη λεγων τις αυτον κατεδικασε· φασκων εν τη Αποκαλυψει ταυτα· Εγω Ιωαννης ο αδελφος υμων, και συγκοινωνος εν τη θλιψει και βασιλεια και υπομονη του Ιησου, εγενομην εν τη νησφ τη καλουμενη Πατμω δια τον λογον του Θεου· και τα εξης. Και ειυκε την Αποκαλυψιν εν τη νησφ τεθεωρηκεναι. Vol. i. p. 417. (Ed. Paris 1679.)

³ Stuart 272.

And, after an argument of some length, to show that by this baptism Christ meant, not the baptism *in water*, but that of *martyrdom* or *suffering*, he adds that, if this be admitted as the sense of the phrase, then Christ's saying may be shown to have had fulfilment in respect of either of the two sons of Zebedee. For, adds he, "*Herod* indeed" (the *Jewish* king) "killed James with the sword; but the *Roman* king, as the tradition reports, exiled John to Patmos: who himself tells us the fact, though not mentioning who it was that condemned him; saying, 'I was in the isle that is called Patmos for the word of God, &c.'" The context shows clearly enough, as it seems to me, that the point of Origen's allusion to what St. John had omitted specifying, was its being a *Roman*, not (as in his brother James' case) a *Jewish* king, that was the author of his suffering.¹ Had Origen wished violently to deviate from his whole subject, so as darkly to refer to a disputed chronological point, would he not, instead of 'Ο δε Ῥωμαίων βασιλεὺς, have rather said, Ῥωμαίων δε βασιλεὺς τις?—The passage is surely, on the face of the thing, utterly worthless, for the purpose for which it has been adduced. Indeed, in so far as it goes, it is in favour of the *Domitianic* date, not the *Neronic*. For Origen says, in the *singular*, "as *the tradition* reports to us:" (ὡς ἡ παραδοσις διδάσκει) not, in the *plural*, "as two or more varying traditions report." So that he would seem to have known of but one tradition; just like Eusebius 70 or 80 years afterwards:² and that, by necessary inference, the tradition of *Irenæus*; as he could not be ignorant of it.—In corroboration of which view I may add that Victorinus, who so decidedly and unhesitatingly refers John's banishment to Domitian, and was apparently quite unaware of any doubt or variance of opinion on the matter, is expressly said by Jerome to have been a careful student of Origen.³

¹ At first it occurred to me that Origen might have had in his mind, when so speaking, the kindly and forgiving spirit of St. John, in thus never naming his injurer. Professor Hug's remark in his Apocalyptic Commentary, had struck me as here applicable: who, speaking of the Beast's ten horns as figuring ten Cæsars up to Domitian, thus expresses himself on John's *supposed* omission of Domitian; "But has he counted only the *dead*, and is he silent respecting the one *living*? (i. e. Domitian.) This Cæsar had oppressed Christianity, and banished John himself. What *honourable* mention could he make of *him*? And was it in the spirit of his Master to speak *evil* of him? Then, if he could not say good, and might [not] say evil, had he any choice but to be *silent* respecting him?" Introd. to New Testament, ii. 680. But, on reconsideration, the explanation seems to me clearly enough to be that given above.

² See to this effect my pp. 35, 36 *suprà*.

³ "Taceo de *Victorino*, et cæteris, qui Origenem in explanatione duntaxat Scripturarum sequuti sunt." Ad Vigilant. Ep. 36. Cited by Lardner iii. 172.

3. Comes Professor Stuart's *addendum* on the external evidence for the Neronian date, written after receiving Guerike's adhesion to that view: and which in part reverts to the old previously disputed evidence; in part reports a certain new light profest to be thrown on the subject by Guerike.—As to the *old*, he says that he inclines to think, on reconsideration, that both *Clement's* testimony and *Tertullian's* may be regarded as favouring the *Neronian*, rather than the *Domitianic* date:¹ the *first*, because John could hardly at the age of ninety-five have been supposed to travel on horse, or on foot, as *Clement* relates, after the young prodigal:² (but is not John's great age at the time

¹ The writer on the *Date of the Apocalypse* in the Congregational Magazine before referred to, when abstracting Professor Stuart's catena on the Neronian side of the question, not only does so without stating the admissions made by the latter with regard to the weakness of the evidence, or drawbacks in certain cases, but even lays claim to *Clement* and *Chrysostom*, unlike the doubtful and vacillating American Professor, as *distinct and decided witnesses on that side*, in respect of their story of the recovered reprobate. In order to this it is essential that the story be made one of *many years*; more than can be supposed to have elapsed between John's return from Patmos, on the hypothesis of the *Domitianic* date, i. e. A.D. 96, and his death. Accordingly (though doubtless from inadvertence) the Reviewer makes *Chrysostom* so state it; "Some time after this, *Clement* says not how long, but *Chrysostom* says *many years*:"—which however *Chrysostom* does *not* say. His expression is *πολυ χρονον* a chronological phrase variously to be construed as to length, according to the nature of the thing which it relates to; and which may even sometimes only mean a few days, or hours. So in the case of *Ajax's* body remaining unburied; (*Sophocles Ajax Mastig.* 1402;) *Ἡδη γαρ πολυς εκτεταται χρονος, κ. τ. λ.* On which says the Scholiast; *Πολυς χρονος αφ ου τετελευτηκει ο Αιας, και ηδη δε αυτου ταφηται.* So again in *Arrian's History*, v. 27: *Ταυτα ειποντος Αλεξανδρου πολυν μεν χρονον σιωπη ην, ουτε αντιλεγειν τολμωνται προς τον βασιλεα εκ του ευθεος, ουτε συγχωρειν εθελοντων.* And similarly *Joseph. Antiq. Jud.* xii. 9. 5; &c.—In the present case a year or two would surely satisfy the requirements of the phrase. And this would well consist also both with *Chrysostom's* intimation that the reprobate was still a *young man* when recovered; and with *Clement's* yet more characteristic intimation, of the interval being simply one in which nothing had occurred in the country Church (though *ου μακραν*, not very far off,) to make it needful previously to send for *St. John* from *Ephesus*. Now *John's* life was prolonged into *Trajan's* reign, according to *Irenæus*; its 3rd year, say *Eusebius* and *Jerome*: thus giving four years' interval between his return to *Patmos*, on the *Domitianic* hypothesis, and death.—As to *St. John's age*, which the Reviewer says must have been at the lowest computation 90 at *Domitian's* death, (so presuming on a questioned point, on which see the next Note,) it is a marked feature in the story.

I have in the above somewhat repeated what is already more briefly said at p. 34, from wishing to satisfy the objections of this respectable, but evidently inconsiderate writer.

² On *St. John's* age *Jerome's* is, I believe, the most authoritative statement of ancient tradition; the same that I have given p. 34, Note ³, *suprà*. According to this, he was still a *puer*, when called by *Christ*; a word which, I think, would suggest the age of not more than 18. *Professor Hug* (ii. 261,) reckoning his age as at that time about 16, makes him but 19 at *Christ's* death; and thus 84 on *Nerva's* accession.

As to *St. John's* not being able to travel on horse or on foot at the age of 95, compare *Eusebius' account*, or rather that of the contemporary record inserted by him, of

one essential point in Clement's story ?)—the *second* because it rather seems to him that *Tertullian* meant to note a synchronism of suffering in Paul, Peter, and John, though indeed he does not say anything of the kind. To this I deem no further answer necessary, beyond what has been already given by me.¹ But the *new* point is a curious one, and deserves notice. Guerike has discovered that *Irenæus'* own evidence is for *Nero*, not *Domitian*. How so? It is thus. *Irenæus* says that "the Apocalypse was seen, almost in our generation, *προς τῷ τελει της Δομετιανου αρχης.*" Now, argues the German critic; 1st, if *Δομετιανου* were a *noun* and *proper name*, it ought to have the article *του* before it, *της του Δομετιανου αρχης*; and, as this is wanting, it must be taken *adjectively*. Which being so, then 2ndly, in accordance with the law of Greek grammatical formations, it must be regarded as derived from the name *Domitius*, not *Domitian*: for the adjective formed from *Domitian* would be *Δομετιανικος*. Hence *Domitius Nero* must be the emperor referred to; *Domitius* having been *Nero's* prænomen.

Such is Guerike's discovery and argument. No wonder Prof. Stuart is much struck with it. Says he; "The conjecture is very ingenious; or, if we must rank it higher, the criticism is acute and discriminating. The usual fact is (as Guerike states) that nouns ending in *—ιος*, form adjectives in *—ικος*. . . . If he is right in his criticism on the word *Δομετιανου*, the past opinions in respect to it present one of the most singular cases of long-continued and oft-repeated philological error, which has ever come to my knowledge."¹ Yet the two circumstances, 1. that so many Greek fathers, and Latin ones understanding Greek, supposed *Domitian* to have been meant by *Irenæus*, 2. that *Domitius* was so very unusual an appellation of *Nero*, make the American Professor hesitate

Polycarp's capture and martyrdom. In which record *Polycarp* is stated to have moved from village to village, on foot apparently, and then rode back on an ass, then walked on foot with alacrity to the Pro-consul's tribunal, though at an age that can hardly have been less than 95; as he speaks of having served God 86 years. M. Stuart, indeed, i. 292, makes this 86 years to mean the whole length of *Polycarp's* life. But this does not seem to me the natural meaning of his words.

¹ See my pp. 40, 41 *suprà*. In order to do away with the argument from *Tertullian's* noting *John's* banishment as a punishment inflicted on St. John, and the known fact that *Domitian* so punished Christians as well as others, Professor Stuart says, p. 281, "Doubtless *banishment of Christians* took place under both; " i. e. under *Nero*, as well as *Domitian*. But he gives no authority to prove this; and, I believe, can give none. See my observations at p. 44. It is an assumption on the part of the Professor just as gratuitous, as that other assumption, so necessary to his theory, that *Nero's* persecution of Christians extended beyond Rome, into all the provinces of the empire.

² i. 283.

at acquiescing in Guerike's solution, and still retain "some doubts" respecting the matter.

Now what is the real state of the question, and real value of Guerike's criticism and argument? 1. Instead of the article *του* being required before *Δομετιανου*, in case of its being a proper name, we have in the very chapter of Eusebius referred to, H. E. v. 8, no less than three cases of proper names *without the article*, in precisely the same collocation, between an article preceding them, and the noun that belongs to it following:—*Περι της Ιωαννου αποκαλυψεως*· *Μεμνηται δε της Ιωαννου πρωτης επιστολης*· *Εκ των Μαρκιωνος συγγραμματος*· *του του Ιωαννου*, or *του Μαρκιωνος*.—2. Even were *Δομετιανου* taken adjectively, it is not true that it can only be derived as an adjective from *Δομετιος*; not *Δομετιανος*. According to analogy it may be from the latter proper name, quite as well as from the former:¹ and in fact we have examples of both kinds of formation. But mark! Whereas in reference to Domitius Nero, *Domitius* is the usual adjective made use of, (so "Domitia gens" in Suetonius, speaking of Nero's gens and kindred,) never, I believe, *Domitianus*,—in reference to the emperor Domitian the adjective *Domitianus* in question is expressly used; and this by his own friend and contemporary Statius. In the Preface to the 4th Book of his *Silvæ*, Statius speaks thus of a road formed by Domitian, called in common parlance "The Domitian road;" "Tertio viam *Domitianam* miratus sum." And indeed he heads his third Ode in that Book with the title, (this being the subject of the Ode,) "Via *Domitiana*."

II. So much on the Professors Stuart and Lücke's *external* evidence.

—As to their *internal* evidence it is based primarily on three points:—all alluded to, and sufficiently refuted, I believe, in my preceding Essay. 1. There is urged the fact of St. John's Gospel being written in better Greek, the Apocalypse more Hebraic, as well with more of fire and spirit: a fact accounted for quite otherwise, as I have shown in my Note² page 5; *suprà*; and on which see also to the same effect Prof. Hug, ii. 675.²—2. They argue that Jerusalem must have been standing

¹ So e. g. Codex Justinianus, Vasa Gratiana, &c.

² Dr. Wordsworth well cites the case of Horace, (which I have also myself just alluded to) as composer both of the *Sermones* and the *Odes*, in quite different styles, in illustration of the unreasonableness of those objections that have been drawn from the different styles of the Johannic Gospel and the Apocalypse, as if showing that the John who was author of the one cannot be the author of the other.—The same illustra-

when the Apocalypse was written, because of sealed ones out of the *tribes of Israel* being noted in Apoc. vii, and *the temple* measured, and "*city where our Lord was crucified*" spoken of, in Apoc. xi:—an argument this which, taking for granted as it does the *literal* meaning of the designation *Israel*, and the *temple*-symbol, &c., is one of the most extraordinary cases of the *petitio principii* that I have ever met with: especially considering their recognition of the seven candlesticks, *in a temple like the Jewish*, at the opening of the Apocalypse, as symbols of *Christian Churches*; and of "*the twelve tribes of Israel*" in the New Jerusalem, at the end of the Apocalypse, as meant of the *spiritual Israel*, or *Christian Church*.¹—3. They note the circumstance of five Roman emperors having fallen, reckoned from Julius Cæsar, says Stuart, from Augustus, says Lücke;² and the sixth reigning at the time of the Apocalypse, according to the Angel's statement in Apoc. xvii, whether Nero or else Galba. Which last argument also takes for granted, what needs to be proved, that the *Beast's heads* mean single emperors; contrary to the analogy of Daniel vii. 6, viii. 22. On which point, however, and other difficulties connected with the view of these expositors, I must beg to refer to my examination of the *Præterist* Apocalyptic Scheme in the Appendix to my 4th Volume. They are difficulties, I believe, which the *Præterists* can never get over.³

4thly there is referred to by them that point of internal evidence, arising out of comparison of the *Apocalyptic* representation of the state of the Asiatic Churches, and the *Pauline*, on which I have cursorily touched in my primary Essay on the Date;⁴ but on which the arguments of these expositors of the German School make a few additional remarks desirable.—It is fully admitted by them that the difference of the Apocalyptic picture and the Pauline, in respect both of the *number* of the Christian Churches in Proconsular Asia, of the *state* of the two older Churches of Ephesus and Laodicea, (the only two out of the seven that occur alike in both the two sketches,) and

tion may be applied, in proof that the *greater fire* of one composition of an author does not prove it to be the composition of a younger age, the more prosaic style that of an older age. Horace's *Sermones* were productions of a comparatively young age, many of his most spirited Odes of an older. See Bentley's Chronological Essay, prefixed to Gessner's Horace.

¹ M. Stuart ii. 379.

² Stuart i. 276, Lücke, p. 417.

³ Dr. Davidson's internal evidence is a mere repetition of the above from Stuart and Lücke.

⁴ See my p. 46 *suprà*.

of the *governing apostle*, or *bishop*, in the one case Paul and Timothy, in the other St. John,—that these differences are so marked, as to require the supposition of a certain not inconsiderable interval of time to account for it.¹ But, says Stuart, “some *seven* or *eight* years probably had intervened between Paul’s Letter [to the Church of Ephesus] and the Epistle of St. John:”² (an interval which Lücke’s hypothesis of the Apocalypse having been written under Galba, rather than Nero, would increase to *eight* or *nine* years:³) and that this interval is quite sufficient to account for the changes.—Now I must beg the reader here to observe the strange omission made by these writers, as if the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon, were the only Pauline documents extant, to compare with the Apocalyptic. We have also for comparison St. Paul’s two Epistles to Timothy, *Bishop of Ephesus*; and more especially the 2nd Epistle: one written, as may be inferred from almost decisive internal evidence, during a second imprisonment of St. Paul at Rome, very shortly before his martyrdom;⁴ an event assigned by Lücke himself to the

¹ Lücke, p. 245; Stuart, i. 273.

² Stuart, *ibid.* 279. In order to get this *seven* or *eight* years’ interval Stuart is obliged to suppose that St. John’s Apocalyptic visions, and letters to the Asiatic Churches, were revealed and written not till the very end of Nero’s persecution and life. For of Paul’s Epistle to Ephesus the earliest possible date is towards the decline of A.D. 60; (the true date, I believe, though by most expositors, as I shall have to observe presently, it is dated later,) and Nero died in June 68. Now Nero’s persecution begun in 64; and Paul’s martyrdom under it occurred in 66 or 67.

³ Lücke, p. 413, expresses himself on this point with a rather strange indistinctness. “Zwischen der Paul. Stiftung des Christenthumes in diesen Gegenden, und dem Zeitpunkte wo, nach unsrer Bestimmung, die Apok. geschrieben ist, war wenigstens eine Zeit von mehr als zehn Jahren verflossen. Das ist ein Zeitraum in welchem nicht nur eine Menge neuer Gemeinden, die Paulus noch nicht kannte, entstehen, sondern auch in den älteren Gemeinden, wie Ephesus, die erste Liebe und Reinheit sich schon verlieren und schwächen konnten.” He here speaks in his first sentence of the ten years’ interval at least between St. Paul’s “stiftung des Christenthumes,” *planting of Christianity* in the Asiatic district, and his own date of the Apocalypse, as written under Galba. In his second sentence he speaks of a change having in that time taken place to the establishment of more Churches there than St. Paul *knew*. Now Paul’s *knowledge* on this point would of course have to be inferred from his epistles to the Churches; supposing (which, as stated above, is not the case) that these were the only Epistles of his to judge by:—epistles dating much later than the “stiftung” spoken of, and consequently separated by a much shorter interval than ten years from Lücke’s Apocalyptic æra.

⁴ The argument for referring the 2nd Epistle to Timothy to a second imprisonment of St. Paul has been well drawn out by Michaelis and others, and seems to me quite decisive. St. Paul’s first imprisonment at Rome followed on his voyage from Cæsarea through the Mediterranean, by the South of Crete, Malta, and Puteoli: and during the two years it lasted he was in his own hired house; and seems to have had a considerable measure of liberty, with friends ministering to him, and full expectation of a release. The imprisonment under which he was suffering when he wrote the 2nd

year 68, the last of Nero.¹ Thus the time of the Epistle must be considered as almost touching, certainly scarce more than a year or two years prior to, the date assigned by Stuart, or even Lücke, to the Apocalypse.² And consequently, were their theory of the Apocalyptic date correct, we might expect the hints that we find in this Epistle of Paul to Timothy about the state of things in the Asiatic churches to correspond in considerable measure with the Apocalyptic picturings. But is it so? Surely rather the contrary. Not a hint do we find in it of any such large accession and combination of Christian Churches in Asia as the Apocalypse tells of:—not a hint as to persecution (persecution that might probably be unto death) having reached, or threatened, the Churches there:—not a hint as to the beloved disciple St. John's arrival, or expected arrival in Ephesus, to supersede Timothy in the chief superintendence of the Asiatic Churches, and be ready to bear the brunt of the storm coming upon them.³ There is on the face of the documents a marked chronological interval between the times of the writing of the one and of the other: precisely such an interval as that of the thirty years between the Neronic persecution, under which Paul suffered; and the Domitianic, under which, according to Irenæus, St. John saw the Apocalypse in Patmos.

5thly, and finally, let me advert to Lücke's chronological argument, from comparison of the Apocalyptic report as to the then state of the Laodicean Church, with the fact of *the Laodicean earthquake* in the

Epistle to Timothy, followed evidently after a voyage, and journey, in which he had dropped Trophimus at Miletus,* Erastus at Corinth, and, between those two places, left a cloak and parchments at Troas. (2 Tim. iv. 13, 20.) Moreover there was then a state of persecution and imminent danger, in which he knew that he would have to suffer martyrdom.

¹ Lücke, p. 245; "die Zeit von dem Todte des Apostels Paulus in der Neronischen Verfolgung, etwa 68."—Clinton, ad ann. 65, dates the death of St. Paul in *that* year. But in this he seems to me to have varied without sufficient reason from Eusebius and Jerome, who place it one or two years later.

² Nero was slain, as observed before, in June, 68. Therefore Stuart can hardly fix his Neronic date of the Apocalypse later than the end of 67.

³ I beg my readers to run their eye through St. Paul's second Epistle to Timothy, with this particular point in view.

* Some who advocate the idea of this being Paul's first imprisonment, explain the *Miletus* here mentioned as that in *Crete*; and as thus in accord with St. Paul's first route to Rome by sea. But, if the reader looks at the map, he will see that St. Paul's vessel sailed along the *South* coast of the island by Lasea, the Fair Havens, and Phœnicæ; whereas the Cretan Miletus was on the North side of the island.

See my discussion on the Pauline Chronology in the Appendix to Vol. iii., and the Pauline Chart in my Warburton Lectures.

6th year of Nero, (ending Oct. 13, A.D. 60,) as dated by Tacitus. The subject is one that I have noticed cursorily in my primary Essay on the Date;¹ but it may be well to supplement the argument as there stated.—Lücke's reasoning on this head is directed not against the Domitianic theory of date, but against theories which would date the Apocalypse at any considerable time before Galba. Could it have been said to the Laodicean Christians, he argues,² "Thou sayest, I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing," until several years had elapsed after the earthquake, and given its inhabitants time to recover from its effects? And, so far, his argument seems fair and unanswerable. I observe that Professor Stuart, who advocates a Neronic date, *before Galba*, though he had Lücke's Essay in his hands, yet entirely omits adverting to this point.³ But, while valid against Stuart's *Neronic* date, is not the argument valid against Lücke's own *Galbaic* date also? Against which date, only suggested apparently in order to get this somewhat longer interval, there lies the grave additional objection that no historic evidence points to it as a time of persecution of Christians. Besides which apply now, what I before omitted, the internal evidence bearing on this point which may be drawn from *St. Paul's Epistle to the Colossian Church*, and that to the *individual Colossian Philemon*. It is all but universally admitted, and not without good reason, that these two Epistles were written and despatched by St. Paul from Rome, during his first imprisonment there.⁴ To fix their *precise* date is difficult. In our larger Bibles it is given as A.D. 64. But this seems clearly too late. The best critics, as Whitby, Macknight, Lardner, &c., give the date A.D. 61, or 62: quite irrespective however of the fact of the earthquake we speak of, which somewhat remarkably they altogether overlook.

¹ pp. 45, 46, *suprà*.

² Lücke, pp. 418, 419.

³ There can hardly be less than a year's difference between Stuart's Neronic and Lücke's Galbaic date. And, as Nero's persecution began in the year 64, and Galba's short reign in 69, the former *may* be as much as 3 or 4 years earlier than the latter.

⁴ I learn indeed from Kitto's Cyclopædia, on the word *Colossæ*, that of late years this has been controverted by Dr. Schulz; who would have both this epistle, and those to Philemon and to the Ephesians, to have been written by St. Paul, during his two years' imprisonment at Cæsarea. But the writer of the Article shows that the internal evidence is by no means conclusive in favour of this view: which being the case, (and more might be added against Schulz' hypothesis,) "the testimony," says he, "of tradition may fairly be permitted to settle the question: and this is unequivocally in favour of the opinion that these epistles were written from Rome, during the earlier part of St. Paul's confinement there."—It is curious that the fact of the earthquake at Laodicea should have been passed over in silence (as I infer from the Cyclopædia) in this controversy.

For my own part I incline to assign them to the autumn of the year 60; in order to make the date consistent with *Tacitus'* date of the Laodicean earthquake, as in Nero's 6th year, ending, as I said, Oct. 13, A.D. 60. For, of course, the circumstance of St. Paul's writing to the Colossians, and sending messages to, or respecting, the Christians of Laodicea, as also of Hierapolis,¹ shows that those cities were all three then in existence; and that no such tremendous catastrophe, as that of an overthrow by an earthquake, had just immediately before that time befallen any one of the three cities. At the same time, as the autumn of 60 seems full early for the date of the two epistles spoken of, a doubt may not unnaturally suggest itself to many as to the accuracy of *Tacitus'* date, and a preference be given to that of *Eusebius*; who, alluding doubtless to the same earthquake, assigns it to the 10th year of Nero, four years later.² With which date, let me observe, the medallie and historical evidence referred to in my Essay suits, just as well as with that of *Tacitus*.³ Then, if so, in *Lücke's* own exprest

¹ Col. ii. 1; "I would that ye knew what great conflict I have for you, and for them at *Laodicea*, &c." iv. 13, 15, 16; "I bear him record (sc. "Epaphras, who is one of you,") that he hath a great zeal for you, and for them that are in *Laodicea*, and them in *Hierapolis*. Salute the brethren which are in *Laodicea*. . . . And, when this epistle has been read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the *Laodiceans*."

² "Eodem anno [sc. 6th of Nero] ex inlustribus Asiæ urbibus *Laodicea*, tremore terræ prolapsa, nullo à nobis remedio, propriis opibus revaluit." So *Tacitus*, Ann. xiv. 27; already cited by me p. 45.

³ Anno Neronis 10. Nero, ut similitudinem ardentis Trojæ inspiceret, plurimam partem Romanæ urbis incendit. In Asiâ tres urbes terræ motu conciderunt, *Laodicea*, *Hierapolis*, *Colasæ*." So *Eusebius*, Chronicon.

I follow *Tillemont* in supposing the same earthquake to be meant by *Tacitus* and *Eusebius*. So p. 45 Note 4 *suprà*.

³ So too the inscription on the Laodicean amphitheatre, alluded to p. 46 *suprà*, as noticed by *Kitto* in his Pictorial Bible. A notice however, as I have since discovered, by no means correct. Deeming the point one of much interest, if, as he represents it, the inscription shows the theatre to have been in course of erection at the very time when the Apocalyptic letter was dictated to the Church at Laodicea, I thought it desirable to look at the Inscription, and see whether it warrants his statement; the rather, because he does not cite his authority for it. Accordingly, I have compared two copies of the Inscription, given respectively by *Chandler* in his *Inscript. Ant.* p. 30, and by *Eckhel*, Vol. vi. p. 435, from *Muratori*. They agree, with one or two slight and unimportant differences. And this is the translation.

"To Titus Cæsar Augustus Vespasian, Consul the seventh time, son of the Emperor Vespasian, and to the People, Nicostratus the younger, son of Lycius, son of Nicos-tratus, dedicated . . . at his own expence; Nicostratus his heir having completed what was wanting of the work, and M. Ulpius Trajanus, the Proconsul, having consecrated it."

It results that the amphitheatre was completed and dedicated in the year of *Titus'* 7th consulship; i. e. as *Eckhel*, *Clinton*, and also *Chandler* give it, A.D. 79:—a date well suiting, it will be obvious, either *Tacitus'* or *Eusebius'* date of the earthquake; also *Tacitus'* statement of the restoration of the city by the Laodiceans' own re-

judgment the interval between this Laodicean earthquake, A.D. 64, and his *presumed* Apocalyptic date under Galba, in the last half of 69, will be too small to consist with the Apocalyptic picture of Laodicea's then flourishing state of worldly ease and opulence;—an inconsistency still greater, of course, in the case of Prof. Stuart's somewhat earlier Neronic date.

As to the time of Colossæ's restoration, it may be remembered that the negative medallie evidence mentioned in my Essay militates against its having occurred till a long time after. Pliny indeed in his N. H. v. 41, written probably under Vespasian,¹ cursorily mentions Colossæ, with eight others, as among the most famous towns of Phrygia. But writing from books apparently, (see his B. iii. c. 1,) rather than from personal knowledge of the locality, he may probably have repeated in this some earlier account about the towns of Phrygia, written before the catastrophe of the earthquake. On the other hand, in the copious and particular enumeration of all the cities in that neighbourhood, then standing, by Ptolemy, the learned geographer of the times of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius, the name of Colossæ appears not.² A fact this quite accounting for the omission of Colossæ in the Apocalyptic epistles to the seven Churches.

In fine we see that while all and every indication, medallie and historic, Scriptural and classical, internal and external, combine to militate against a *Neronic* or *Galbaic* date, they all accord perfectly with the supposition of a *Domitianic* date to the Apocalypse.

sources; and the Apocalyptic Letter to the Church there established, speaking of it as in A.D. 96 rich and increased in goods.

By a most strange mistake Chandler, in his *Travels*, pp. 225, 226, seems to confound the *Proconsul's* office with the *consul's*; and because M. Ulpus Trajan (the *son*) was *consul* A.D. 91, and the date of A.D. 79 occurs at the commencement of the Inscription, (for he gives no other reason,) states that "twelve years were consumed in perfecting the structure." On which mistake Dr. Kitto advances by making the amphitheatre "in course of erection" A.D. 96.

Eckhel justly observes that it must have been M. Ulpus Trajan *the father* (not the *son*, afterwards emperor) that was Proconsul of Asia at the time specified.

¹ In the year 72 Pliny was writing his 14th Book; in the year 77 he dedicated the completed Book to Titus. See Clinton, *Fast. Rom.*, on those two years.

² I observe in Ptolemy mention of Pergamos among the Mysian cities; of Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, Laodicea, among those of Lydia and Mæonia; and of Hierapolis in Phrygia: besides, of course, the greater and more famous cities of Ephesus and Smyrna. Thus all the seven cities of the Apocalyptic Churches are mentioned by him; which makes his omission of Colossæ, conformably with the Apocalyptic omission of it, the more remarkable. *Lib. v. c. 2.* pp. 119, 120. (Ed. Amstelod. 1605.)

APPENDIX.

No. II.

ON THE COUNTER-STRUCTURAL SCHEME WHICH SUPPOSES A
CHRONOLOGICAL PARALLELISM OF SEALS AND TRUMPETS;
THE SEALS AS PREFIGURING THE CHURCH HISTORY,
THE TRUMPETS THE SECULAR HISTORY OF ROMAN
CHRISTENDOM.

(See page 106; also pp. 79, 125.)

THIS counter-scheme of the Apocalyptic Seals was made chiefly notable, after the Reformation, by Pareus' and Vitringa's adoption of it;¹ and it has been subsequently adopted, with various modifications, by Woodhouse, Cuninghame, Bickersteth, Birks, and a few other expositors of our own day.²

It is a cause of much gratification to me that, since the publication of the 4th Edition of this Work, Mr. Birks has renounced this counter-scheme of structure; and declared his acquiescence, after very careful re-consideration of the subject, in the structural view adopted from Mede by myself and many other expositors.³ As Mr. Birks

¹ So far as regards the application of the *first* Seal to Christianity and the Church, it was a scheme, as will be seen,* of early patristic origin. But, beyond the first Seal, the idea of explaining the Apocalyptic *horse* to mean *the Church* was not received, I believe, or the Seals interpreted with reference to it, till Anselm of Havelburg in 1245. See my Notice of Anselm in the History of Apocalyptic Interpretation.

² Dr. Keith can scarcely be counted in the number; his peculiarities of view being too considerable. For, while supposing the *white horse* to figure the *Christian Church*, he explains the *red* of *Mahomedism*; the *black* of *Popery*; the *pale* of *Infidelity*. I have sufficiently shown the untenableness of this view in my *Vindiciæ Horariæ*. As it has not, I believe, been much adopted by other expositors, there seems no need of my further noticing it here.

The Works referred to of Cuninghame, Bickersteth, and Birks are Cuninghame's Dissertation on the Apocalypse, 4th Edition; Bickersteth on the Prophecies, 7th Edition; Birks' Chronological Table of Sacred History, ap. Bickersteth, p. 412, and also his Mystery of Providence, published in 1848.

³ So in a Letter to myself, written in 1856. "I agree now with you in the points following:—

1st, The subordination of the Trumpets to the Seals: i. e. that the 7th Seal includes, and is unfolded in, the seven Trumpets.

* See my History of Apocalyptic Interpretation, Vol. iv., two first Periods.

may naturally have been looked up to as the ablest and most eminent modern advocate of the counter-scheme, the fact of his renunciation of it might perhaps by some be regarded as a sufficient reason for omitting in the present 5th edition of my Work this review and refutation of it. And so I was for a while inclined to think myself. After reflecting, however, on Vitringa's high and deserved reputation, as one of the most learned of Apocalyptic expositors, and the tendency of the human mind, when inclined towards speculation, to reproduce from time to time, unless the refutation be before them, old thoroughly refuted schemes of exposition, I have thought it better still to retain this paper in my Work.

As regards Vitringa it is important to premise that, perceiving the naturalness of Mede's scheme of structure, and the obvious fitness moreover of the symbols of the first Seal, when applied historically, to depict the state of *the Roman Empire* from Nerva's accession, immediately after the Apocalyptic revelations, to that of Commodus,¹

2ndly, the reference of Seal vi. to the fall of Paganism in the Roman empire.

3rdly, the periods of time of the earlier Seals.

4thly, the mystical sense of the sealed tribes (Apoc. vii.), reaching through the whole dispensation.

5thly, the probable date of the 2nd Woe."

He adds that he still prefers to refer Seal i. to "the triumphs of the Gospel from St. John to Commodus;" thinks that "the symbols in Seal iii. denote a limited scarcity;" adheres to his former interpretation of "the 4th part" in Seal iv.; and thinks that in the palm-bearing vision of Apoc. vii. there is "a prospective reference to a time still future."

On none of these points of difference can I see any reason to change the opinions previously express by me. The coincidences of fact and prophecy, so explained, are not denied by Mr. B. And this I consider to be the strong foundation of all my Apocalyptic Exposition. But with these points of difference I have nothing to do in the present Paper; or indeed in the present Appendix, save only as regards "the fourth part" of Seal iv. considered in its bearing on "the third part" of the four first Trumpets. On which see my No. iv. § 3.

¹ Says Vitringa; "Neque ego inficias eam hanc interpretandi rationem [viz. the general scheme of subordinating the Trumpets to the Seals as the evolution of the seventh Seal, and applying the six first Seals as a prefiguration of the fortunes of the Roman Empire down to the revolution under Constantine] magnâ se commendare specie." p. 306. Besides its structural naturalness he gives two additional reasons which much influenced him in its favour:—1. that, except on this scheme, the immensely important revolution under Constantine seemed left unprefigured in the seven Seals:—2. that if, instead of the Constantinian revolution, the sixth Seal (or rather its first half in Apoc. vi.) was made to figure the revolution at the consummation, (in his view the only conceivable alternative,) then the seventh Seal would seem to have nothing of prefiguration left for it.

After concluding, however, to adopt the Church-counter-scheme of structure, he proposes to obviate the *latter* objection against it by making the *silence* at the opening of the seventh Seal (its whole subject according to him) signify the *millennial rest*: the

he would apparently at first fain have seen his way to some consistent continuous *Roman* interpretation of the Seals, could he have done so. But, having only *Mede's* historic application of this scheme before him, which gave another view of the first Seal than that which, like myself, *Vitringa* recognized as just,¹ while, in respect of the other Seals, it was manifestly indefensible, and perceiving himself as regarded *them* no better, he settled in fine on that counter-scheme which I have here to review:—the grand characteristic of which is to regard the Seals as a series of figurations synchronic with the Trumpets, in symbolization of the phases and fortunes of the *Church*; while the Trumpets figure those of the *secular empire*; each from *St. John's* time to the consummation.

As *Vitringa's* scheme, though in this main point like the others, has yet differences sufficiently marked to render a distinct view of it desirable, a separate diagram of it is subjoined.²

former by reference to the vision in the xiith Chapter (i. e. in another series of the Apocalyptic figurations), as supplying the defect, and prefiguring the Constantinian revolution. Thus he satisfied himself. But his followers, for the most part, are not satisfied with it; and offer consequently modifications of the scheme, some of which will be seen in what follows of this Appendix.

¹ "Sub bonis et laudatis principibus, à Nervâ usque ad Commodum, facies Roman Imperii satis fuit æquabilis; et emblemate, non *rufi* [as *Mede*], sed *albi equi*, cum sesore victorioso, figurari potuisset." p. 310.

² *Vitringa's Church-Scheme of the Seals.*

First Seal.	Second Seal.	Third Seal.	Fourth Seal.	Fifth Seal.	Sixth Seal.
White Horse.	Red Horse.	Black Horse.	Pale Horse.	Souls under the Altar.	Earthquake, &c.
<p>—</p> <p>The 150 years of comparative peace to the Church, from <i>Nerva</i> to <i>Decius</i>.</p> <p>A.D. 96—250.</p>	<p>—</p> <p>Persecutions of the Church, from <i>Decius</i> to <i>Diocletian</i>, inclusive.</p> <p>250—310.</p>	<p>—</p> <p>Mournful dissensions of the Ch., from 4th to 9th century: — also corruptions of essential evangelic doctrines, e. g. of the <i>bread of life</i> by the <i>Arians</i>; and of the doctrines of grace (the <i>Christians' wine & oil</i>) by the <i>Pelagians</i>: —the Church Rulers and Councils holding the balance, and dispensing the true bread and wine.</p>	<p>—</p> <p>Desolations of the <i>Church Visible</i>, and specially of that of Greek Christendom, by the <i>Saracens</i> and <i>Turks</i>.</p>	<p>—</p> <p>Persecutions and martyrdoms of <i>Christ's true confessing Church</i>, i. e. of <i>Waldenses</i>, <i>Bohemians</i>, and early <i>Reformers</i>: continued from A.D. 1200 for five centuries; nor yet ended. (i. e. in 1700 A.D.)</p>	<p>—</p> <p>Final overthrow of the true professing Protestant Churches' enemies; their own preservation, from the storm of the last great earthly tribulation; * finally the palm-bearing Millennial earthly triumph.</p> <p>Seventh Seal.</p> <p>—</p> <p>Silence in heaven = the millennial rest of the Church.</p>

* Certainly not, says he, the last universal judgment on *Christ's* second coming; for "resuscitandorum, et coram tribunali *Christi* compariturorum, qui indubius est

And there are three things to be particularly noted in his scheme, when considered in comparison with the others:—1st, that he insists, again and again, on the point that it is the *external state* of the Church, whether of the *Church visible* in the Roman world, or of the *faithful Church*, (for he makes the four first Seals figure the *Church visible*, the fifth *faithful confessing Churches*,) that is the subject of the symbolization; ¹—2. that he most strongly repudiates the idea of interpreting the *horse and his rider*, in each of the four first Seals, separately, and of making the *horse*, by itself, the representative of the *Church visible*: his judgment being that the *rider* and the *horse* should be taken (*centaur-like*) together, as a *composite symbol*, to figure the varying phases of the Church: ² and that whosoever attempted more, and explained the horse, as above-intimated, *by itself*, would, though he might do well enough in the *first Seal*, find himself inextricably embarrassed in those that followed: ³—3. that he includes in his first prophetic series the *seventh Seal*, as itself figurative of the Millennium: whereas other expositors, who take the Church-view of the Seals, end their first series with the *sixth Seal*; making the *seventh* to include the seven Trumpets, and so to constitute their second series.—Now the structural inconsistency of supposing the seventh Seal to figure the selfsame millennial happiness which has already been pictured, according to him, in the Palm-bearing Vision of the sixth Seal is very obvious. Again, with regard to the four earlier Seals, I must say that his declaration as to the impracticability of explaining the *horse* separately, amounts nearly, as it seems to me, to a confession that he was unable, on the principle of applying the

¹ “Sigillis hisce *exteriorem* ecclesie statum depingi jam sæpius monuimus.” p. 364.—He expressly makes the *true Church* the subject of the 5th Seal: saying that from the calamitous state of the Eastern Churches in the 4th Seal St. John, in the 5th, “transit ad statum externum *veræ ecclesie*, et populi Dei, in occidentali Christiani orbis plagâ.” Ibid.

² “Perspexi . . . equum non designare *subjectum rationale*, à *sessore equi* distinctum; sed certa solummodo demonstrare *sessoris attributa et proprietates*.” As, for example, if the rider were to represent a minister of the Divine Providence, the *horse* would represent the quickness of his executing the divine commands; its *colour* the character of the providential dispensations committed to him. p. 328.

³ “Videbam interpretes, qui per *equum album* hic intelligunt *Ecclesiam Christi*, sive *apostolos* super quibus dici potest vehi, vehementer laborare in sequente emblemate rectè exponendo.” Ibid.

universalis iudicii character, nulla planè hic memoria, ut nec aliarum iudicii novissimi *περιττασεων*.” p. 385.—The tempest-winds of Apoc. vii. 1 he supposes to be (*retrospectively*) that of which the earthquake, &c., of the 6th Seal, just before described, was the result.

Seals to *Church* history, to make out a fully satisfactory interpretation of them. And enough will now be stated that is applicable to Vitringa's scheme, in the examination I am about to enter on of that of the best known recent commentators who have adopted a scheme mainly similar,¹ to confirm this view of its unsatisfactoriness.

Proceed we then to consider more particularly the schemes of *Messrs. Cuninghame* and *Bickersteth*; — schemes substantially the same with each other, and which alike take *Woodhouse* as their original; being only somewhat more elaborated. The Diagram subjoined below gives a general view of them.²

Now by these commentators, notwithstanding Vitringa's warning, the *horse* is boldly taken as a separate symbol; to figure throughout, they say, the *professing Church visible*:³—at which preliminary point let me caution the reader always, when *the Church* is named, to mark distinctly *what Church* is meant, and in what point of view. And, to justify its symbolization as a *war-horse*, this *Church visible* is called also by them the *Church militant*; a confusion, I must say, of two

¹ Viz. Woodhouse, Cuninghame, Bickersteth.

² The following are the Church-Schemes, respectively, of Cuninghame and Bickersteth.

B. First Seal.	Second Seal.	Third Seal.	Fourth Seal.	Fifth Seal.	Sixth Seal.
White Horse.	Red Horse.	Black Horse.	Pale Horse.	Souls under the altar.	Earthquake.
Victories of Church visible and militant.	Discord of Ch. visible. (Sword sent. Matt. x. 34.)	Spiritual famine of Ch. visible. Papal Yoke. 533—	Spiritual desolation.	Cry of the Martyrs.	French Revolution.
A. D. 70—320.	324—530.	533—	1073—	1438.	1789.
Apostolic Church.	Nicene orthodox Church.	Superstitions.	Papal Church in the climax of corruption.	Height of Papal power before Reformation.	Seventh Seal.
On the <i>horses</i> , &c., of the first four Seals, see Zechariah vi. 1—5.					
C. (p. 4.)		Papal yoke.	Bloody persecutions of true Christians, in 13th century and four following. Sword kills the body. Famine is <i>spiritual</i> famine: Pestilence, pestilential doctrine: Wild beasts, wolves in sheep's clothing.	Souls of slain martyrs cry for vengeance about A. D. 1500. White robes given them, about A. D. 1552.	Same.
<i>White</i> , as in primitive purity. <i>Crown</i> as of spiritual and heavenly warriors. The <i>horse</i> —the body of the Church: the <i>rider</i> its rulers or ministers.	Same.	Spiritual famine to the generality, and Scripture hid. But to the few real Christians abundance of comforting & sanctifying grace of Holy Spirit.			Begins 1792.
	Begins about A. D. 319.	Begins about A. D. 509.	Begins about A. D. 1200.		Holding the winds—restraining of war by the four great powers after Peace of Paris.—Palm-bearing vision = Saints' beatification at Christ's second coming.
A. D. 33—312.					

³ C. pp. 4, 5, &c. For B. see my p. 554 Note ² *infra*.

things very different :¹ in the sense, it seems, (but one, we shall soon see, that will ill bear the testing,) of its being “the Lord’s instrument,” (so Mr. B. expresses it,) through all the four Seals, “for subduing the kingdoms of the world to himself.”² As to the *riders*, they are, says Mr. Cuninghame, the *rulers* or *ministers of the Church* for the time being : says Mr. B., *the four Spirits of the heavens*, some bad, some good, noted in Zechariah ;³ though surely the mere thought might have deterred Mr. B. from such a notion, that it makes Zechariah’s fourth rider, or the fourth Spirit of the heavens, like the rider in the fourth Seal, to be *Death*.—Then the *colours* of the horse they expound to signify rather the *inward and spiritual state* of the Church visible, than its *earthly and external guise*, so as does Vitringa : though not so, if I rightly understand them, as altogether to exclude the latter sense also.—And thus, according to them, the *white horse* represents this Church in its *inward primitive purity* and *earthly course of conquest*, from Christ’s ascension,⁴ or the fall of Jerusalem, to Constantine’s establishment of Christianity in the Roman Empire :—the *red horse* the visible professing Church in its *spirit of discord and feud* from Constantine to Justinian :—the *black horse* the visible professing Church (at least that part of it in Western Christendom), in its state

¹ Mr. B. himself thus notices the difference : “The Church” (*true Church*) “is a gathering of his people, not only out of the world, but also out of the visible Church ; a gathering that has been going on in every age. Part of *this Church* is now with the Lord ; part is *militant* here on earth.”—Homily Sermon, p. 27. *Militant*, I conceive, (when said of the *Church*,) means at war with sin, the flesh, the world, the devil, as Christ’s faithful soldiers ; and thus is only applicable to *true Christians*.

² “The *visible Church* in unbroken union we see existing in the first four Seals, as the Lord’s instrument for subduing the kingdoms of the world to Himself.” Prayer Book and Homily Sermon, p. 28. Both Bickersteth on the Prophecies, p. 294, (“The *horses* describing the *Church militant*,”) and Cuninghame, p. 5, speak of the *horse* as the *Church militant*. At p. 293 the former writes thus ; “The series of the *four horsemen*, as denoting the *visible Church* in successive stages, after being obscured for a time by its foul degeneracy, &c.” But it would seem from the clause just cited, and his reference on the four first Seals, in his Chart, to Zech. vi., where no *riders* are told of, that “*horsemen*” was written by mistake instead of *horses*.

³ See the diagrams.—The passage in Zechariah vi. 1—5, referred to for the explanation of the *riders* (?), is as follows : “These are the four Spirits of the heavens which go forth from standing before the Lord of the whole earth ;” and follows after a vision of four chariots with their respective pairs of horses,—*red, black, white, and grisled and bay* : but without a word being said either of *riders*, or *drivers*. In Zech. i. 8, however, there is a vision of a *red horse* with his *rider*, and of some others *speckled and white*.—Both prophecies are most obscure. And, if the *riders* be explained from Zechariah’s vision, should not the *horses* also ?

⁴ For, notwithstanding the chronological intimation by the revealing Angel, “I will show thee what is to happen *after these things*,” Mr. C. thus antedates the opening prefiguration of the Apocalypse.—See Irenæus’ decisive testimony on this point, as well as other evidence, in my Preliminary Essay on the Date of the Apocalypse.

of *dark ignorance* and *spiritual famine*, under the oppressive *Papal yoke*, from Justinian, for some five centuries, to the time of Pope Gregory VII:—the *pale horse* the Church visible in its state of *spiritual corruption*, together with persecution of the faithful *even unto death* by the Church's ruling authorities, after the Popedom had attained its climax of corruption and of power, from about 1070 to 1400 or 1500:¹—while the vision of the fifth Seal, or of *the souls under the altar*, represents in its *first* part the cry of slaughtered martyrs, from Huss to the Reformation inclusive;² in its *second* part the vindication of the martyrs by the establishment of the Reformation.³—Finally, the *earthquake*, &c., of the sixth Seal they suppose to figure that of the French Revolution; and the *winds threatened* afterwards to indicate some final desolation and judgment on Christendom.

Now, ere we enter on the more particular historical examination of this scheme, let me just suggest, in passing, the general unfitness of the emblem of a *horse* to be the representative, so as they would have it, of the *Church visible*. Even as an emblem of the *Church* in its primary course of progress, during its *earlier* purer state, the symbol seems singular:—seeing that *Judah's victories*, when God makes it (to quote the text adduced as a parallel) “his goodly horse in battle,”⁴ are to be, as is generally supposed, victories obtained by actual force, and in a literal field of battle; whereas those of the earlier Church were obtained by the foolishness of preaching, and the force of its members' holy life, and patience in suffering. Much more how in *later* days the *Church visible* could be *God's horse* at all, “for subduing the kingdoms of the world to himself,”—I mean after its purity had altogether past away, and it had become (so as both Mr. B. and Mr. C. most truly, I believe, assert it to have become from Justinian's time) the Church of *Antichrist*, not Christ,—how, I say, it could thenceforward be God's horse at all for subduing the world to Himself, appears to me not only incomprehensible, but that the very idea savours of making God the associate of evil; and especially if the *rider* be supposed one of the delegated Spirits of his Divine Provi-

¹ In Mr. C.'s scheme the commencing date given is 1200, in Mr. B.'s 1073.

² Mr. Cuninghame's commencing date is about 1400, Mr. Bickersteth's 1438. But I conceive the latter at least includes Huss.

³ In explanation, with Vitringa, of the “white robes being given them.”

⁴ Zech. x. 3; cited by Mr. B. on Prophecy, p. 317.

dence. I know nothing in Scripture to justify such a representation. Can the Devil's chosen instrument be God's chosen instrument? Can Christ have communion with Belial? or cast out devils by Beelzebub?

From this general view I pass on to consider their explanations more in detail. And here at once, as we enter on the *first* Seal, the fact (as well as reason for it) strikes us, of their giving to the symbols that characterize the Church's state a meaning chiefly *spiritual*; ¹ though with a sufficient measure of the *earthly* and *visible* to introduce confusion. As what they call the conquests of the Church, in the second and third centuries, confessedly *appeared* in the extension of its visible limits, and increase of its adherents and influence,—indeed was so palpably a *visible* and *earthly* success and advancement, that Gibbon's description of it is referred to by Mr. B. in illustration,²—it might surely be expected that to the *crown*, given to the rider of the horse in this Seal, there would be attached the sense of an *earthly* crown; and to the horse's *white* colour that of *earthly* triumph and joy. But not so. The *crown* is construed as half *earthly*, half *heavenly*; in designation of the horse and his rider being heavenly warriors, as well as of their gaining earthly triumphs: ³ while the *white* of the horse is explained simply in a *spiritual* sense, as indicating the then inward and primitive purity of the Church. Why is this? Dean Woodhouse had himself justly declared that the *white* was a symbol of "victory, peace, and happiness."⁴ And, notwithstanding Mr. Cuninghame's disclaimer,⁵ the thing is notorious. Again, the *crown* was as notoriously a badge of earthly conquest, and imperial supremacy. And, let me add, the circumstance of the crown

¹ In direct contrast to Vitranga.

² Viz. Gibbon, chap. xv. So B. On Prophecy, p. 416.

³ I will quote from Mr. C. "Being invested with the *crown* is the symbol of a *spiritual* or *heavenly* warrior. And the whole complex hieroglyphic denotes the *host of the Lord*, that is, his *Church militant*, shining with its *primitive purity*, and going forth in a career of victory; and it marks the *triumphant progress* of the Gospel during the first three centuries." p. 4.

⁴ p. 122, 2nd Ed. He shuns this meaning however, like the rest, in his explanation.

⁵ "*White* is *everywhere* used as the symbol of *holiness*," p. 3. I presume he means in *Scripture* only. And, even so, we might object the *white* of the asses of Jewish judges and governors, the *white* of Esther's royal robe; &c. But the main point here to be considered is, what authority has an expositor to exclude the *Roman* or *Greek* meaning of symbols; seeing that they are notoriously taken into account in Holy Scripture elsewhere?

in the vision being given to the rider forthwith upon his setting forth, and on the other hand of the *heavenly* crown being never spoken of in Scripture as given to the Christian warrior, or the true Christian Church collectively, till after death, or at Christ's coming, shows clearly enough that the *earthly*, not the *heavenly*, was meant.¹ But in truth our expositors must have known that the symbols, if so construed of *earthly* success and joy, would be utterly unfit to depict the *visible state* of the Church during the greater part of these two centuries. Let the accounts be read that have been given in a previous chapter of this work, and illustrated by extracts from eminent Christians of the time,²—and it will, I think, be seen that to have applied the bright symbols of this first Seal in any *earthly* sense to them, amidst their often bitter sufferings, mockeries, and tears of blood, would have been felt as an act adding insult to injury.—At any rate we may require *consistency* in expositors. If the crown of the rider

¹ So Apoc. ii. 10; "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." Also 2 Tim. iv. 8; 1 Pet. v. 4, &c. Similarly the crowns of the twenty-four presbyters, &c. seem to be those of departed saints.

² Part i. ch. v. See for example the quotation given from Tertullian, p. 215 *suprà*.

Let me illustrate this further by the subjoined inscription on a martyr that suffered under the second Antonine; the inscription being on a commemorative tablet in the catacombs of Rome, and given by Boldetti. (Dr. Wiseman, *Lect. on Science*, ii. 130, gives it as from Aringhi. But I do not find it in my Ed. of Aringhi; Paris, 1659.)

ALEXANDER MORTUUS NON EST, SED VIVIT SUPER AS-
TRA, ET CORPUS IN HOC TUMULO QUIESCIT. VITAM
EXPLEVIT SUB ANTONINO IMP. QUI, UBI MULTUM BENE-
FITI ANTEVENIRE PREVIDERET, PRO GRATIA ODIUM
REDDIDIT. GENUA ENIM FLECTENS, VERO DEO SACRIFICA-
TURUS, AD SUPPLICIA DUCITUR. O TEMPORA INFAUSTA,
QUIBUS INTER SACRA ET VOTA NE IN CAVERNIS QUIDEM*
SALVARI POSSUMUS. QUID MISERIUS VITA, SED QUID MISE-
RIUS IN MORTE, CUM AB AMICIS ET PARENTIBUS SEPELIRI
NEQUEANT. TANDEM IN CÆLO CORUSCANT. PARUM
VIXIT QUI VIXIT IN X. TEM.

This last clause is explained by the Rev. C. Maitland, to whose Book on the Catacombs I was first indebted for the inscription, as an abbreviation for, *in Christianis temporibus*. "He scarcely has lived who has lived in Christian times." If this be doubtful, the *O tempora infausta*, and again the *Quid miserius vitâ*, well illustrate the unsuitableness of the application of the *white horse and his rider*, to whom a crown was given, going forth conquering and to conquer, to the Christian Church of the second and third centuries.

Let me add a brief descriptive clause of the sad state of the Christians in Clement of Rome's time, immediately after St. John: Βίος ἡμῶν ἄλλο οὐδὲν εἰ μὴ θανάτος· also in the third century, as given by Celsus, viii. 418; φευγοντες καὶ κρυπτομενοι, ἢ ἀλισκομενοι καὶ ἀπολλυμενοι. Cited by Neander, Ch. Hist. i. 147.

* Here stands the *monogram for Christ*, the same as on the *labarum*: to signify the devotion of the deceased to Christ.

* * Here a *palm-branch*; an emblem generally of *martyrdom*.

of the white horse be the *heavenly* crown, and the white that purity which is described as belonging, or attributed, to the saints and church collectively in the *heavenly* state, then let his conquests be consistently explained as those conquests over sin, the flesh, and the devil in the *inward* heart, to which that crown and robe of white are attached in Scripture. Alas! if they attempt this, the whole solution is found to crumble to pieces in their hands. For then the *white* and the *crown* would belong not to the *horse*,—the whole visible professing Church of the second and third centuries,—but to a part only (perhaps much the smaller part)¹ out of it; and not to this small minority during the second and third centuries only, but just as much to the end of time.—In fact a *consistent* explanation of the *first* Seal on this theory *cannot* be given.

It will not need to say much of the *second* Seal, and its *red* horse, whose *rider* had a *great sword* given him “to take peace from the earth, and that they should kill one another:”—a symbolic picture which the expositors spoken of explain to signify the *theological dissensions and feuds of the Church visible*, from Constantine to Justinian. It may suffice to suggest two questions in reference to it. One is, on what authority do they apply our Lord’s language, “I am not come to send peace on the earth, but *a sword*,”² in explanation of the sword of this vision, to the feuds of the visible Church as begun not till after the time of its establishment by Constantine? It is usually explained, and I conceive with good reason, of the enmity that would forthwith be shown by the unbelieving members of each heathen and Jewish family into which the gospel might enter, towards such of its members as embraced the faith. And, if so, then Christ’s saying about the sword sent would rather apply to the times *before* the imperial establishment of Christianity than to those *after*; i. e. to the times of the *first* Seal, rather than of the *second*.—My other question is, how many thousands of Christians do Messrs. C. and B. suppose to have been killed by their brother Christians throughout the whole extent of the Roman empire, during the two centuries alluded to;

¹ Notwithstanding the representation given of the Church as preserving its primitive purity through the three first centuries, the reader will see, on the testimony of the most eminent of the Christians themselves, that such was far from the case. See my p. 227 *suprà*; also Mosheim, and (though I think the work too severe on the early Church) Mr. Taylor’s “Ancient Christianity.”—Compare too, on the Church’s state about A.D. 100, the Epistles to the seven Churches.

² Matt. x. 34.

and what the population of the whole empire¹ (now professedly christianized) out of which that number was slain? I suspect that the numeral returns given would show clearly enough, by themselves, that the mutual slaughter of Christians which occurred in a few places, (much the most in the single African province,²) was utterly insufficient to answer to the fearful symbol of the *blood-red horse* under the *great sword* of its rider, and the fateful sentence pronounced that its constituent members were then "to kill one another."³

I turn to the *third Seal* and its *black horse*, with a rider holding a *yoke*, (so they prefer to interpret the ζυγος,⁴) who had certain words addressed to him from the throne about corn, wine, and oil; in symbolization, they say, of the *spiritual famine* of the visible Church, for some five centuries of the middle age, from Justinian till Gregory VII: which *famine* however, as already shown, the specified price of barley and uninjured state of the oil and wine makes an impossibility.—Of course, as the horse appears again in his integrity, we might expect the Church visible represented to be that of Roman Christendom, in the same full extent as before. But this, it seems, is not so. The rider's yoke being the *Papal*, the horse is to be understood of *Western* Christendom only: and the other half of the Church visible is, at the pleasure of the expositors, excised.⁵—Pass we this, however, to consider the *horse's colour*; which, being *black*, ought certainly, so as when applied elsewhere to pictures of famine, to signify the *distressed aspect*, and thus the *distress* itself, of the famished;⁶

¹ Gibbon's second Chapter (Vol. i. 68), compared with his notices of the subsequent decrease of the population, will furnish data for this.

² By the *Circumcelliones*, a band of ruffians hired by the Donatists.—Much more generally the war carried on by the Christian antagonistic sects was one of the *tongue*. Κατ' ἀλλήλων ἀντι ὁματων ἐκινουν τας γλωσσας. Theodoret, H. E. i. 6.

³ It will be seen, on comparing Vitringa's scheme with the others, that, as his second Seal is included in their first, so much of his third is their second.

⁴ Wrongly I am persuaded. See my Note, p. 161 *suprà*.—Vitringa (p. 344) considers, as I do, the concurrent mention of the *chenix* to be a decisive reason for understanding the word ζυγος in the sense of a *balance*. And the fact (for fact I believe it is) that such an emblem as a *yoke held in the hand is positively unknown in archaeology*, furnishes an argument pretty decisive of itself against the word having the meaning of a *yoke* here.

⁵ Woodhouse indeed speaks of the yoke of superstition imposed upon the *Greek Church*, and even on *Mahomedans* also. But Mr. Cuninghame understands it distinctively of the *Papal yoke*. And so too, I suppose, Mr. Bickersteth: since the duration of his 3rd Seal, reaching from A.D. 533 to near 1073, (the date of his next Seal,) embraces a period for the greater part of which nearly all communion between Eastern and Western Christendom was cut off.

⁶ So Lam. iv. 4; "The young children ask bread, and no man breaketh it unto

then when the appetite craves, and there is nothing to satisfy it. But how can this apply to the state of Christendom during the time spoken of? The ecclesiastical history of the times negatives the idea of any such *spiritual craving* on the part of the mass of the population. Not merely as seen by man, but (to adopt Mr. Bickersteth's way of putting the case) as seen by the Holy Ghost,¹ there was then nothing, or almost nothing, of the distressed aspect of spiritual famine. The general case was that of Judah in Jeremiah's time; "The prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their means, and *my people love to have it so.*"²

But it is *the address to the rider* about the corn, wine, and oil that perhaps most curiously exhibits the difficulties and infelicity of this part of these expositors' interpretation. The *spiritual state of the Church visible* being the supposed subject of symbolization through the Seals, it is laid down by them, (indeed by Vitringa, as well as by Woodhouse, Cuninghame, Bickersteth, &c.,) that the corn, wine, and oil are to have a *spiritual* signification:—though, on the question, *what* precisely is the spiritual thing signified, there appears a certain diversity of opinion: some explaining those articles of food, all alike, of Church doctrines,³ Church ordinances, and the Bible itself; some the oil and wine, at least, of the comforting, rejoicing, and sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit:⁴ which last surely ought not to be omitted.⁵ But how reconcile the two clauses of the address; the first tantamount (on their understanding of it)⁶ to "Let the wheat and barley be at scarcity price,"—the second, "Hurt not the wine and oil,"—with each other, and with historic fact? *Vitringa* argues fairly that the first clause is rather a charge to *moderate* the scarcity

them." After which comes the description of the aspect of famine, ascribed to another cognate class of the sufferers: "Their visage is blacker than a coal."

¹ Prayer Book Sermon, p. 29.

² Jer. v. 31.

³ So *Vitringa*, as illustrated in what follows; and, in part, *Woodhouse* and *Bickersteth*.

⁴ *Woodhouse* explains the *wheat and barley* of the great *saving doctrines* of Christianity; the *wine and oil* of the divine knowledge laid up in the Bible as a depository; which, he says, has been always accessible to *some persons*, [qu. to how many in the dark ages?] and handed down to us with its text uncorrupted.—*Cuninghame* understands the *wheat and barley* of the *word and ordinances*, dispensed to *all* within the pale of the visible Church; the *wine and oil*, of the *comforting and sanctifying influences* of the Spirit of God, imparted only to *true* believers. p. 8.

⁵ Compare, on the symbols of *corn and bread*, Psalm lxxii. 16, lxxxi. 16, Prov. ix. 5, Amos viii. 11, John vi. 35;—on the *wine*, Prov. ix. 2, Isa. xxv. 6, lv. 1;—on the *oil*, Psalm xxiii. 5, xlv. 7, Isa. lxi. 3, Matt. xxv. 3.

⁶ They consider not the *three barley chænixes for a denarius*. See p. 166, &c., *suprà*.

of corn, than to *cause* it; and so in apposition, not contrast, with the second about the wine and oil. Agreeably with which explication of the symbol he asserts that the councils and rulers of the Church, from the fourth to the ninth century, (in his view the *æra* intended,) defined and preserved the true doctrines of religion, especially on the great contested questions of Arianism and Pelagianism. And so, very much, *Woodhouse* also. But, on consulting historic testimony, it will appear that though, on the two questions specially noted by him, the councils and rulers at the beginning and end of the fourth century did indeed define and assert the *truth*, yet at the same time they had even then begun, and in the four succeeding centuries went on, so to inculcate superstitious idolatry, so to make void God's word by their traditions,¹ and so too to teach a system of semi-pelagianism also,² as almost to cut off the people from all nourishment of Christ's evangelic doctrine, and consequently from the grace and influence of his Holy Spirit; in short, to introduce a spiritual famine. Really it is astonishing that by such a man there should have been propounded an ecclesiastical picture of the age referred to so incorrect.—But even this is not so marvellous as that which attaches to *Mr. Cuninghame's* and *Mr. Biekersteth's* exposition; supposing even that, for argument's sake, we were to admit the price specified of *barley* (especially as connected with what is said of the *wine* and *oil*) to be, what we have long since seen it cannot be, a famine or scarcity price. For *Vitringa*, in all he says, supposes the *æra* represented to be prior to that of the Apocalyptic Beast, or Antichrist.³ But Messrs. B. and C., while supposing the *æra* to be that of the *Papal Antichrist*, and indeed most strongly and energetically insisting on the point, do yet, in their interpretation of this Seal, assert an authoritative charge to have been given to the then rulers of the Church visible, (whether the popes, or priesthood, or Spirit of superstition,⁴) not to injure the *wine* and the *oil* of spiritual grace and joy,⁵ at that very time when, according to their own exposition of other parts of the prophecy,

¹ See my sketch of the *æra*, pp. 404—415 *suprà*.

² See my observations pp. 316, 317 *suprà*; also my Ch. vii. § 2, Part iii. ad init. on the Western Witnesses, in the next Vol.

³ *Vitringa* would prefer to regard the 3½ years of the domination of the Papal Beast as meaning 3½ centuries, from the rise of the Waldenses about 1170 to Luther's protest A.D. 1517. See his Commentary, p. 620.

⁴ The latter, Mr. B.'s hypothesis, it will be remembered; the former, Mr. C.'s.

⁵ See the abstract from Mr. C. in the Note on p. 551.

Christ's *true Church* would be living in the barrenness of the *wilderness*,¹ and the body of the *Church visible*, or constituency of the *black horse*, (which of course was as well to profit by the conservative charge about the wine and oil, as to suffer from the restrictive charge about the wheat and barley,) would be drugged,—universally and willingly drugged,—through the agency of these self-same rulers, with wine from the poison-cup of the fornication of the mystic Babylon!!²

Nor does this interpretation succeed better in the *fourth Seal*, and its vision of *Death on the pale horse*, with *Hades* following; and all the destroying agencies in operation, in reference to “the fourth part of the earth,” of the sword, famine, pestilence, and wild beasts.—Wherever Death is impersonated, it always, I believe,—and certainly always when associated, as here, with Hades,³—means the *King of terrors*, the destroyer of *natural* life. And Vitringa, sensible of this, as well as of the necessarily literal meaning of the *sword*, (of which more presently,) forms his interpretation accordingly; and explains the Seal of the dreadful destruction of life made in Christendom by the successive scourges of the Saracen and Turkish invaders:—though hinting, however, the *possibility* of the *spiritual* injury done by them to the Christian life and faith of the inhabitants being also intended.⁴ The other interpreters too that I am speaking of consider the rider Death to be an impersonator of the destroying powers of life *natural*, as well as life *spiritual*:⁵ and, though explaining his weapons of *famine* and *pestilence* spiritually, viz. of the pestilential doctrines and famine of the word and ordinances introduced by him, yet admit that the *sword* must mean literally that of persecution. It is another example of the sliding scale between things spiritual and temporal.—And who then suffers from this sword? Of course (according to the purport of the symbol) they that are represented by

¹ Apoc. xii. 14. See my Comment on the verse, Vol. iii. Part iv. ch. ii.

² Apoc. xvii. 2, xviii. 3.—Mr. Cuninghame indeed (p. 8) would have the *oil* and *wine*, spared by the rider, to be set aside for Christ's true servants alone. But there is no distinction whatever in the words from the throne as to the parties to be affected respectively by the charges respecting the *wheat and barley* on the one hand, and the *oil and wine* on the other. And, in either case, it was evidently to be those that constituted the body of the *horse*.

³ Compare Apoc. i. 18, “I have the keys of Hades and of death;” xx. 13, “Death and Hades gave up the dead that were in them;” xx. 14, “Death and Hades were cast into the lake of fire.”

⁴ pp. 353—355.

⁵ So Woodhouse, Cuninghame, and I believe Bickersteth.

the *horse*;—i. e. the *Church visible* of the times. Yet, in the nature of things, could this be so? The ghastly and putrid colours of the horse, presignifying, it is said, the Church visible in its then “climax of corruption” and spiritual death,¹ would indeed be of itself evidence of its having suffered from the *spiritual famine and pestilence*: and from the *wild beasts of the earth*, also, if interpreted of false ministers “like wolves in sheep’s clothing,” so as Mr. Cuninghame somewhat curiously would explain the emblem.² But this very putridity and moral corruption would be its safeguard from the rider’s *sword of persecution*. I say, from the very nature of the symbol, and character of the rider, as they themselves represent it, that sword could only be directed at individuals of spirit essentially and altogether distinct from that of the *horse*:—individuals, spiritually alive, not dead. Just agreeably with which view of the necessity of things, the *history* of the æra supposed to be represented describes the objects of the fierce Papal persecutions of those middle ages to have been persons solemnly *excommunicated and cut off from the body of the Church*;³ nay more, depicts the members of the *Church visible*, of that æra,—in other words, the constituent body of the *pale horse*,—as the active energetic co-operators with their ecclesiastical superiors, or animating malignant Spirit, figured by the *rider*, in this persecution of the excommunicate Waldensian and other heretics. Turn it which way we may, this palpable inconsistency will be found essentially involved in the above scheme of interpretation of the 4th Apocalyptic Seal.—How far it accords with scriptural theology to represent *God* as commissioning a minister of his providence, and arming him with the sword of persecution, *against his own faithful servants*, is another and more serious question.⁴ This, however, has been already hinted at. And I feel bound to repeat that I believe it directly contrary to all spiritual representations of the dealings of God.

¹ Bickersteth on Prophecy, p. 298, and Sermon for Prayer-Book and Homily Society, p. 29.

² p. 12.—Bickersteth explains them of the *idolatrous secular empires*. “The effects (of Death’s going forth) were persecution, famine of the word, false doctrine full of deadly infection; and the *kingdoms of the Western Empire became earthly and idolatrous*.” Homily Sermon, p. 29.

³ See my Vol. iii. Part iv. Chs. vi. 3, vii. 4.

⁴ When God’s servants *apostatize* and are *unfaithful*, then God, as the God of justice, is frequently described as sending a sword against the people or land. In regard of the *faithful Satan* sends the trial, as in Job’s case; God permits and overrules it.

Thus there remains only for consideration on this head the explanation offered in the scheme we are examining of that *fourth part of the earth*¹ on which the rider Death is presumed to have had to execute his commission. In regard of which, Dean Woodhouse by his generalism of explanation,² and Mr. Cuninghame by his entire silence on it, alike confess by implication their inability to offer a satisfactory interpretation. Mr. Bickersteth, however, boldly meets the difficulty, by identifying this *fourth part of the earth* with *Daniel's fourth empire*:³—a parallelism and identification of *chronological order* with *geographical division* surely most extraordinary; and only to be justified, even *primâ facie*, on the hypothesis that Daniel's four great successive empires had each its peculiar and distinct territory, and that the territories of all four united together, reaching from the Atlantic to beyond the Indus, constituted the Apocalyptic earth. It scarcely needs to say that not only is there no evidence in favour of such hypotheses,⁴ but abundant evidence against them. If we look but at the context, we shall find that both in the Seal next but one preceding, and in that too next following, "*the earth*," used *integrally*, means, according to Mr. B. himself, simply *Roman Christendom*; that is to say, has the same sense that he now attaches to *the fourth part of the earth*. And, as to *the third part*, no sooner has he laid it down as an *axiom* in his prophetic scheme that it always signifies (i. e. *territorially*) the *Greek*, or *third of Daniel's great empires*,⁵ than he contradicts his own statement: explaining the judg-

¹ The reader will remember the different reading of the clause preferred by me—See pp. 201, 202 *suprà*.

² "It may perhaps be found that the Christian countries which underwent the rage of this Seal bore this proportion (one fourth) to the remainder." p. 140. The Dean uses the word *rage* in reference to the *sword of persecution*, which he seems to view as the main subject of this Seal.

³ So in his work on Prophecy, p. 297, and Prayer-Book Sermon, p. 22.

⁴ 1st, I know not what territory could be assigned to the *Babylonian* empire (except that of *North Africa*, of which Berosus speaks, reaching to the straits of Gades) that did not belong also as properly to the *Persian*: which latter empire began with, and dates from, its subjugation and incorporation of Babylon.

2ndly, no evidence whatever exists of the Apocalyptic earth, in its original and largest extent, having reached beyond the Euphrates or Tigris; the limits of the old Roman Empire in the East.

⁵ Axiom 52; "The *third part* denotes uniformly the *third or Eastern* empire."—Axiom 54; "The second Trumpet (i. e. 'The *third part* of the sea became blood, and the *third part* of the creatures which were in the sea, and had life, died,') relates to the fall of the *Latin* emperors of *Rome*." Ibid. p. 297.

ment on *the third part of the sea*, figured under the second Trumpet, as “the fall of *the Latin Emperors of Rome.*”¹

After this it will not need, I am sure, that I enter at any length on their explanations of *the other three Seals*. Suffice it to say that they are clogged with difficulties and inconsistencies, just like those before. For example, who can believe that the vision of *the souls under the altar* in the *fifth Seal*, crying for vengeance against the earth’s inhabitants, and then having white robes given them, and being told to rest till other martyrs were slain like themselves, can be meant in its latter half as a picture of the *Reformation*:—that glorious event which was elsewhere partly prefigured, as we have seen, (and Mr. Bickersteth owns the correctness of that part of my view,²) by the *living* representative of *true professing* Christians *taking possession of that mystic altar-court*, and casting out their enemies? Not to add that the enemies of the Reformation, occupying still nine-tenths of Roman Christendom, instead of thenceforth recognizing the earlier Protestant martyrs’ innocence, (according to the import of the white robing in the symbol,) have ever since blasphemed them, as before.—Again, in the *sixth Seal* it is hard to see what its earthquake and revolutionary convulsions of earth, sun, and stars,—the prototype, they say, of the French Revolution,—had to do with the *spiritual state* of the Church visible; which spiritual state they affirm to be the great subject of the Seals:—besides that, so far as we have yet seen, there has appeared nothing in the feelings of the nations judged under the French Revolution, to answer to that consciousness of suffering *under the wrath of the Lamb*, which was expressed by the parties judged under the 6th Seal.—And then, as to the notable *sealing vision* which follows, (still in the same 6th Seal,) introduced by the Evangelist with the note of time, “*After these things* I saw,” and which consists of two contemporary and parallel parts, viz. of Angels of the winds standing prepared to desolate the earth, but temporarily restrained from it, and of the sealing of God’s servants, as a safeguard from the winds, by God’s seal-bearing Angel,—does it need my suggesting that it adds its own strong evidence,

¹ Compare my opening remarks, No. iv. § 3, on “The third Part,” *infra*.

² It having been communicated confidentially to Mr. B. So in the Sermon before the Homily Society, before quoted, p. 29; where he refers to it with entire approbation.

alike from either of its two great subjects of figuration, against the scheme in question? 1. With regard to the *tempest-angels*, if their *temporary restraining* was of importance such as to call for particular symbolization, (an importance strongly dwelt on by Messrs. C. and B.,¹) much more must their *letting loose* the tempests have been of importance to call for it. Yet, in the scheme under review, the prophecy is made to pass at once from the vision of these tempest-angels' restraint, and the contemporary sealing by the other Angel, to the palm-bearing vision, figuring (they say) the Millennium, without the slightest prophetic intimation of the outburst of the tempests; which, however, must notwithstanding necessarily have happened in the interval.²—2. With regard to the *sealing* and the *sealed ones*, here first depicted to St. John in vision, there is a very observable notice in the figuration of the 5th Trumpet³ of a certain few then visible, or at least then existing, on the Apocalyptic scene, not only of the same general character as these sealed ones, but that bore, and were to be recognised by, the precise mark and stamp here described as impressed by the Angel: whence the natural, might I not say *necessary* inference, that the chronological æra of the 5th Trumpet-vision (just according to its position in the Apocalyptic record) is subsequent to that of this sealing vision. Whereas the Church-scheme of the Seals inverts this order; making the date of what the sealing vision figures some 1200 years later than that which is figured under

¹ Mr. C. Pref. p. x. (4th Ed.), speaks of this as *the key* to our present position in the prophecy: that is, on the understanding (in which Mr. B. agrees with him) of its signifying the restraining of the European nations from war since the Peace of 1815.

I must observe that, whereas in the vision *the sealing-angel* is plainly from the time of his rising the *restrainer*, and the *four tempest-angels* the prepared *inflictors* of the judgment, Mr. C. strangely makes these last the restrainers: applying it to the four allied powers, England, Austria, Russia, Prussia; and their endeavours, ever since 1815, to preserve the peace of Europe.—Vitranga makes the four angels the *desolators* of the earth, as I do.

² Vitranga (pp. 391, 392) tries to escape from this difficulty by making the four tempest-angels the causers of the physical commotions, earthquake, &c., described previously in Ch. vi. But unfortunately the vision of the tempest-angels is expressly stated to have occurred *after* the conclusion of the commotions of Apoc. vi. So Apoc. vii. 1; “*After these things I saw four angels . . . holding the four winds of the earth, &c.*”

³ Apoc. ix. 4.—I might refer too to the mention of the 144,000 sealed ones seen on Mount Zion with the Lamb, Apoc. xiv. 1; since, according to the most natural signification of that vision, it seems to be one in general opposition to that of the Beast's kingdom and followers, during the 1260 years. But Mr. C. makes its chronological position identical with that of the seventh Trumpet's sounding; and is therefore not necessarily chargeable on this head of his scheme with inconsistency.

the 5th Trumpet :—nor do either Messrs. B. or C. seem to me to offer any explanation of the anachronism.

And thus at length, and through all these difficulties and inconsistencies, the interpreters in question come to the *seventh Seal* : which however they can ill agree what to do with. Mr. C. feeling justly that at any rate this Seal ought to contain *something*, and also that the palm-bearing vision, symbolizing the Millennium, is the fittest possible termination to his first prophetic series, makes it embrace the seven Trumpets, and so begin the figurations *de novo* ; with the same commencing chronology as the *first Seal*.¹ On the other hand, Mr. B., dissatisfied with this inversion of order, makes the seventh Seal the termination of his first series, like Vitringa before him. Also, like Vitringa, finding no other subject-matter in it (since he will not admit it to contain the Trumpets) but the *half-hour's silence* before the Trumpets' preparation, he is fain to make something sufficient out of *this* : and, after first identifying the silence with the previously described pause on the restraining of the tempest-angels,² adopted subsequently the view of its meaning some "*pause at the return of Christ*," so as in Apoc. xix, xx,³ whether in the sense of its figuring the millennial rest, or what else precisely, I do not well understand. Now that one of the Seals should simply reveal "*a pause*" seems to me little credible ; above all when the Scripture evidence for such a pause is so wanting that we are given the large margin of Apoc. xix, xx, in which to seek it.⁴

Thus, on the whole, our close examination of this Scheme of the Seals has issued, I believe, in seeing its total failure :—a failure, not as regards one Seal only, but every Seal ; nor as tried by one test only, but by multiplied tests : and, if I mistake not, without one single strong point of evidence appearing in its favour.

¹ See the Diagram prefixed to his Work :—a Diagram which (like the cycles and epicycles of the old astronomers) strikingly marks to the eye the want of simplicity, and consequently (I should say) of probability, in the scheme depicted.

² So in his Work on Prophecy, (6th Ed.) p. 363 ; "Seal vii, Apoc. viii. 1, Pause before judgment ; A.D. 1815."

³ So in a corrected copy of his Scheme privately communicated to me.

⁴ Subsequently in his 7th Edition, p. 295, he added, "*Events unfolded Apoc. xix, xx.*" This makes the case no better, but rather worse. If the subject-matter of the Seal be a *pause*, how can it include *stirring events*!

I might suggest, in yet further corroboration of my argument, the impossibility of fitting the symbols of the next opening series of the Trumpets to the events of Roman history, as begun and progressing from after the time of St. John's seeing the visions in Patmos; so as to furnish any plausible historic evidence for its being a prophetic series of chronological parallelism with the Seals. This impossibility appears more clearly than ever before in the attempt at overcoming it made by Mr. Birks himself, in his recently published book on "The Mystery of Providence;" and will be briefly noticed by me in a subsequent Paper in this Appendix, entitled, "On the third part in the four first Trumpets." ¹

¹ No. iv., § 3.—I have mentioned at the opening of this Paper that Mr. Birks, since the publication of my 4th Ed., has intimated to me his abandonment of the whole Church Scheme of the Seals, and adoption of the same structural theory of them as myself, after Mede. For the same reasons, however, that I have given for the retention of the present Paper, I think it well to re-insert the other. 5th Ed.

APPENDIX.

No. III.

ON THE ROMAN COINAGE, COINS, AND WEIGHT, ENGRAVED IN THIS VOLUME.

(See Pages 126, 184, &c.)

§ 1. GENERAL NOTICE ON THE ROMAN COINAGE AND COINS.

As I have somewhat largely illustrated my Apocalyptic Exposition in this Volume by Roman coins, and shall have to avail myself of the same kind of illustration, though more sparingly, in the remaining Volumes, it will, I think, be both interesting and useful to the reader, with a view to his correcter judgment on the illustrative value of the medals thus made use of by me, to have before him a brief general sketch on matters connected with the Roman coinage. I purpose therefore in my present Paper first to give this general sketch; then to add a few exemplifications, with remarks in detail on them, such as we may so be better prepared for, from various Roman undisputed coins engraved in my book. On two or three, with which controverted questions are connected, there will be separate Essays.¹ I shall abstract almost throughout from Eckhel's great work on the *Doctrina Veterum Nummorum*; a work confessedly the most learned and authoritative that exists on the general subject.

I. The date of the first coinage of money seems to have been nearly about the commencement of the Olympian Æra, B.C. 776, or founding of Rome, B.C. 753: the metals silver, and, though much more rarely, gold; the country Greece.² Thence the art and custom past

¹ Viz. 1st, on the *Roman* character of the coins with the *horse* and *Mars' head* and *Rome*; 2ndly, on the *Cretensic* reference of Nerva's *Dianic* coin; 3dly, on the earliest imperial coins on which the Roman emperors were depicted with a *diadem*.

² Eckhel Prolegom. i. ix.—Demosthenes refers to a law of Solon's imposing the penalty of death on such as adulterated the public money. Now Solon, we know, lived some 500 years before the Christian æra; and was the contemporary of Cyrus king of Persia, and Tarquinius Priscus the 5th king of Rome.

in early times to its various Western colonies, especially those in Magna Græcia and Sicily: so that we have coins of Rhegium and Messina still extant of as early a date as V.C. 276,¹ or B.C. 477; and of Zankle, (the previous name of Messina,) of Caulonia in the Bruttii, and of other ancient neighbouring cities, still earlier.²—The Roman coinage is said to have begun under king Servius, whose death occurred V.C. 218;³ though none of so ancient a date yet remains: and it was at first, and for a long time after, only of *brass*; in direct contrast with the earliest Greek coinage, which, as observed, was originally of *silver*.⁴ The date of the first Roman *silver* coinage is fixed by Pliny at V.C. 485, five years before the first Punic war;⁵ with which statement the evidence of medals still extant sufficiently agrees.—The earliest and standard *type* of the Roman *brass* coinage seems to have been for the *as* Janus' head on the obverse, for the *lesser coins* the head of Jove, Minerva, Hercules, or Mercury; with a ship's prow in all on the reverse:⁶ the type of the *as* having reference to Saturn's arrival in a ship in the Tiber, according to an ancient tradition; and teaching a certain primitive king, Janus, there resident at the time, both other arts of civilization, and specially the coining of money.⁷ Of the *denarius*, the chief Roman *silver* coin, (in value equivalent to a Greek drachma, and also originally to ten Roman asses, whence its name,)⁸ the earliest type extant is a winged head of the helmeted Minerva on the obverse, and on the reverse the Dioscuri Equites, or Castor and Pollux:⁹ after which, somewhat later, the reverse often presents some one of the Roman gods in a

¹ The æra V. C., that is *Urbis Condita*, is always made use of by Eckhel.

² Eckhel v. 10, i. 220.—Zankle was the original name of Messina; which new name that city received on the old inhabitants being dispossessed by a colony of Messenians from the Peloponnesus, under Anaxilaus, shortly after the battle of Marathon. So that, says Eckhel, coins with *Zankle* or *Dankle* on them cannot be of a later date than V. C. 276; the old name having been superseded by the new one of Messina.—On the antiquity of the Caulonian medals, see *ib.* i. 167.

³ So Pliny: *ib.* v. 2.

⁴ *Ibid.* v. 2, 3.

⁵ *Ibid.* v. 7. See too Arnold's *Rome* ii. 534.

⁶ *Ibid.* v. 11.

⁷ *Ibid.* v. 14. So Ovid, *Fasti* i. 229;

Multa quidem didici: sed cur navalis in ære

Altera signata est; altera forma biceps?

Causa ratis superest. Tuscum rate venit in amnem,

Ante pererrato falcifer orbe Deus.

At bona posteritas puppim servavit in ære;

Hospitis adventum testificata Dei.

From *Janus* originated the name of the hill *Janiculum*.

⁸ *ib.* 18.

⁹ *ib.* v. 42, 84.

biga or quadriga; whence the frequent ancient appellation of the coins, as *bigati* or *quadrigati*.¹—Gold money does not appear to have been struck at Rome, except on certain extraordinary occasions, till the time of Julius Cæsar's dictatorship.²—The want of a Roman native silver coinage before the first Punic war, and want of a native gold coinage afterwards, seems to have been mainly supplied (not to speak now of a smaller early supply from Samnium or Campania, furnished in a way that will be illustrated in my next Section) by the abundant influx, or importation, of foreign silver and gold money. So Festus;³ whose statement is well illustrated by various facts in the Roman Republican history.⁴

During the Republic the proper and only ordinary *place* for the Roman coinage was *Rome* itself. Under extraordinary circumstances however it might be elsewhere: and when struck with Roman types, of Roman weight, and by Roman officers, it was rightly to be regarded as Roman money.⁵ Probably the money to be noticed in my next Section was an early example of this.⁶ Later, the money called *Lucullean*, struck under Sylla's direction for use in the Mithridatic war, was coined in the Greek Peloponnesus. We have also extant Roman money struck *ex S. C.* at Osca in Spain. And, in the times of the civil wars, we find that the Consuls, driven from Rome on Cæsar's passage of the Rubicon, struck denarii at Apollonia in Illyricum; that Metellus Scipio struck denarii in Africa, on the renewal of the war V.C. 707 against Cæsar; and that, still later, money was coined by Brutus and Cassius in different towns in Greece, and by Antony at Lyons.⁷—With regard to the *right of coinage*, as this was always and in every nation considered as a mark of sovereignty, so republican Rome ever jealously vindicated that right to herself;⁸ the special charge over it, and over the Treasury, being entrusted to the Senate.⁹ Hence on the earliest *Roman* silver coins, called *Numi*

¹ Ib. v. 19, 42, 43.

² Ib. v. 37—40.

³ In Patres. "Solcabant Romani, jam inde à Romulo, numis auri atque argenti signati ultramarinis uti; id quod publicæ et privatæ rationes commentariorum docent." Ap. Eckhel v. 41.

⁴ Eckhel, *ibid.*, gives examples of this importation, on the successful ending of wars in Greece or Asia. "Invexit Quinctius, ex Græciâ redux, in triumpho Philippeos 14,515; Scipio Asiaticus, victo Antiocho M., 140,000; M. Fulvius, in triumpho de Ætolis, 12,422, &c." How much vaster the influx from the ordinary course and necessities of commerce!

⁵ Ib. v. 68.

⁶ See my next Section itself.

⁷ *Ibid.* 68, 69.

⁸ *Ibid.* i. lxx—lxxii.

⁹ Cicero *Vat.* 15.

Consulares, and which are stamped with types such as I have before indicated, there appears neither name, nor effigy, of Consul or other Magistrate; but only *Roma*.¹ Later the names of certain Magistrates were inscribed, whence the coins are called *Numi Familiarum*;² but never their effigies: such effigies as appear on certain of the coins being not those of the Magistrates themselves, but only of some illustrious ancestor of theirs; for stamping which, special permission was obtained from the Senate.³ It was to the dictator Julius Cæsar that the right of stamping his own image on the coinage was first assigned by a Decree of the Senate: after whom the Triumvirs Octavian, Antony, Lepidus, and also Sext. Pompey and M. Brutus, coined in their own name, and as by their own right; an introduction this to Augustus' and his successors' subsequent supremacy over the mint and coinage.⁴—In subordination to the Senate the *City Quæstors* had charge over the treasury;⁵ the *Triumviri Monetales* over the coinage: which Triumvirs are stated by Pomponius to have been first appointed as early as V.C. 465;⁶ though the evidence of this on coins themselves is, and could only be, much later.⁷—It does not appear that there was any regular annual coinage, or issue of money; but that this was made only as required. The Magistrates, whether Prætors, Ædiles, Quæstors, or others, seem to have made application for it to the Senate, according as it might be needed for purposes of war, public games, procuration of corn, public buildings, &c., &c.: which application granted, they ordered it from the Triumviri.⁸ Hence frequently, in the last two centuries of the Republic, their names on the coins, as well as also sometimes

¹ Eckhel calls these *Numi Consulares*, in contradistinction to the *Numi Familiarum*; though the latter of course were also struck under the Consular regime. "Prævertunt ætatem, antequam mos signandæ in numis familiæ esset in vectus." v. 42.

² How late the date of their beginning, and what the chronology of the individual coins of this class previously to the 8th century V. C., is unknown. A desideratum much lamented by Numismatists; and in consequence of which the coins are classed not chronologically, but alphabetically, according to the names of the Gentes or Familiæ. Eckhel v. 53, 54.

³ Prolegom. i: lxxi.

⁴ Ibid. lxxii.

⁵ Ibid. lxxviii.

⁶ Ib. lxxix.; v. 61, 65. Pomponius speaks of them thus; "Constituti sunt eodem tempore . . . Triumviri Monetales, æris argenti auri flatores." But, as to their coining of silver and gold, Pomponius, observes Eckhel, must have spoken *προληπτικως*; as silver was not coined till V.C. 485, twenty years later, and gold not till long afterwards.

⁷ Because no names of *any* magistrates, or public officers, were admitted to be engraved till some considerable time afterwards.—Names of Triumviri Monetales appear on coins of the last century, or century and a half, of the Republic's duration.

⁸ Eckhel v. 67.

those of the *Triumvirs*; and symbols either of their office, or of the purpose the money was granted for.—When Roman money was struck in the Provinces, the Provincial *Quæstors* had superintendence over it, so as the *Triumviri Monet.* at Rome: and they inscribed either their own names, or that of their *Proconsul* or *Propætor*, or both.¹

As the Roman dominion extended itself more and more in every direction, so as at first to include Italy, then by degrees more and more of what at length, ere the end of the Republic, (as well as afterwards under the Emperors,) became known as the Roman World, the circulation of its coinage naturally extended far and near. Yet it was still permitted both to the Italian cities after their incorporation with the Republic, and afterwards to the ultramarine Provinces, to retain among other rights of liberty that of coining their own money, according to their respective wants and means: so that, for example, the Asiatics of the Ephesian or Proconsular Asia still coined as before their silver *cistophori* in great abundance, the Athenians their *tetradrachms*.²—To the Roman colonies too, whether in Italy, Sicily, or elsewhere, the right was attached of coining their own money.³

So as regards the Roman coinage, and that of the Roman Provinces, during the times of the *Republic*. On the Republic becoming changed into an *Empire* under Augustus and his successors, various changes occurred both at home and abroad. At Rome the exclusive authority over the gold and silver coinage was attached to the Emperor; that over the brass coinage being alone left to the Senate:⁴ and in both one, and the other, the name and effigy of the Emperor appeared on the obverse. The *Triumviri Monetales* were still continued as the executive officers over the Mint: the office being one assigned by the Emperor to certain individuals chosen by him out of the Equestrian order; and regarded, in common with three or four other offices, similarly appointed to from out of the Equestrians, as the stepping-

¹ Eckhel v. 69.

² *Ibid.* i. lxxi., 82.

³ *Ibid.* iv. 499.

⁴ *Ib.* i. lxxiii—lxxviii. Hence the s. c. only on the imperial *brass* money: except when the subject of the *type* of a silver or gold coin might be something ordered by the Senate; such as the consecration of a deceased Emperor, or an arc or statue dedicated to him. Then the Ex. s. c. may appear: as indeed on Republican coins also, in the case of types similarly significant, more anciently.—On the brass the s. c. ceases under Gallienus.

stone to higher offices in the State.¹—With regard to the *Provinces* it seems to have been Augustus' wish to carry out gradually the policy urged on him by Mæcenas, of making the Roman the sole coinage current through the Roman world.² Thus with the Italian cities the right of coining seems to have ceased on the first accession of Augustus. In Gaul, Spain, Sicily, and the African and Cyrenaic Provinces, it ceased under Tiberius and Caligula. The East however, from Greece proper to Mæsia on the N. E., and to Egypt, Arabia, and Mesopotamia on the S. E., continued still to strike coins;³ whether *autonomi*, as they are called, i. e. without the head of Emperor or Empress, or *officiosi*, with it:⁴ with this restriction, however, that the privilege of coining *silver* was only granted to comparatively few cities, and those of the highest rank: such as Alexandria in Egypt, the Syrian Antioch, Cæsarea in Cappadocia, Tarsus, &c.⁵ For the *Roman Colonies* it was necessary to receive the special permission of the Emperor, or the Proconsul: and though under the Republic this permission seems to have been unrestricted, yet it was now only granted to certain Colonies, not to others; and, where granted, only extended to the right of coining brass money.⁶—Such continued the state of things, as regarded the coinage of the Eastern Provinces, till the latter half of the third Century of the Christian Æra. Then under Gallienus and Claudius their coinage ceased almost altogether; the Alexandrian alone lingering a few years longer, till the reign of Diocletian.⁷ Imperial mints, *Officinæ Monetales*, were now established permanently at different places over the empire, as Siscia in Pannonia, Treves, Lyons, Carthage, Constantinople, &c. &c., as well as Rome;⁸ thus in a more systematic manner supplying the

¹ Eckhel i. lxxix., v. 62, 63. So Ovid of his own appointment to the office, *Trist.* iv. 33;

Cœpimus et teneræ primos ætatis honores;
Eque *viris* quondam pars *tribus* una fui.

There are still extant marbles which speak of III VIRI A. A. A. F. F., (i. e. auro argento ære flando ferundo,) of the age of Trajan, that of Severus, and that of Gordian. Eckhel i. lxxix.

² “Numismate, pondere, mensurâ peculiari urbs nulla utitor, sed nostris omnes.” So Dion Cassius, lii. 30. The advice was given, says Eckhel, i. 82, in the year V.C. 725, when Augustus was doubting whether or not to restore the Republic.

³ i. 82, 83.

⁴ *Ibid.* i. lxxi.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ i. lxxi. 82; iv. 497, 499. Such a colony was Philippi, mentioned Acts xvi. 12. *Ibid.* ii. 75.

⁷ i. ix., x.

⁸ *Permanently*, in contradistinction to the mints temporarily established, under particular passing circumstances, by certain of the Emperors; as by Vespasian at Antioch,

wants of the Provinces. So was prepared in respect of the *coinage*, as well as in respect of the political constitution of the Roman world, the grand transition in Imperial history from the *earlier* to the *later* or *lower* empire.—After the fall of the Western Empire under the Gothic invasions, and total separation of the Eastern Empire from it in the new form that it afterwards assumed, the coinage of the Eastern Empire had its own peculiarities, and may be called rather the *Byzantine*, or *Greek*, than the *Roman* coinage.

II. I now proceed to notice more or less cursorily, and as illustrative of the general historic sketch of the Roman coinage given under my former head, those coins of which use has been made in this work, especially in this its first volume. In this I shall follow a chronological order: arranging the coins under heads, according to the time when they were struck.

1. Of those of earliest date specimens occur in the medals of *Mars* and a *horse*, or *horse's head*, with *Roma* or *Romano* inscribed, which are given at p. 126 of this volume. For they date before what are generally called *Numi Familiarum*, from the names of officials inscribed, and refer in the types (as we saw) to some particular person, or particular historic fact of celebrity, connected with the particular family of the Roman official coining; whereas on these coins, it will be seen, there is simply the inscription *Roma*, or *Romano*. In my commentary ad loc. I have cited the judgments of Eckhel and Niebuhr, in reference to their antiquity and origin. And I doubt not they offer a true specimen of those very ancient Roman ante-Familiaric *Numi Consulares*.¹ As the medals in question, however, involve controverted matter, and this of some considerable importance in its bearing on my view of the four first Seals, I have thought it best to treat of the subject separately and more fully, as the reader will find, in the next Section of the present Essay.

2. Of Roman medals of the next earliest class of coins, called *Numi Familiarum*, three are engraved in this Volume, (see p. 185 *suprà*,) in illustration of the 3rd Seal. Besides which other examples will be found described in the *third* Section of this Essay.

Of these three coins the second and third are illustrative of the pro-

Pesennius Niger in the East, Clodius Albinus in Gaul, &c. Eckhel i. lxxxii. In his 8th Volume, p. 518 &c., Eckhel gives a full list of the towns where the Roman mints were permanently fixed.

¹ See p. 572, Note ¹.

curations of corn under the Republic, spoken of as made by order of the Senate for distribution among the poorer citizens, so as the inscription *Ad. Fru. Emu. Ex. S. C.* on the one, and the *modius* and *ears of corn* on the other, indicate; also of money being struck for the purpose.¹—The obverse on the third coin is a head of some ancient Regulus, (not improbably, we may suppose, of the Regulus so famous in the first Carthagiuan war,) the ancestor of the L. Livineius Regulus, Prætor of Rome under J. Cæsar's Dictatorship, for whose use in the public service the money was struck;² and thus illustrates what was before stated, respecting the human effigies that appear on certain of the Numi Familiarum, as not those of the inscribed magistrates themselves, but (by the Senate's permission) of some one of their ancestors.³ The obverse on the second coin is a head which seems to be that of Saturn; the obverse on the first, the head of Jupiter Terminalis.—With regard to the *balance* on the first coin engraved, (the most important emblem of course in the three medals towards the illustration of my third Seal,) it was stated by me⁴ that it appears both on Roman Republican and Roman Imperial coins as the symbol of *justice*: and this in reference specially to two acts, or offices, in which equitable dealing is most important on the part of governing authorities to the commonwealth governed; viz. 1st, the judicial office, or, as it is often characteristically called, the administration of justice; 2ndly, the coinage of the public money, with just weight and purity of metal. The latter view of justice was naturally a favourite subject with the officers of the mint: and they were able specifically to point out a reference to it, by the added signs either of a mass of metal, or instruments⁵ of

¹ See p. 572 *suprà*.—As another illustration of this, from the Numi Familiarum, let me add the description of a denarius of the Claudian Gens, and family of the Marcelli, given by Eckhel v. 170;

{ Caput Palladis alatum, præ quo x, pone *modius*.
 { *M. Marc.* Victoria in bigis; in imo *duæ spicæ*, et *Roma*.

² Eckhel v. 235.—This medal was restored by Trajan. Of whose restorations of the ancient republican coins, Eckhel, after giving a list of what are still extant v. 98, &c., observes that it is probable he restored most, or even all. “Cum Trajanus obscurarum familiarum numos restituerit, . . . verisimile est ab eo illarum plerosque, et forte omnes, restitutos; sed quos hactenus videre non licuit. Videmus enim eorum numerum, etsi lentè, sensim tamen augeri; et haud dubiè complures in variis Museis latent, sed nobis ignoti.” p. 110.

³ Eckhel v. 154, 159.

⁴ See pp. 170, 186.

⁵ The *instruments of coining* appear, for example, on a medal of the *Gens Carisia*, thus described by Eckhel v. 163;

{ *Moneta.* Caput muliebre.
 { *T. Carisius.* Incus, pileus Vulcani, forceps, malleus.

coining, or significant words or letters inscribed,¹ or the personification of one goddess superscribed *Moneta*, or perhaps three, with the balance beneath; the three indicating the three metals struck in coinage.² In other cases, the reference either to justice in its largest sense,—justice executive, legislative, and administrative,—or to the judicial administration of justice in particular, was also made evident. I subjoin illustrations.³ In the engraving given by me, the suspension of the *balance* above the *curule chair* is sufficiently significative of his latter reference: this being under the Republic the seat of the Prætor, or Proprætor, in administering justice. I have given ad loc. Spanheim's notice of the symbol to this effect, in his earlier and smaller work *De Præstantiâ Nummorum*; and I now subjoin the notice of it to the same effect, in his later and larger *Work*.⁴

The *mass of metal* appears on an Alexandrine medal of Commodus, given by Eckhel iv. 77;

{ Κομμοδος, &c.

{ Μονητα. Moneta stolata stans, d. bilancem s. sceptrum; ante pedes acervus æris.

¹ So in a medal of the Emperor Claudius, given by Eckhel, vi. 238:

{ T. Claudius Cæsar Aug. Dextra bilancem tenens, intrâ ejus lances P. N. R.

{ Cos. Des. It. Pont. M. Tr. P. Imp. In medio S. C.

where Eckhel explains the P. N. R. to mean *Pondus Numi Restitutum*.—Of the word *Moneta* examples have been given in the Note preceding.

² Eckhel, vii. 188, describes a coin of this character of the Emperor S. Severus.

{ S. Severus Aug. Caput laureatum.

{ Æquitati Publicæ. Tres Monetæ stantes cum bilance et cornu copiæ. Juxtâ singulas, præ pedibus, massa metalli.

In Gessner and elsewhere the reader may see engravings of the three *Monetæ*.

³ In the mass of Roman medals with the figure of Justice bearing a balance in hand, and the inscription *Æquitas Augusti*, reason requires that we give this large meaning to the symbol.—Similarly in the Alexandrine medals, where we have multitudes of types of the Emperors or Empresses, with personifications accompanying of various other virtues, as *Ελπις*, *Ειρηνη*, *Τυχη*, *Προνοια*, and also that of *Δικαιοσυνη*, or *Justice*,—as the other personifications are *general* in their meaning, so too, we may reasonably suppose, the *Δικαιοσυνη*; whose type, like that of *Æquitas*, in the Latin coins, is a *balance*. I may cite for example one of the Emperor Claudius, given by Eckhel iv. 51;

{ Ti Claudius, &c.

{ Δικαιοσυνη. L. Γ. Mulier stans, d. bilancem.

Rasehe, on *Δικαιοσυνη*, mentions an “*insignis numus*,” given by Seguin, Vaillant, and Morell; on which “*hinc Tiberii caput, illinc libra æquis lancibus, cum adscriptis circum nominibus Βασιλισσα Πυθοδωρις Κοτυος*.” And he adds in explanation: “*Signata ibi libra cum lancibus ad prædicandum Tiberii justitiam; dum ab eo id impetravit hæc Regina Pythodoris, ut in ultionem occisi per fraudem à Rheseuporide mariti ipse in Senatu damnaretur, et Alexandriam delatus capite ibi lueret*.”

⁴ I refer to his Vol. ii. p. 111, and Section headed, “*De Prætoribus in Numis*.” He there observes: “*Quam curulis foret itidem magistratus, neque unum paulatim constitutum sit Prætorum in Urbe genus, verum eorum primo qui jus Romæ dicerent, dein qui ad regendas Romani Populi Provincias, aut cæteroquin cum militari imperio mitterentur, tum qui prius quæstiones publicas de certis criminibus in Urbe exercebant,—ita miscuê iidem initialibus primis illius magistratûs literis PR, seu Prætoris,*

Of the procurations indicated in these coins, I noticed in my Comments on the 3rd Seal the continuance and extension under the Emperors, with a view to the supply of the vast wants both of the army and the Roman populace: and how in the 3rd Century the extension was such as materially to aggravate the pressure of the heavy tax of contributions of corn required from the Provincials; carried out, as those procurations too often were, with injustice and oppression. Accordingly, the *modius* often appears in a similar signifiatory sense on Imperial coins: for example on one of Nerva's, exhibiting a "modius prominentibus spicis," and with the inscription, *Plebei Urbanæ Frumento Constituto*.¹

And still in imperial times there was the same association as before of justice with the same symbols. Thus the goddess Justice was sometimes depicted as sitting on a *curule chair* for her tribunal.² Again, the symbol of the balance continued to be used as significative of justice. Both the idea indeed, and the symbol, now attached primarily to the Emperors themselves; as the supreme legislators and administrators of law in the State.³ The coin of Alexander Severus given under my 3rd Seal illustrates this. Subordinately, however, both the idea and the symbol attached to those also who administered the law under the Emperors.⁴ So Manilius, writing near the close of the reign of Augustus, speaks not only of the emperor, but also of the Prætor and Judge, as fitly born under the zodiacal sign of the balance.⁵ Now in the hieroglyphic of the third

et communibus præterea *sellæ curulis*, *Blancis* subinde, (vulgati justitiæ, ut similiter in aliquot Cæsarum numis, symboli,) fascium præterea, quandoque et securium insignibus utebantur."

¹ Eckhel vi. 407.

² "Sellæ curuli, nempe pro tribunali, adsidet Justitia, hastâ purâ insignis; et, portatâ paterâ, religionem sibi curæ esse ostendit." So Rasche, on Justitia, referring to a gold coin of Hadrian, given by Khell in his Supplement, p. 70.

³ So Rasche on *Æquitas Augusti*; observing that justice was considered to attach properly to those, most of all, "qui jus dicere solent:" so as did the Augusti, as the head of the law and government.

⁴ Just as, though the Emperors were the head of the army also, and so wore the sword of supreme command, yet the sword was borne, as the badge of military command, by the *Imperial generals* under them: so as we have seen under our second Seal.

⁵ Viz. in his 4th Book. In one passage, verse 545, he says;

Sed cum autumnales cæperunt surgere Chelæ,
Felix æquato genitus sub pondere *Libræ*,
Judex extremæ sistet vitæque necisque;
Imponetque jugum terris, legesque rogabit.

This with special reference to Augustus, the supreme judge and legislator; whom

Apocalyptic Seal this latter application of the balance in the hand of the rider, I mean its application to the *subordinate* administrators of justice, (its administrators both judicially and executively,) was fixed alike by the absence of the crown from his head, and by those most significant words of charge and monition, addressed to him in the voice from the throne, about the price of corn, and against injustice, which Emperors “*lege soluti*” never received, but Provincial Governors received perpetually; and of which I have fully spoken in my comment on that Seal.¹

3. Of the *Provincial* coinage, both under the Republic and under the Emperors, examples appear in my two Cretan coins given at p. 140 of this Volume.—The *Cydonian* medal is of silver; and may very possibly be in date earlier than the epoch of Crete becoming a Province of the Roman Empire. If later it illustrates the fact of the permission, accorded very generally to the Provincial towns under the Republic, to strike their *numos autonomos*, and this *in silver*, as before. The obverse (not given by me) has on it a Woman’s head adorned with flowers, and the inscription *Νευαντος Εποει*, designating the designer, or the coiner.²—The other of the *Cretan Diana* is of Roman imperial times: it being struck by the *Κοινων Κρητων*: which *Κοινων*, like many others whose names appear on medals, were communities formed under the Emperors, with a view simply to the common celebration of public games and religious festivals. Eckhel³ gives a list of the various *Κοινα* formed about this period; and mentions that the extant coins of this Cretan *Κοινων* extend from Tiberius to M. Aurelius inclusive.—The *Diana* occurs, I may observe, in Cretan coins under the reigns of Hadrian and Anton. Pius, as well

he here supposes to have been born under the sign of *Libra*, though others referred his birth to the sign of *Capricorn*. (See Scaliger’s Note.) Elsewhere he connects with it judges, and law advisers, and administrators more generally.

Librantes noctem Chelæ cum tempore lucis,
Per nova maturi post annum tempora Bacchi,
Mensuræ et tribuent usus, et pondera rerum:
Hic etiam legum tabulas, et condita jura,
Et licitum sciet, et vetitum quæ pœna sequatur,
Perpetuum populi privato in limine Prætor.

Libra was the sign of *Astræa*, the heavenly goddess of justice.

¹ From seeing the *reverse* only, (so as in Spanheim’s smaller work,) and the inscription *Leg. Pro. Pr.* on it, I had originally supposed the coin with the balance to have been one stamped with the name of a *Legatus Proprietore* under the Emperors. It was struck, we see, just before the establishment of the empire under Augustus.

² Eckhel ii. 309.

³ Vol. iv. p. 423, &c.

as Trajan. So common and recognised was the *huntress-Diana* type as Cretan, at, and for a while after, the time of the striking of that Roman *Dianic* coin by the Emperor Nerva, of which I shall have to speak more particularly in the 3rd Section of this Essay. I observe in Gessner another characteristic coin of the Cretan Κοινον of Domitian's time: the obverse presenting Domitian's head, with Δομιτ. Καίσαρ; (so it was not one of the *autonomic* provincial coins;) the reverse Κρητων Κοινον, with a man holding a bow. Eckhel¹ adds the inscription on a very illustrative marble of the Lyttii of Crete, from Gruter; Ἰερον Αγωνος Πενταετηρικου Του Κοινου Των Κρητων; showing that the games of this Cretan Community were quinquennial.

4. Of Roman *Imperial* coins of the first grand division of the *Empire*, i. e. from Augustus' accession to that of Constantine, seven are engraven in the Horæ; viz. (in chronological order) that of *Augustus on horseback*, that of *Claudius Drusus on a triumphal arch*, that of *Vespasian with Rome on the seven hills*, that of *Titus on the destruction of Jerusalem*, that of *Nerva's head with the laurel crown*, to which may be added the same Emperor's *Dianic coin*, and that of *Alexander Severus' with the figure of Justice*.²—On the first of the two *Nervas*, the *Vespasian*, the *Titus*, and the *Alex. Severus*, (the last just before referred to,) there does not occur to me anything here needing further observation; save only that on the *Vespasian* and *Alex. Severus* there appear the letters S. C., marking them to be of the Senate's coinage, and that they are of course of brass.³—The equestrian *Augustus* suggests a similar medal of Domitian, the reigning Emperor at the time of St. John's exile in Patmos, engraved in Patin's Numismata, p. 157; one which represents that same equestrian statue of him, which in my Note ad loc. I stated to have been the subject of one of Statius' Odes.—In connexion with that which exhibits the triumphal arc of *Claudius Drusus*, it may be well to add that medals of similar design were wont to be struck in St. John's own time, on occasion of the *Profectio Augusti*, or Emperor's going forth to war. So a medal of Domitian, struck in flattery by the Senate, on occasion of one of *his* goings forth to war, with a horseman at full speed, wounding a prostrate enemy. To which let me add one of Trajan's, coined very shortly after the apostle's death,

¹ iv. 431.

² The *Vespasian* is in my 4th Volume; the rest of the above-mentioned are in this my 1st Volume.

³ See p. 572 supra.

which exhibits that emperor galloping forth, and striking down an enemy; with the inscription round it, *S. P. Q. R. Optimo Principi*. Also a medal of Alexander Severus, given in Gessner, Tab. 164 N. 34, of similar character, and struck on a similar occasion of his *profectio*, but on which, besides the emperor galloping forth and striking down an enemy, there is also *Victory, with a crown, preceding him*, (somewhat as in my Plate,) *and a soldier following*.

As to my sixth imperial medal of this class, (taken in chronological order,) viz. that of *Nerva* with *Diana* on the reverse, it will be fully discussed in the 3rd Section of this Paper, and therefore needs not to be spoken of here.

5thly. I have to notice the Roman Imperial medals, given in this Volume, which refer to the times of and after Constantine; viz. the *Constantines* with the *labarum* or *phœnix*, the *Valentinian* with the *diadem*, and the much later Constantinopolitan coins, with *the images of Christ and the Virgin*:—classed with which are the coins of *Maximian* and *Theodosius* given in my 3rd Volume.

On some of these, viz. the *Constantinian* coins and that of *Maximian* and *Theodosius*, the reader will observe at the bottom of the coin the marks of those *Officinæ Monetales*, which I spoke of in my first Head as established about the close of the third century at different places throughout the Empire; AQP, ESIS, ASIS, TRP, TESOB. The AQ signifies *Aquilcia*; the P *percussum*, or struck. The *Sis* in the two next signifies *Siscia* in Pannonia, a town on the Save, some fifty miles E.N.E. of Trieste; the prefix A and E designating the particular offices of the mint there established. The *Tr* of the third indicates the mint at *Treves*, in North Eastern Gaul; the P, as before, *percussum*. The intent of the *Tesob* is more doubtful; as also that of *Conob*, another word of similar form, often found at the bottom of imperial coins of this period. I must refer the reader to Eckhel's discussion of this point, in his Section on the *Officinæ Monetales*, near the end of his last Volume.

As to the *radiated phœnix* in my Constantinian coins, an emblem associated with the *labarum* in the first given by me in Plate 10, Spanheim thus explains it, with reference to the times of the Christian Emperors. "Phœnix velut novæ ac æternæ vitæ, aut novi quasi et fortunati seu aurei sæculi, symbolum est sub Christianis Cæsaribus frequentatum." So in like manner Patinus; adverting, in explanation, "ad religionem Christianam quam Constantinus M. propa-

gaverat, filiique omni cultu prosequebantur.”¹—The symbol had previously been made use of by Hadrian, to signify the “golden age” of which *his* reign was a part. Which medal of Hadrian is thus described by Eckhel, Vol. vi. p. 508;

{ *Imp. Cæsar. Trajan. Hadrianus. Aug.* Protome laureata.
 { *Sæc. Aur. P. M. TR. P. Cos. iii.* Vir seminudus stans, et s.
 { tenens globum cui phœnix insistit, d. circulum contingit quo
 { totus ambitur.

And he observes on it; “Aversa hujus numi aureum imperante Hadriano sæculum deprædicat:” the circulus of the coin being explained as signifying “orbem sæculi in se revoluti.”

6thly, and finally, there will be seen at p. 486 examples of the latest of Roman Imperial coins, and which indeed might rather be called *Greek* or *Byzantine* Imperial coins;—I mean those *with an image of the Virgin*, of the Emperors *John Zimisce*, *Romanus III*, and *Andronicus II*. But, respecting these, my observations ad loc. supersede the necessity of any further observations here.

§ 2. ON THE HORSE WITH THE MARS' HEAD, AND INSCRIPTION ROMA
OR ROMANO, AS A ROMAN COIN.²

(See Page 126.)

It is important that it should be always borne in mind, as stated by me in my Apocalyptic Commentary and elsewhere, that the fitness of this emblem of the *horse*, in the view in which I represent it, is altogether independent of the illustrative *medals* given by me: the *horse* having been sacred to *Mars*, the reputed father of the *Mavortia proles*, or Roman people; and accordingly, from the earliest times of Roman history, both horse-races established as an annual festival in honour of him, and also each October the solemn sacrifice of a horse to him. So associated with the Romans' reputed origin, earliest national history, public religious festivals, and known national character too, how could there but be *intrinsic* fitness in the symbol of a *war-horse* to signify the *Roman martial people*? There is just as much fitness of symbol here surely, as in the *goat*, from its association with

¹ p. 472.

² The present Paper is copied from the Appendix to the *Vindiciæ Horariæ*, with some slight alterations. This will explain its controversial form.

the early national legendary history of the Macedonians, to signify the Macedonian empire: the propriety of which latter symbol is recognised in Scripture; as appears from its adoption in Dan. viii. 5, 21.

The only attempt to impugn the justice of *this* argument that has met my eye is that made by the Rev. W. G. Barker, first in his "Friendly Remarks on the Horæ," and afterwards in his Answer to my Reply, in the Churchman's Monthly Review.¹ And what then his objection? Why, he asserts that the horse was *not* sacred to Mars. A really startling assertion this, to any one pretty well versed in classical literature; and which is based solely and wholly on an inference drawn by him from the statement following in Smith's Dictionary of Antiquities: "It may be considered as a general rule that those animals which were sacred to a god were not sacrificed to him; though horses were sacrificed to Neptune, notwithstanding this usage." For Mr. B. thence argues; "If this be true, the horse was sacred to Neptune, and *was not sacred to Mars.*" But is a writer's *general* rule to be made *universal*, with only one exception, simply because, in illustration of its not being universal, he gives but one example of exception; which yet may be, and here in fact is, only one out of several?²—Let me ask Mr. B. has he considered what was meant by the ancients in speaking of one and another animal as *sacred* to a god? Was it not simply that the god was supposed to delight in, and affect the company of that animal; so as Jupiter that of the eagle, Juno of the peacock, Venus of the dove, Minerva of the owl? And was not the *horse* thus associated with *Mars*? What reports Pausanias on this point? That among the two or three statues of Mars that he saw in Greece, one was of *Mars on horseback*.³ What Horace? "*Martis equis acheronta fugit.*" What Ovid?

¹ Friendly Remarks, pp. 4—6; Churchman's Monthly Rev. for 1847, pp. 718—720.

² The *cock* was sacred to *Æsculapius*; yet, as in Socrates' well-known example, was sacrificed to him. It was sacred too to Mars, and so called by Aristophanes *Ἀρεὸς νεοττός*; yet perpetually sacrificed to him. (Potter, Antiq. i. 379.) The *stag* was sacred to *Diana*, as Festus and Pausanias state, and thus stags harnessed to her car, yet stags sacrificed to her; and so too sometimes, as the same Pausanias tells us in his Laconics, another animal sacred to her, even the *dog*. Again, the *horse* was sacred to the Sun, yet the horse sacrificed to him. "Constat Soli equos fuisse sacros, et sacrificatos. . . Sic Rhodios, &c." So Eckhel v. 49. Also Ovid, of the Persians; (Fasti i. 385;)

Placat equo Persis radiis Hyperiona cinctum.

³ So in his *Eliacs*, ch. 15.—Montfaucon, Vol. vi. p. 52, after reference on this point to Pausanias, observes that Mars, Neptune, and Minerva were the only three gods of the ancient mythology that were represented sometimes as on horseback; and that they were each one designated in consequence by the title *Hippius*.

“*Marsque suos, junctis curribus, urget equos.*”—It is from this mythological notion of Mars then harnessing his horses to the chariot, that Ovid derives the institution of those *equiria*, or *horse-races*, that I before spoke of, celebrated in the Campus Martius on the Kalends of March in honour of him.¹ And, as regards the *sacrifice of the horse* to Mars, Festus explains that it was either with reference to the wooden horse by which Troy was taken, or because of *Mars’ complacency in the animal*; “quòd eo genere animalis Mars delectari putatur.”—Accordingly, not without reason, the most learned lexicographers and antiquarians declare the horse to have been sacred to Mars. So *Hoffman*, on the word *Mars*: “*Sacrum ei fecerunt equum, lupum, canem, et picum; quos in Dei hujus tutelâ esse credi voluerunt:*” adding also; “*Effinxere eum veteres ardentem, nunc in curru, nunc in equo armatum, cùm hastâ, &c.*” So again *Adams*, in the chapter on the Roman Gods, in his *Roman Antiquities*; “The animals sacred to Mars were the *horse*, wolf, and woodpecker:” and once more *Facciolati*, on the word *Equus*: “*Fuit equus Marti sacer, propter usum belli, et quotannis ei Romæ immolabatur.*”—Tertullian, as stated by me under the second Seal, specifies the horse of *red* colour, in particular, as sacred to Mars.²

Thus the question of the Roman reference and origin of *my engraved medals*, is one on a matter subsidiary, not essential: and I believe that on this point too the case of the impugnors of the Horæ will be found on examination totally to break down. The question, as put by my first and friendly correspondent on the subject Mr. B. Lewis, is whether or not the *horse* on the medal is what may be called *the Roman horse*, as being the horse *sacred* to the *Roman Mars*, whose head is on the obverse of the coins. I was at first led to suppose by Mr. L.’s report that Eckhel’s authority was against me on this point: and, not having Eckhel at hand to refer to, thought it right so to state the fact in my 2nd Edition; though it seemed to me a little strange in such case that there should be the *horse*, the *Mars*, and the *Roma* or *Romano*, all three combined together. Subsequently I had the opportunity of consulting Eckhel; and found that, although thinking

¹ The passage with its context stands thus: Fasti B. ii. ad fin.

Jamque duæ restant noctes de mense secundo;

Marsque suos junctis curribus urget equos.

Ex vero positum permansit equiria nomen;

Quæ Deus in campo prospicit ipse suo.

² See my p. 147, Note ³, *suprà*.

that the type was not so properly a Roman type, nor Rome the mint of these medals' coinage, but rather a type and mint of some people of Greek origin subject to Rome, like those in Campania, Magna Græcia, or Sicily, (of which more presently,) yet, as to the point I was most concerned with, viz. the horse being the *Roman horse*, and the Mars the *Roman Mars*, to whom that horse was sacred,¹ the opinion given by him was, in fact, in favour of my view, not against it. "Ad Romana hic typus sacra pertinet. Refert Festus; 'Equiria ludi quos Romulus Marti instituit, per equorum cursum, qui in Campo Martio exercebatur. De equo dicto Octobri, qui singulis annis Marti in Campo Martio immolabatur, vide eundem Festum in October equus.'"² I cited this passage in a reply to Mr. Arnold, in the British Magazine for March 1847; together with a quotation from Niebuhr, stating his opinion that this class of medals was struck by the *Roman governor* of *Roman colonists* early settled in Campania.³ Nor was any reply attempted, or contradiction given to my statement, either by Mr. Arnold or Mr. Lewis.—It is to be observed that the only other medal noticed either by Eckhel, Mionnet,⁴ or other medallic authors that I have consulted, in which the *horse* and the *Mars' head* are united, so as here, is one of Cosa,—Cosa in Etruria, according to Eckhel; in which place a *Roman colony* was fixed, just as in Campania also, a little before the first Punic war:⁵ so that this particular medal might well serve to corroborate Niebuhr's general theory.—Mr. Barker, referring to Dr. Glen King's Tables of Roman medals, says that amidst "thousands of engraved coins of the Roman empire, in consular and imperial coins, the horse, as a symbol, is never to be found." Now, 1st, Dr. G. King's Tables commence with the Roman Nuni Familiares; and therefore could not include these, which are of a class earlier. 2dly, as to his requirement of the horse being engraved as a *symbol* of the Roman people, there is not the

¹ The frequent similar connexion of the types on a medal's face and obverse is thus stated by Eckhel, i. cv. "In Numis autonomis pars aversa plerumque cum antica componitur. Sic Dii Deaque sua habent in aversis seu attributa, seu sacra sibi animalia, seu victimas, &c. Cum Jove aquila; . . cum Cerere porcus, ejus victima. Cum Dianâ componi cervum, aut canem, in vulgus notum."

² Eckhel v. 49.

³ See p. 126, Note² supra.

⁴ Except one *sine epigraphe*, and consequently on which no judgment can be pronounced.

⁵ Millingen (p. 229) prefers to ascribe these coins to *Compsa* or *Cossa*, a town of the Arpini, a Samnite people: adding, "Ses monnaies, qui sont de fabrication plutot ancienne, attestent qu'elle a du avoir été colonie ou *municipe Romain*; et probablement avant sa prise par Hannibal."

least need of my proving it such.¹ The question is, whether in this particular class of coins, (*a class most abundant,*) the *horse* engraved was not meant to be *the horse sacred to the Roman Mars*. Mr. B.'s mere positive re-assertion against this view of it,² without any supporting argument or evidence, is of course valueless.

While at Rome last winter³ I took the opportunity of consulting two antiquaries there, well known for their knowledge in numismatics; I mean the *Cavaliere Visconti*, (a gentleman who then held high office in the Antiquarian Department under the Papal Government,) and *Signor Capranesi*. Alike the one and the other expressed to me their persuasion that this class of coins was to be regarded as *Roman* in character, even though struck (if so it was) in Campania: and the latter gave me a Dissertation of his own in which the subject is alluded to, and in which he takes for granted, as a thing known and admitted, that the *horse* is the horse of the *Roman Mars*.⁴—Signor Capranesi also referred me to a Treatise of the learned Jesuit Fathers *Marchi* and *Tessieri*, of the Kircherian Museum, on 'the early Italian

¹ Indeed Mr. Barker affirms that, in order to answer my purpose, the horse ought not merely to be on Roman medals "*as a symbol,*" (i. e. "of the Roman empire,") but moreover to be on them "*everywhere.*"*—In illustration of his meaning in the former of these two requirements, that of being on the coins *as a symbol*, he says; "We should recognise the coins of *Rome* by their *horse*, as we do the coins of *Peloponnesus* by their *tortoise*." But 1st, I am not aware that *any* coins of Peloponnesus were stamped with a *tortoise*. Those so stamped, and with the letters AIFI, once ascribed to Ægium in Achaia, are now recognised as coins of Ægina, an island *not* Peloponnesian; in which island they abound, or at least used to do, as I knew from personal experience.† It was only from their large circulation in the Peloponnesus, that they were sometimes loosely spoken of as Peloponnesian. There never, I believe, was any *common* medal of the Peloponnesus as a whole.—2ndly, as regards the various really Peloponnesian types, such as the *pegasus* of Corinth, the *eagle's head* of Elis, the *wolf* of Argos, &c., they are no otherwise symbols of the cities, than as referring to some legendary story connected with their early history or religion; precisely as the *horse* in the coins under discussion (according to Eckhel and the rest) referred to the supposed origin from, and worship of, Mars at Rome.—As to Mr. B.'s second requirement of the *everywhere*, where will he find *any* numismatic device of *any* people of which this could be predicated? Certainly not of the Persian *ram*, the Macedonian *goat*, or the Roman *eagle*; all which however are used as types of those nations in the Holy Scriptures.

² "The coins in question were not Roman." Churchman's Monthly Rev. p. 719.

³ This was written in 1849.

⁴ "Le monete de' Romani di argento e bronzo, anche con la scritta *Romano o Roma*, portano alcune la testa di *Marte*, ed il busto di *cavallo* nel reverso." Monete Antiche Illustrate da Francesco Capranesi, p. 4.

* Monthly Churchman, p. 720.

† See Mionnet on *Ægina*.—In Eckhel's time this class of medals were not so well known as they are now.

coins of this class; and another on the same subject, of a little later date, by *Signor Gennarelli*.—In the *former* (entitled *Æs Grave del Museo Kircheriano, ovvero Le Monete Piu Antiche de' Popoli dell' Italia Media*, Roma 1839) there are given (Plate xii.) the selfsame two coins that are engraved in the *Horæ*; I mean with the *Mars* bearded or beardless, the *horse* or *horse's head*, and inscription of *Roma* or *Romano*. And in the comment it is stated, at p. 70, that they were engraved under the direction of those learned antiquaries, with the express object of vindicating them, not only as *Roman* coins, but coins expressly *of the mint at Rome*; (“non per altra ragione, se non per rivendicarne il pieno diritto *alle officine urbane di Roma*.”) Then, alluding to Eckhel's opinion that from their magnificent workmanship their local origin might be probably in Campania or Lucania, [districts where the chief population was of Greek colonists,] it refers to other medals of similar beauty of fabric, and at the same time of unquestionable Roman types, e. g. the *Hercules' head* and *ship's prow*;¹ states that some of the most ancient Roman denarii are also of excellent workmanship; and infers that it would thus seem that Rome early availed herself of the skill of foreign artists.—So write the Jesuit fathers of the Kircherian Museum.—In the other Dissertation of *Dr. Achille Gennarelli* on the *Moneta Primitiva dell Italia Antica*, Rome 1843, (a Dissertation crowned by the Pontifical Academy of Archæology,) the subject is noticed at p. 33. And there, —having stated, as the four grounds on which some would refer this class of coins to *Campania*, 1st, that the coins come chiefly from Campania; 2. that the beauty of the workmanship is unsuited to the rude civilization of Latium; 3. that there is the Campanian termination in many of the *no* (*Romano, Aisernino, &c.*); 4. the correspondence of the types with those of coins that were certainly Campanian,—he then proceeds to answer all.—Thus, as to the 1st point, he replies that the coins do *not* come exclusively from Campania, but are *much more frequently* found in “*our*” [i. e. the Roman and Latin] districts than Campania: so that, as all coin-sellers know, *they are of less value at Rome than at Naples*.² 2. The arts flourished

¹ I have myself various coins of this class, of unquestioned Roman type, which I bought while at Rome.

² I beg the reader's particular attention to this point, as decisively negating one chief ground on which Eckhel grounds his anti-Roman judgment. Eckhel was under the disadvantage of writing at Vienna, not Rome; and moreover at a time when much less was known about this class of medals than is known now.

in Latium, at least as much as in Campania; a point which the author prepares to establish in his Dissertation. 3. The *no* termination is not exclusively Campanian: but, as the Cav. Avellino has shown, exists alike in the medals of the Umbrians, *Latins*, Samnites, Campanians, and Lucanians. [As to the types, 4thly, many, as observed before, are unquestionably *Roman*.]—On the whole, the writer considers that the Jesuit Padre Marchi was wrong in excluding *all* from a Campanian origin, that have the inscription *Roma* or *Romano*; seeing that there are *some* with both that, and also a *Neapolitan* inscription. But the larger number he seems to consider as of Roman or Latian origin; in general agreement with the Jesuit fathers.

✻ Let me add that *Millingen* too, in his Work on the *Numismatique de l'Ancienne Italie*, suggests that these coins may have been struck in part by *Roman Consuls*, or *Roman Quæstors*, for the use of the armies stationed in the Samnite or Campanian districts.

So that every authority tends to establish for my engraved coins a *Roman* reference, whether struck at Rome, or elsewhere; and to justify my original insertion of them as coins stamped with the *Roman horse*, sacred to the *Roman Mars*.¹

§ 3.—MEDALLIC ILLUSTRATION OF NERVA'S CRÉTENSIC ORIGIN.

(See Page 146.)

IN the Plate opposite I give a silver Roman coin of Nerva, which bears on its reverse the type of *the huntress Diana* with her quiver

¹ Since writing this I have read the remarks of Sign. Riccio on the subject of this Paper, in his Book on the "Monete delle Antiche Famiglie di Roma," pp. 264—268; 2nd Ed. Naples, 1843; i. e. the same year as Gennarelli's publication, though a little later in the year. And I see nothing in them to alter my conclusions exprest about the medals in it.

Riccio unites with Eckhel, Millingen, and other numismatists, in judging the district of their coinage to have been Campania; but Campania *after its subjugation by the Romans* (p. 264), and when consequently the coinage there was in the hands of Roman authorities. Further he considers the type of the horse to have been originally Campanian; doubting the Jesuit fathers' correctness (265) in ascribing the *asses* with similar type to Rome. But Riccio offers no case of Campanian medals with the united types of *Mars* on one side, and the *horse*, or *horse's bust*, on the other. Nor does he state any objection to Eckhel's explanation of the Roman coiners' reference, *in this new combination of the types*, to the Roman horse-games and horse-sacrifices at Rome to Mars; which is all that my illustrative use of the coins requires.—In Riccio's Tables, as in those of other numismatists, the type of *Rome helmeted* on one side, and *Mars driving his horse-biga* or *quadriga* on the other, are very common.

The judgments of Signors Visconti and Capranesi as to the *Roman* character of the coins, noticed at p. 586, were exprest to me in 1848 in perfect cognizance of Sig. Riccio's Book.

NERVA'S ROMAN COIN OF THE HUNTRESS DIANA.



From a coin in the British Museum

and bow. Vaillant, seeing that this was an unusual type on Roman money, explains it by reference to Nerva's *Cretensic* origin; Diana having been an object of specially devoted worship with the inhabitants of Crete. Eckhel, in his Vol. vi. p. 404, thus objects to this, after description of the coin:—

{ IMP. NERVA CÆS. AUG. PONT. MAX. TR. P. Caput laureatum.
 { COS. II. DESIG. III. P. P. Diana venatrix gradiens, d. sagittam ex pharetrâ
 promit, comite cane.

“Observat Vaillantius hunc aversæ typum in monetâ Romanâ insolentem esse. Censet igitur, cum Nervam ex Cretâ oriundum dicat Victor, Diana autem singulari in hâc insulâ religione coleretur, propterea eam huic denario insertam. At dixi suprâ non satis unius Victoris testimonio Cretense Nervæ genus probatum. Cæterùm similis Dianæ typus frequens est in numis Augusti, quem ibi ad Siciliam referendum diximus.” He had just before (p. 403) grounded his rejection of Aurelius Victor's statement as to Nerva's Cretensic origin, and his preference of the younger Victor's intimation that he was born at Narni in Umbria, on Dion Cassius' authoritative declaration that Trajan was the first foreigner (*αλλοεθνής*) that held the Roman emperorship.

But in reality there is nothing whatever contrary in the younger Victor's statement to that of Aurelius Victor; for the latter may be considered as speaking of his family origin, the former of his birth-place:—a view this taken by the writer in the *Ancient Universal History*, cited ad loc. by me: “Nerva was a native of Narni in Umbria, but his family came originally from the island of Crete;” as well as by Tillemont, and the writer (also cited by me p. 146) in the *Encyclopædia Metropolitana*. And, as to Dion Cassius, his words, as I there stated, are strongly confirmatory of Aurelius Victor's statement, not contradictory. For he shows his own meaning about Trajan by contra-distinguishing his foreign extraction, not merely from that of the *Itali*, or persons of original Italian extraction, but also from that of *Italiotæ*, or persons of Greck extraction Italicized by settlement in Italy. Precisely of which latter class Nerva was, according to the combined testimonies of the two Victors; and *Nerva alone of all the Emperors preceding Trajan*. So that, were we to set aside Aurelius Victor's statement, and suppose Nerva, like all his predecessors in the empire, to have been of original Italian extraction, Dion Cassius's introduction of the *Italiotæ*, as well as of the

Itali, in contra-distinction to Trajan's wholly foreign origin and birth, would be so utterly without point or object as to be little better than absurd.

Which premised let us consider, on Eckhel's own accurate principles of investigation and judgment as applied to medals, whether his or Vaillant's view of the medal now in question be the more probably correct.

Says Vaillant, as the groundwork of his argument, "*The huntress Diana* is an unusual device on Roman money." (On *Roman money*, the reader will observe, or money struck at Rome, as this is; not coins struck in the *Greek* provinces under the Emperors; which is quite another thing, and of another argument.)¹ Eckhel denies not Vaillant's statement of the type, as a Roman type, being unusual. But, says he, "the same type appears frequently on the coins of *Augustus*;" as if this were a sufficient precedent, and sufficient reason, for its appearing on Nerva's.—But was there then nothing peculiar in Augustus' case, with reference to this monetary device; nothing but what might attach to succeeding Emperors, in their simple character of Roman Emperors, as well as to him? Eckhel himself tells us quite the contrary; and indeed some of Augustus' own medals that have the Diana on them, tell the same also quite as clearly. Augustus' high fortune and attainment of the empire arose chiefly, Eckhel justly observes, out of his two great naval victories: the one over Antony, at *Actium* in Epirus; the other over Sext. Pompey, off *Artemisium* in Sicily. Now at Actium there was a temple of *Apollo*; at Artemisium, or Dianium, as it is in Latin, one of *Diana*. To these deities then Augustus ascribed his fortune. And, in expression and commemoration of it, he struck frequent medals, of

¹ For, of course, certain types might be natural and proper to the coinage of foreign provincial cities, whether by reference to the productions of the soil, or the religious worship of the country, which might be strange, except for some special justifying cause, on a Roman coin. A *palm-tree* might be natural on a Syrian or African provincial coin; an *elephant* on an Asiatic; a *crocodile* on an Egyptian. But, if seen on an emperor's Roman coinage, the question must arise as to what particular cause might have originated it. And history generally explains the particular reason; as in the elephant coins of Julius Cæsar, the palm-trees of Vespasian and Titus, the crocodiles of Augustus or Hadrian.—Similarly, in regard of types betokening the religious worship. A Diana was a natural and common type on an Ephesian or a Cretan coin, considering the Dianic worship predominating there. But it was not a common Roman type; except in that form in the *bigati*, under which most of the chief gods of Rome were from ancient times stamped on the Roman coinage, Diana as well as the rest. See p. 571 *suprà*.

many successive years: some inscribed *Act. Imp.* with the type of *Apollo of Actium*; others with *Diana's bust*, or *Diana as a huntress*, and a reference to *Artemisium*. There seem to be two chief varieties of the latter or *Dianian* class, which are described thus by Eckhel:¹—

1. { Protome Dianæ.
{ *Imp. Cæsar.*—Templum, intrâ templum trophæum navale, triquetra.
2. { *Aug. Div. F.*—Caput nudum.
{ *Sicil. Imp. viii.*—Diana stolata gradiens d. telum ex pharetrâ promit, s. arcum.

Now it is to be understood that the *triquetra*, or three-legged figure, in the former medal of the two, is the well-known symbol of the triangularly-shaped Sicily; while in the latter the name *Sicil.* occurs. Thus the reader sees that the reasons of Augustus' striking medals with the type of Diana are indicated on the medals themselves, as distinctly those which affected him individually and alone; and which consequently could in no wise have suggested the type to Nerva. The reasonable inference is that Nerva must have had some peculiar individual reason for striking *his* coins with the Diana, as Augustus had for striking *his*: the rather if, as I believe, the Diana Venatrix does not appear on any *Roman* money of the ten intervening emperors; save and except, perhaps, on a brass coin of Domitian,² who celebrated the Ludi Seculares in her honour. Which brass coin was of the Senate's striking, not the Emperor's; a difference notable in the view of numismatists:³ whereas Nerva's was a silver coin, struck under his more personal direction.

And I am led to regard this inference as yet the more strongly probable, from observing that in the Roman *Republican* coins too this precise type of *Diana as huntress* seems unknown.⁴ And indeed

¹ Vol. vi. pp. 85, 93.

² Mionnet alone gives this of *Domitian*. *Medailles Rom.* i. 169. Eckhel, Gessner, Morell, I think, give none. I observe in Patinus, p. 151, a coin of *Titus* with Diana and a bow, which some I believe have considered Roman. But it is without any name of a people. And Patinus suggests that it was probably struck either at *Ephesus* or in *Crete*, as being the two chief Eastern localities most famed for Diana's worship.

Mr. Barker, disputing my above-made statement, mentioned various Imperial Dianic coins of intervening emperors. But, on examination, they proved *every one* to be *provincial* coins; whether of Ephesus, Colophon, Crete, or Patras; the latter being stamped with the *Laphræan* Diana, whose temple there was famous. See Pausanias.

³ "Confer cum his (sc. the imperial gold and silver coinage, the types on one of which were generally repeated by the same emperor in the other) monetam æneam sub primis imperatoribus signatam, quàm enorme utrinque discrimen, nullis certe aut nonnisi raris communibus typis:" i. e. no common types with the contemporary gold or silver coinage. Eckhel i. lxxiv. On the Senate's superintendence of the brass coinage, see my p. 573 *suprà*.

⁴ I still go on Eckhel's authority.

where *other* types of Diana occur, Eckhel almost always seeks a particular reason for the type; and generally finds it. Thus in coins of the *Æmilia gens*, struck by the Quæstor Buca, we have, "Diana, adstante Victoriâ, ad virum humi dormientem descendit."¹ And we find that this Buca was Quæstor to Sylla: and that the story was current of a goddess having appeared in a dream to Sylla, whether *Luna* (one of *Diana's* names), or *Minerva*, or *Bellona*; bidding him strike his enemies, and presenting him with a thunderbolt. Which same explanation applies also to coins of the *Cornelia gens*, struck by Sylla himself, with three different types of Diana;² one very similar to that just described.³—In a coin of the *Caninia gens*, where there appears on one side Diana's bust, with the quiver and bow, on the other a dog running, Eckhel reasonably supposes an allusion in the dog (*canis*) to the name *Caninia*: and that the Diana is added as the dog's natural companion.⁴—In a coin of the *Plancia gens* we have on one side a woman's head, with a pileus; on the other a mountain-goat, and by it a bow and quiver. And Eckhel expresses himself delighted with Visconti's solution: who, explaining the woman as Diana, (an explanation obvious from the mountain-goat, bow, and quiver on the reverse,) refers in illustration to an old marble, on which there is mention made "*Dianæ Plancianæ*," of the *Plancian Diana*: whence, says he, we may infer that there was the private worship of Diana in the houses of the *Plancii*.⁵—In one coin of the *Postumia gens* there is the head of Diana, and on the reverse a man in the toga on a hill sacrificing a bull, the inscription bearing the name of A. Postumius Albinus: while another coin of the same family has the head of Diana, and a dog running. And these are explained from Livy's statement that A. Postumius Albinus was made Decemvir for the purpose of celebrating sacred rites; which probably, says Eckhel, were the *Ludi Seculares*, in honour of Apollo and Diana.⁶—The same *Ludi Seculares* furnish the explanation given by Spanheim, as Eckhel tells us, of a medal of the *Claudia gens*, struck by P. Clodius, with Diana holding a torch in either hand: while in another medal, struck also by P. Clodius, we have the Sun radiated on one side, the Moon among stars on the other; which Sun

¹ Eckhel v. 121.² *Ib.* pp. 192, 194.³ { Caput Veneris, juxta globus.

| Vir humi decumbens; adsistentibus Dianâ, et Victoriâ palmæ ramum tenente.

⁴ *Ib.* 162.⁵ *Ib.* 275.⁶ *Ib.* 288.

and Moon are but other names and figures of Apollo and Diana.¹ Eckhel himself offers the alternative of a reference to the private family religion of the Claudian gens; another coin of which also presents Diana's head, with the accompaniment of a quiver and bow. And he further suggests these alternative explanations of the *Ludi Seculares*, or a Dianian private family religion, in explanation of a coin of the *Aquillia gens*; where the radiated Sun appears on one side of a coin, and Diana in her biga on the reverse.²—These medals, together with two of a probably Sicilian reference, and two curious coins of the *Mamilian* and the *Hostilian gens* respectively, in which the Diana seems to refer to something in the histories of Ulysses and King Hostilius, the reputed ancestors of the two families,³ make up the whole, I believe, of the Republican coins on which Diana is stamped; save and except three or four on which she appears in the *biga*;⁴ that common ancient type, in connexion with Rome's various gods and goddesses, whence the old coins were often called *bigati*.⁵ Thus, in almost all, we see, some particular explanation of a Dianian type is suggested and illustrated by Eckhel.

What then, on the whole, the probable and fair conclusion respecting the device of *Diana the huntress* on Nerva's coin, but that Nerva had some particular individual reason, as I before said, for choosing it? And what a more natural or satisfactory reason than that suggested by Tristanus and Vaillant from *Nerva's Cretensic original*, and consequent *Dianian* family religion: seeing that Diana was a goddess worshipped with special devotion in most of the cities of that island, as their several coins still abundantly testify;⁶ while on certain coins of the *Κοινὸν Κρητῶν*, or Cretan community under the Emperors, as will have been already seen, there is just a similar type to that on Nerva's; viz. of Diana as the huntress, with her quiver and her bow?⁷

¹ Ib. 172.² Ib. 141.³ Ib. 226, 242.⁴ Viz. in the coins of the *Azian*, *Flavian*, and *Furian* Gentes; noted by Eckhel, pp. 148, 213, 222.⁵ Noted by Tacitus, *De Mor. Germ.* 5; "Pecuniam probant veterem, et diu notam, serratos bigatosque." Also by Pliny and Livy. See Eckhel, v. 19, 111.⁶ Ovid in his *Fasti*, iii. 90, thus notices together *Mars* as the chief *Roman* tutelary God, *Diana* as the chief *Cretan*:—

Et tamen ante omnes *Martem* coluere priores,
 Hoc dederat studiis bellia turba suis.
 Pallada *Cecropidæ*, *Minoia Creta Dianam*; . . .
Mars Latio venerandus erat.

⁷ See my engraving.—Let me add that Vaillant gives another coin of Nerva, which he thinks to have a Cretan bearing; and which he thus describes:—

For as to the idea of Nerva's having chosen the type from any special connexion with Sicily, Ephesus, or any other place, Crete alone excepted, where Diana's worship peculiarly prevailed, it seems out of the question. Nor, we know, did it fall to his lot, as to Domitian's, to celebrate the rare and slowly returning *Ludi Seculares*.—A conclusion this which seems not a little corroborated by the frequent recurrence of the same Dianic type after Nerva under the reign of his sons by adoption, Trajan, Hadrian, and the two Antonines.¹

§ 4.—ON THE *Διλειτρον*, OR BILIBRA, OF ALEXANDER SEVERUS.

(See page 184.)

I PROPOSE here to give an abstract of Padre Secchi's very ingenious and conclusive argument, in proof that the ancient 2lb. weight given in my Plate at p. 184 was a weight made, and sent to its destination, under the reign of *Alexander Severus*. Ere entering on it I must beg my readers to remember Mæcenas' advice to Augustus; an advice gradually more and more acted on both by himself and by his successors, that throughout the Roman empire no other *measures* and *weights* (as well as no other *coined money*) should be used, but the Roman only.²

The antiquity and genuineness of the weight as an old Roman weight is undisputed and indisputable. 1. there is the evidence of its being of the same form as three other old Roman weights; one of which is stamped, very similarly to the one under consideration, with the words *τριβγκιον Ιταλικον*:—2. there is the palæography of the inscription:—3. it is hard incrustated with "serpole marine;" showing that it must have been long immersed in the sea. Thus the only question is as to its *date* under the emperors.

And on this point there are *three* several indicative characteristics, all converging to show that it was a weight made under the Emperor Alexander Severus.

{ *Αυτοκρ. Νερους.*
{ *Ελευθ. Δημον.* *Mulier stolata* (sc. *Libertas*.)

It is doubtful who were the people here noted as enfranchised by Nerva: but Vaillant thinks some people of Crete.

¹ Trajan's seems to have been struck at the beginning of his reign. Eckhel vi. 443.

² See p. 574.

1. On considering the palæography of the capital letters in the inscription there appears a peculiarity in four of them; viz. the small *o*, the small *ω*, the diphthong *ε*, and the \square for sigma. Now, of these (not to speak of the small *o*, which is less distinctive) the small *ω* is noted by Eckhel as “forma non admodum vetusta, *serius* in¹ numis obvia.”¹ As regards the \square , which is a character that stands sometimes for the Digamma, and sometimes for K, as well as for Σ, yet wherever other characters are used for K, so as here, and there can be no admissibility of a Digamma, which is the case here also, then it must necessarily stand for Σ. So taking it, the time when, and during which, it was so used in Magna Græcia is thus defined by Eckhel; “Obvium in numis inferioris ævi ad usque Valeriani tempora;”² in which period, we must observe, the reign of Alex. Severus is included.—Further, by the *ε* the date is more nearly fixed to the actual time of his reign. For it is first seen on medals of Sept. Severus, beginning with the close of the 2nd century; and is much more usual on the imperial medals of the 3rd century; especially on those of Elagabalus and Alex. Severus. So Montfaucon;³ and Eckhel gives a coin of that date, which adds its confirmation.⁴ Hence, on the whole, the date seems to be probably fixed by these palæographic indications to an epoch somewhere between Sept. Severus and Valerian; i. e. between about A.D. 200 and A.D. 260; in the middle of which term falls the reign of Alex. Severus.

2. We have the indication of the ΕΤΟΥΣ · ΔΙ of the inscription.—It is to be observed that, though the existing mark between the Δ and the Ι is nearly effaced, yet as the interval is too small for a letter, it therefore can only be a point; so as pretty much of itself to show that the ΔΙ must be taken as a numeral; an explanation of it which is confirmed by the mark — above. Thus, numerally construed, Δ·Ι = 14, the mark evidently, as connected with the word *ετους*, or *year*, of the date. And, as it was inscribed on a government public standard weight, this must have been by noting the year of the tribunician power of the then reigning Augustus, or

¹ Prolegom. i. civ.

² Eckhel Prolegom. i. cii.

³ Palæograph. Græc. § ix., and L. ii. 7, p. 175.

⁴ iv. 233. It is a coin of the Mæsiæ Marcianopolis, with the inscription, ‘ΗΓΥΜΕΝΗ ΤΕΡΕΒΕΝΤΙΝΟΥ: struck, says Eckhel, “sub Caracallâ et Alexandro Severo.” I suppose it was repeated under the latter emperor; the same Roman Præses, Terebentinus, still continuing in the Mæsiæ government.

Emperor;¹ though here, as in sundry other ancient authorized weights or measures, for public use, the name of the actual Emperor is wanting.

To supply this want, however, and show the particular emperor reigning, there is, 3rdly, the indication of the name of one *Julius Klatius Severus* as consul that year; meaning by consul the *ordinary* consul, not the surrogate,² forasmuch as in the 3rd century the *ordinary* consul was alone noted, not the *surrogate*, to mark the year. Now in the interval between Sept. Severus and Valerian there was no consul bearing the name *Severus* but one that was colleague to Quintianus, in the year of whose consulship the Emperor *Alex. Severus* is known to have died. And that year was precisely the 14th year of *his* tribunician power.³

Thus, in fine, we are led to conclude on Alex. Severus as the specific emperor in whose reign the weight was made. The two last indications taken together will appear the more decisive and satisfactory, from the fact that of all the Roman emperors from Octavian Augustus to Diocletian there were but twelve who enjoyed a 14th year of tribunician power, viz. Octavian, Tiberius, Claudius, Nero, Domitian, Trajan, Hadrian, the first and second Antonine, S. Severus, A. Severus, and Gallienus; and in the 14th tribunician year of not

¹ See Eckhel's Dissertation, beginning viii. 391, on the *Tribunicia Potestas* of the emperors. Augustus, he observes, obtained from the Senate that he should have the *tribunicia potestas* for a continuance: not the actual office; which was nominally assigned to others, down perhaps to Constantine's time, and involved restrictions that would have been to an emperor altogether inconvenient. Whence arose the custom of its being assigned each year ever afterwards to the reigning emperor; and, as Dio Cass. observes (liii. 17), the year was marked by the numeral indicating how many times he had had this power renewed to him: *Την δὴ δύναμιν τὴν τῶν δημαρχῶν πασαν ὅση περ τα μαλιεα ἐγενετο προστιθενται' καὶ δι' αὐτῆς καὶ ἡ ἐξαρῖθμησις τῶν ἐτῶν τῆς ἀρχῆς αὐτῶν, ὡς καὶ κατ' ἐτος αὐτὴν . . λαμβανούτων, προβαίνει.* It would seem that from Augustus to Antoninus Pius the tribun. potest. of the emperors was dated from the day on which it was received; from Antoninus Pius to Gallienus from 1st January.

² i. e. One who might be appointed in place of the ordinary consul, in case of his dying in the year of his consulship.

³ There has been some difference of statement among the ancient writers as to the exact time that A. Severus reigned; and hence some controversy as to the year of his reign in which he died among moderns. But Clinton in his *Fasti Rom.* states the time in accordance with Secchi. Thus, A. D. 222, Feb. 3, Elagabalus was slain, and A. Severus declared emperor. This therefore was the first year of his *Tribunician* power, to which coins still extant witness. A. D. 223 was (as coins also attest) the 2nd year of his Trib. power, dating from Jan. 1. (See Note ¹ *suprà*.) And so A. D. 235 was the 14th year, still dating from Jan. 1. It seems to have been about Feb. 10 that he was slain; Severus and Quintianus, as Clinton has it, being Consuls.

one of these, save only of Alex. Severus, was there any one named *Severus* as the ordinary consul.

To the above, which has reference to the only point of importance in the inscription bearing on my Apocalyptic exposition, it may be interesting perhaps to the reader if I add a remark or two in elucidation of two other points in it which may seem to need elucidation.

1. As regards the *αγορανομος* specified, one *Mnestheus*, there would seem to have been something a little unusual in the specification, judging from such ancient Roman standard weights and measures as remain to us. On these, under *the Republic*, there was generally inscribed the name of a Consul or Quæstor: under the *Empire* that of the Emperor, either alone, or united with the name of the Consul. So on a *Congius* of Vespasian, of which there is a copy¹ in the Kircherian Museum, and on a *Balance* in the Neapolitan Museum.

Or, yet more generally, the Emperor's name is united with the name of one of the Præfects of the Roman city. Of this last-mentioned class there are six in the Kircherian Museum with the inscription, "*Ex Auctoritate Q. Junii Rustici Præf. Urb.*" Of the specification of the Ædile's name there is no other example than the one here spoken of. The mention of it however may be probably explained by what Lampridius reports of an arrangement of Alex. Severus. While assigning to the *Senate* the duty of appointing the *City Præfects*, he himself appointed (as I have just hinted in a Note at p. 184) fourteen "curatores urbis," from among men of Consular rank, whose business it would be to hear causes connected with city business (*urbana negotia*) in association with the Præfect of the City. It is Secchi's opinion that the *Mnestheus* of our weight was one of these fourteen. There can be no objection to this idea from the circumstance of the inscription being in *Greek*; because in Alex. Severus' time there were many Greek officials, and much use of the Greek language, in *Rome*.

2. With regard to the notice of this weight as a *Διλειτρον Ιταλικον*, it will be observed that the noun *Διλειτρον* is on the one side, the adjective *Ιταλικον* on the other. That they agree together is obvious. And it is to be understood that it is by no means uncommon thus to have the complement on the *reverse* of coins, and other

¹ "Una copia," p. 23; whether in drawing only, or an actual weight in facsimile, Secchi says not.

such ancient monuments, of words used on the *obverse*. Such is Eckhel's statement.¹

The *Λειτρον* is the archaic orthography for *Λιτρον* = the Roman *libra*. As to *Ιταλικον* it was the appellation always given by Greeks to *Roman* weights and measures. So *τριωγκιον Ιταλικον*, stamped (as before mentioned) on another extant weight, and many others.²— That the weight is a public standard weight appears, 1st, from the inscription; 2ndly, from its material, resisting oxydization as it does, like other Roman standard weights; 3rdly, from its square and flat form, in which respect it differs from other weights, whether of metal or marble.

¹ Secchi, p. 25.

² e. g. *Ιταλικη λιτρα*, *Ιταλικη μνα*, *μοδιος Ιταλικος*, and so on; *Ib.* 27; all, says Secchi, in the sense of *Roman*. E. g. in *Cleopatra's Cosmetics*; p. 163 *suprà*.

APPENDIX.

No. IV.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS TO CERTAIN OF MY EXPLANATIONS ON VARIOUS POINTS IN THIS VOLUME.

§ 1. ON THE CONTINUED PRESSURE OF THE AGGRAVATED TAXATION ON THE PROVINCIALS OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE UNDER ALEXANDER SEVERUS, AND AFTER HIM.

(See page 173.)¹

It is Gibbon's statement,² as from Lampridius, and has been urged against my solution of the third Seal by Dr. Keith, that Alexander Severus reduced the tributes (that is *the more proper provincial tributes*) to a *thirtieth part* of the sum exacted at the time of his accession. Referring to the original in Lampridius,³ we find it to the effect, as will be seen, that Alexander reduced the public *vectigalia* so far, that he who paid *ten aurei* under Elagabalus now paid only *one third of an aureus*: also that, in order to facilitate the payments on this reduced rate into the exchequer, he first coined *half-aurei*; then, as the *vectigal* was further reduced, coins equivalent to a *third of an aureus*.⁴ On this passage Salmasius expresses his conviction that in the word *vectigalia* the provincial *tributa* were meant: "Dicit

¹ This Paper is taken from the *Vindiciæ Horariæ*.

² Gibbon i. 268.

³ "Vectigalia publica in id contraxit, ut qui decem aureos sub Heliogabalo præstiterant tertiam partem aurei præstarent, hoc est tricesimam partem. Tuncque primum semisses aureorum formati sunt; tunc etiam, cum ad tertiam aurei partem vectigal decidisset, tremisses." ch. 39.—The value of the *aureus* at this time was not very different from that of a gold Napoleon: a pound of gold (the equivalent to £40 sterling, says Gibbon, iii. 89) being coined under Alex. Severus into 48 aurei. (Under the Constantines, and through the 4th century, it was coined into 72 aurei.) So Salmasius. Of this gold coinage the purity was always kept up; even during the times of greatest adulteration of the silver, in this third century. It was in it that the tributes had always to be paid. Gibb. iii. 86.

⁴ This, judging especially from the context that follows, seems to me pretty evidently to be the meaning of Lampridius. Salmasius, overlooking it, would change the *semisses* into *tremisses*. Eckhel, vii. 279, refers on the subject to Dupuis in the *Memoires des B. L.* vol. xxviii. p. 683, as throwing light on it.

Lampridius Alexandrum vectigalia publica in id contraxisse, ut *provinciales*, qui decem aureos sub Heliogabalo præstiterant, tertiam tantum aurei partem præstarent." "*Vectigalia* hic pro *tributis* accepisse Lampridium sum certus." And on this opinion of Salmasius Gibbon's statement seems to be *wholly* founded. In my judgment however it is palpably and altogether an erroneous one. I proceed to state my reasons.

For, in the 1st place, let it be observed, this is not the proper meaning of *vectigalia*. So Salmasius himself fully allows. *Tributa*, says he, is the more proper expression for the *land-tax* and *capitation-tax* paid by the provincials; (the former paid in money or kind;) *vectigalia* for the *custom-duties* paid on imports or exports. The distinction indeed, as he adds, was not always observed. But why the word should be here taken in its less proper and more unusual sense, and one different too from that which Lampridius himself seems elsewhere to attach to it,¹ neither Salmasius nor Gibbon explains to us.²

2. The reduction of tax, if so understood as by Salmasius and Gibbon, would have been to an extent that seems to me utterly incredible. For let my readers only consider the vast amount of the provincial tribute, as elsewhere estimated by Gibbon. He tells us that it could seldom be less than from fifteen to twenty millions sterling.³ Now is it conceivable that Alexander Severus should at one fell swoop have all but sacrificed this fifteen or twenty millions of revenue; preserving nothing more of it than the trifling remnant of some £600,000 or £700,000: it being remembered that the grand expense of the army remained the same under him as under Caracalla himself; (for Macrinus' intended plan of reduction had proved abortive;)⁴ and consequently that the chief subjects for reduction of state expenditure must have been those only of what we might call the civil list? ⁵

¹ Ch. 24; "*Vectigal* pulcherrimum instituit;" viz. one on workers of metal-plates, (reading *bracteariorum* with Scaliger,) glass, skins, waggons, &c.; where the word must mean either a custom-duty on the wares, or license-tax on the workers: also c. 64, and elsewhere.

² Indeed Salmasius in fine admits of the word being here taken, if persons so prefer, in its other and more proper sense; "*Sive de tributis hunc locum accipiamus, sive de vectigalibus.*" ³ i. 260.

⁴ I do not forget the fact of the provincials having now the Roman citizens' taxes to pay. But so it was under Elagabalus, with the proper provincial taxes besides. Therefore I think it insufficient to justify Salmasius' theory, on this head of objection.

⁵ e. g. Lampridius tells us that A. Severus bound himself by oath to have no one adscriptum of the vacantes, "ne annonis Remp. gravaret: dicens malum pupillum esse Imperatorem qui ex visceribus provincialium homines non necessarios, nec Reip. utiles, pasceret." ch. 15. So again, c. 41, that he had as many only in office in the palace "quot necessitas postulare."

3. As regards the supposed particular application of the immense reduction spoken of to the *land-tax*, it is to be further borne in mind that Alexander Severus' abundant supplies of *provisions* for the troops, and also for the citizens, is a matter quite prominent in Lampridius' history; while the palace too retained its share. We find express mention made of his public granaries, established and well-stored in all the various parts of the empire.¹ "Am not I he," was his language to the mutinying troops at Antioch, "who bestow on you the *corn*, the clothing, and the money of the provinces?"² Now then, does it seem consistent with such conduct that this should have been the particular branch of revenue all but sacrificed by him? —4. Not a word of this extraordinary and immense reduction of the provincial taxation is mentioned either by Dion Cassius or Herodian: though in the former's brief concluding notice of Alexander Severus' reign,³ there might seem to have been the exact occasion for stating it; I mean when he tells of that emperor's minister Ulpian rectifying many of the evil measures of Elagabalus's administration.⁴ Instead of this he proceeds next to speak of Mammæa's avarice, and collecting money from all quarters.—5. If Lampridius' statement were true, in the sense attached to it by Salmasius and Gibbon, there must then have been coined, and scattered *over all the provinces*, a vast profusion of the half and third aurei pieces, connected with the fiscal reduction; seeing that this fiscal reduction, and new coinage, (if the passage be so understood,) must have applied to all the provincials of the empire. Yet not a vestige of the said coinage is to be found.⁵—6. There is the inconsistency arising out of the two combined facts which all the historians unite in stating; *first* of Mammæa, Alexander Severus' mother's ascendancy over

¹ C. 39; "Horrea in omnibus regionibus publica fecit." To which horrea, it is added, those who had no safe custodia of their own might bring their goods.

² Gibbon i. 252. So Lampridius c. 53; "cum qui acceptam à provincialibus annonam, qui vestem, qui stipendia vobis attribuit." In c. 15 it is mentioned how, generally speaking, "annonam militum diligenter inspexit:" in c. 45, 47 how depôts were provided on their marching expeditions. Of the citizens at Rome we read c. 21; "Commeatum Populi Romani sic adjuvit, ut cum frumenta Heliogabalus evertisset, vicem de propriâ pecuniâ loco suo reponeret:" again 22; "oleum, quod Severus populo dederat, quodque Heliogabalus imminuerat, turpissimis hominibus prefecturam annonæ tribuendo, integrum restituit." (So 24 about *oil* for the baths; particularly the baths of Caracalla, which were finished by him.) Again 26; "Congiarium populo ter dedit, donativum militibus ter; *carnem* populo addidit."

³ Though Dion Cassius' history breaks off at this point, yet he seems to have survived, as Niebuhr states, to the reign of Maximus and Balbinus.

⁴ lxxx. 2. The inferior authority of the biographies of the Augustan History to that of Dion or Herodian is well known.

⁵ So Eckhel, vii. 279.

him, insomuch that his reign was almost like her regency; ¹ *secondly* of her covetousness: ² a covetousness which is noted as one of the chief drawbacks to the good of Alexander Severus' reign; and to which probably we are to ascribe the new taxes which Lampridius himself tells us of as a thing objected to him. ³ The inconsistency is noted by Niebuhr. ⁴ After mentioning Alexander's weakness in this subjection to his mother, insomuch that "his government was in reality the regency of Mammæa," he goes on thus to express his opinion on the subject that we have been discussing:—"On the one hand we read of a great reduction of the taxes; while on the other hand, we hear of great complaints of his mother's avarice; which are contradictory things."⁵

On all these grounds, grounds which I trust will be acknowledged to be abundantly strong and convincing, I conclude that Salmasius' explanation of the *vectigalia* that were reduced almost to extinction by Alexander Severus, as if meant in the *improper* sense of the word, with reference to *provincial-tributes*, is incorrect; and that the statement has reference rather to certain of the *vectigalia*, or *custom-duties*, taking the word in its more proper and natural sense, that had been instituted by Augustus. ⁶ In which case Rome itself might be the limited locality to which the reduction would apply; and a comparatively small issue of the new coinage all that would be needed for the intended reduced taxation: a fact (if such it was) accounting for the *semisses* not now existing.—Thus, as regards the provinces, the amount of taxation would remain much as before: except in so far as Alexander Severus' endeavours to select proper governors might be successful; and his appeals for

¹ 1. Dion. lxxx. 1; ἡ (i. e. Mammæa) τὴν τῶν πραγμάτων οἰκονομίαν μετακεχειριστο· and ib. 2; ὁ δὲ ἀντειπεῖν τῇ μητρὶ οὐκ ἠδύνατο, καταρχουσῆ αὐτοῦ. 2. Herod. vi. 1; ἡ τῆς ἀρχῆς οἰκονομία ὑπο ταῖς γυναιξὶ διώκειτο· i. e. under Mammæa and Mæsa, till Mæsa's death: then, ibid. ἤρχε γὰρ αὐτοῦ ὑπερβαλλούτως ἡ μητηρ. 3. Lamprid. c. 60; "Egit omnia ex consilio matris." So too c. 14.

² Dion. lxxx. 2; ἤττων οὐσα χρημάτων ἡ Ἀλεξάνδρον μητηρ ἐχρηματίζετο παντοθεν. Herod. vi. 1; ἤττατο δὲ καὶ τὴν μητέρα . . . ὄρων αὐτὴν οὐσαν φιλοχρηματοῦ, καὶ περὶ τοῦτο ὑπερφύως ἐσπουδακίαν . . . καὶ διεβαλλεν εἰσθ' ὅπη τοῦτο τὴν ἀρχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀκούτος τε καὶ ἀσχαλλούτος, οὐσίας τινῶν, καὶ κληρονομίας, ἐξ ἐπιρρείας ὑφάρπασσας ἐκείνης. Similarly Lampridius 14, 59.

³ Lampridius, c. 64, says that among the faults charged on Alex. Severus, one was "quòd aurum amabat, (a fault previously ascribed to Mammæa distinctively,) et quòd vectigalia multa inveniebat."

⁴ ii. 307.

⁵ His references are merely to Lamprid. c. 39, 14.

⁶ The duty imposed by Augustus varied in amount from $\frac{1}{2}$ th to $\frac{1}{10}$ th of the value of the goods imported. Gib. i. 261.

equitable dealing in the provincial administration duly responded to. But I conceive, in agreement with Gibbon's other and juster notice of the state of things under this reign, (and here Dr. Keith himself concurs with me,) that his success was but partial, as well as transient; "his administration being," as we both state after that historian, "an unavailing struggle against the corruption of his age."¹ So that if the Apocalyptic horse was, as I have supposed, the symbol of the Roman people or empire, the darker aspect which it had assumed² on account of this aggravation of former evils, under Caracalla's fiscal and administrative oppression, can by no means be considered to have wholly passed away even under Alex. Severus.

And what when we pass onward to the next following reigns of *Maximin and his successors*, from A.D. 235 downwards?—That under *Maximin* the administration of the provincial governors was, in respect of fiscal exactions and extortions, as well as otherwise, most oppressive, we have the strong concurrent testimony not merely of the historians Herodian and Capitolinus, but yet more decisively of the contemporary consular writer of the letter to Maximus and Balbinus. Says Capitolinus of Maximin's general administration: "He encouraged false accusers; condemned all brought into court on the accusation; and made of the richest men paupers."³ And Herodian tells how, beginning with the impoverishment of the rich, he proceeded to that of the less wealthy, and of the populace in general:⁴ the provincial governors (as for example the one over the Carthaginian province)⁵ being his ready instruments of oppression. In similar terms the consular writer of the gratulatory epistle to Maximus and Balbinus, on Maximin's death,⁶ thus alluded to the laceration of the provincials by the avarice of their governors; "gratulatus provinciis quas, *inexplebili avaritiâ tyrannorum laceratas*, ad spem salutis reduxistis." The oppression, in truth, would seem to

¹ Gib. i. 251; Keith, i. 233; Horæ i. 173.

² "And darker, as it downward bears,
Is stained with past and present tears."—W. SCOTT.

³ Vit. Maximin e. 13.

⁴ Herod. vii. 3; *τι γὰρ ἦν ὄφελος. . . λείας ἀπαγεῖν τῶν ἐχθρῶν, γυμνοῦντα καὶ τὰς οὐσίας ἀφαιρουμένον τῶν οἰκειῶν; . . . ἑκάστης γούνη ἡμέρας ἦν ἰδεῖν τοὺς ἐχθροὺς πλουσιωτάτους τῆς ἐπιούσης μταιπουντας . . . τοσαυτὴ τις ἦν τῆς τυραννίδος ἢ φιλοχρηματία, ἐπὶ προφασεὶ τῆς περὶ τοὺς στρατιωτὰς χρημάτων συνεχῶς χρηγίας, κ. τ. λ.*

⁵ Ib. 4.

⁶ Capitol, Max. et Balb. c. 17.

have been as great and general under Maximin *after* Alexander Severus, as under Elagabalus *before* him.¹—To change which for the better the succeeding emperors, *Maximus and Balbinus*, whatever their inclination, can have done but little during their few months' precarious tenure of the empire; they being slain in the self-same year, 238, of their accession. And *the younger Gordian* too, who followed, is said during the earlier years of his reign to have trod in the steps of the evil administrators that preceded him, not of the good; his administration being consigned to the eunuchs of the palace, who sold the honours and offices of the empire, as Gibbon tells us,² to the most worthless of mankind. Two years, and but two years, succeeded of a better administration under the care of his father-in-law Misitheus. And then came Gordian's death, and *Philip's* succession and murder: and therewith the commencement of that fearful period of war both foreign and civil, and of famine too and pestilence, which I assign to the 4th Seal; and in which historians describe the effects of the evil that I speak of, so long previously in operation, as only the more made manifest.—In the concluding paragraph of his Chapter on this æra Gibbon thus notes the changed aspect of the empire under Philip from what it had been under Augustus or Hadrian; and with reference to *the long previous continuance of that self-same evil, as its causal agency*, which I suppose to be the evil specially figured in the 3rd Seal. “To the undiscerning eye of the vulgar, Philip appeared a monarch no less powerful than Hadrian or Augustus had formerly been. The form was still the same; but the animating health and vigour were fled. *The industry of the people was discouraged, and exhausted, by a long series of oppression.*”³ And again, somewhat later, in his sketch of the twenty years of confusion and calamity that followed after the death of Philip; that “the general famine [which then befell the empire] was *the inevitable consequence of the rapine and oppression, which extirpated the produce of the present, and the hope of future harvests:*” a passage cited by me in my *Hóræ*, under the fourth Apocalyptic Seal, in illustration of my view of the 3rd Seal.—Nor did the evil stop there; but still continued onward under Gallienus, and even under the then afterwards

¹ Gibbon in fact, in his Index of Contents to Vol. i., speaks of the relief under Alexander Severus as only a passing one; indeed as limited, if I rightly understand him, simply to A. Severus' own reign:—“*Temporary reduction of the Tribute.*”

² Gibb. i. 306, 307.

³ This expresses precisely my idea of the intent of the 3rd Seal's symbol.

commencing restorers of the Roman empire, Claudius,¹ Aurelian, Probus;² (Gibbon, not without due historical authority for it, so painting the thing:) until in fine with the æra of Diocletian, A.D. 284, and the re-establishment of the empire under him, there was developed more fully and systematically, in the oppressive fiscal system established by him, that same particular branch of oppressive provincial contributions in kind, which, as Gibbon observes in his earlier sketch of the oppressive Roman fiscal system begun under Caracalla, did then, and thenceforward, “darken the Roman world with its deadly shade.”

§ 2. ON THE CONSTANTINO-THEodosIAN REVOLUTION, AND OVERTHROW OF HEATHENISM, AS THE SUBJECT OF THE PRIMARY VISION OF THE 6TH SEAL.

(See page 236.)

THERE is nothing novel in the general view that I have taken of the 6th Seal's primary vision, as symbolic of that mighty revolution whereby Heathenism was overthrown and ruined in the Roman empire:—a revolution begun by Constantine, and completed 80 years after by Theodosius. It is one however which, perhaps more than any other of the particular interpretations in the *Horæ*, has incurred the censure and opposition of more than one class of critics and expositors; alike of those of the Futurist School, and of some too of the Protestant Historic School. It may seem desirable therefore, more especially as the question is one of great importance, to add yet a few further remarks upon *it*, *its evidence*, and *the objections and counter-schemes opposed to it*; albeit that my proof has been drawn out in the Chapter on the 6th Seal pretty fully, and as I think satisfactorily: and to show that, while that proof and that solution, *fairly considered*, cannot be set aside, alike that which the Futurists offer in its place, and that which the Section of Historic expositors referred to offer, crumble into ruin when tried by a critical examination.

As regards my own Constantino-Theodosian revolution theory I

¹ Claudius, addressing his soldiers, represents the people as “ruined by oppression, and indolent from despair;” and unable consequently “any longer to supply a numerous army with the means of luxury, or even of subsistence.” Gibbon ii. 8. The historian says at the same place, that “the frequent rebellions of provinces had involved almost every person in the guilt of treason, almost every estate in the case of confiscation.”

* See on these two last-mentioned reigns my p. 198 *suprà*.

said that it was that which, *fairly considered*, would stand the test of criticism, because on no point has there been more of misrepresentation. By one and another and another objector the theory has been represented as if it made the 6th Seal symbolize wholly or chiefly Constantine's victories, and the establishment of Christianity thereupon in the Roman empire.¹ But events the most opposite in character may be connected and concomitant; and pictures very different be required to depict the one and the other. It would be but poor and reckless criticism to object to some dark and sad picture of Napoleon on his fall, after the battle of Waterloo, that the picture was absurd on account of the joyousness of the event to England and the European continent generally. Therefore the *first* charge that I would here inculcate on my readers is, never to be misled by any misrepresentations, however reckless and pertinacious, so as to forget that it is *the overthrow of Heathenism* from its high place of dominancy in the Empire that we make the subject of the 6th Seal: a revolution begun with Constantine's series of victories, but completed by Theodosius; and of which the magnitude was such that there has never yet occurred any politico-religious revolution so mighty and momentous, in the whole history of Christendom.²—When the theory has thus been fairly stated, then the *next* thing must be to require of the objector to disprove the parallelism of all those several Scripture passages that I have cited from the Old Testament prophets, couched under similar imagery to that of the 6th Seal; and on the fact of the reference of which to political or politico-religious revolutions our view of the 6th Seal's meaning was mainly grounded. And let it be remembered that, if the objector wish

¹ So, first, Dr. S. R. Maitland, on Antichrist, pp. 21, 22; "According to all the writers whom I have mentioned, [Brightman, More, Bishop Newton, Faber, &c.,] the language of this tremendous prediction appeared to predict *the setting up of Christianity* on the ruins of Paganism, *under Constantine.*" And a Reviewer in No. viii. of the Quarterly Journal of Prophecy thus writes, p. 376. "It is the necessary consequence of this arrangement [viz. of the 7 Trumpets being included in the 7th Seal] that the 6th Seal must be explained of *the time of Constantine.* We have always thought this interpretation a blot upon most of our modern Apocalyptic schemes." And then he says that a Work called, "The time of the end not yet," supplied "a tempting illustration of the shifts to which it is necessary to resort in its support;" viz. by speaking in detail of one of Constantine's victories over Licinius. So again the Rev. C. Maitland, p. 62, speaks of "*the peaceful reign of Constantine* being taken for the great day of the wrath of the Lamb."

Dr. S. R. M. had no reference to my own Work in his remarks, for it was not then published. The other two writers *were* acquainted with it.

² There must be remembered too Eunapius' and Gibbon's very similar imagery in describing this revolution, as given in my p. 252 *suprà*.

to explain the strength of the symbols in any of those ancient prophecies by supposing that the lesser overthrow of wicked states, there primarily depicted, was figured in symbols of grandiloquence almost beyond the occasion, because of that lesser revolution being in a manner typical of the great and final revolution of the consummation, wherein *all* the powers of evil are to be cast down and broken before the power of Christ, the same may be said of the awful and grandiloquent imagery of this 6th Seal, though meant primarily as explained by me. Indeed that first great Apocalyptically figured revolution might perhaps the rather have been depicted in such language and imagery, in order to admit of the thoughts of Christians, under the persecutions of the 2nd and 3rd centuries, being thereby the more led to hope for the great final overthrow of their enemies as an event not very far off; because, as it might seem, not unsuitable to the symbols of the first and earliest Apocalyptic figuration of any great catastrophe.¹

Then as to *any counter-view* of the Seal to be substituted, the question of *Apocalyptic structure* is of course one which must first, and preliminarily, be urged for consideration. The Reviewer in the Quarterly Prophetic Journal, whom I cited just now in a Note preceding, observes, with reference to this point, that the structural theory of the Apocalypse which supposes the Trumpets to be included in, and the evolution of, the 7th Seal, necessarily involves the Constantinian (he should have said the Constantino-Theodosian) explanation of the 6th Seal. This is not quite correct; for even some Futurists, as Mr. Burgh, admit this view of structure. But certainly, on the *historic* principle of interpretation, which I presume the Reviewer himself adopts, such a structure of the Apocalypse does offer an eminently strong confirmation of my explanation of the Seal, as figuring the Constantino-Theodosian revolution. For what mighty revolution was there but it, subsequent to John's exile in Patmos under Domitian, to which all the Trumpet-figured events might be viewed as posterior? Whence the necessity of every inquirer, and every objector, looking well to the evidence on this point. I have already elsewhere² noticed the *à priori* probability in favour of the structure spoken of from its simplicity:—out of the three consecutive sevens

¹ Let me refer to some valuable remarks by Mr. Irving bearing on this point, near the end of the Preface to his Translation of Ben Ezra, pp. xxxiv. xxxv.

² See p. 106 *suprà*.

of Seals, Trumpets, and Vials, the 7th Seal seeming so naturally to be evolved in the seven Trumpets, the 7th Trumpet in the seven Vials; just, it has been said, as the 7th compassing day of Jericho had seven compassings on that day to evolve it. To which let me now add, in further evidence of this being indeed the relation to each other of the 7th Seal and the seven Trumpets, that such a relation is all but defined to exist between the 7th Trumpet and seven Vials. For, as the 7th Trumpet was declared to be the Trumpet of *the last woe*, and its epoch marked by very peculiar phænomena in the scenic temple in heaven attending it, so the seven Vials were declared also to be *the last plagues* of God's wrath; and the epoch of their introduction marked by scenic phænomena in the temple in heaven so similar, as to seem almost like a repetition of the former.¹ Whence the all but necessary inference of the seven Vial-plagues being the evolution of the 7th Trumpet's woe. But, if so, then (going back) it surely further follows that the seven Trumpets must be also the evolution of the 7th Seal. For a Scheme which made the seven Vials to be the development of the 7th Trumpet, and yet the seven Trumpets not to be the development of the 7th Seal, would have no concinnity; and, like a bird with but one wing, fall to the ground.—If however the objector reject this strong presumptive evidence, and set aside this Scheme of structure, he must then needs have the series of the seven Apocalyptic Seals to end, *not* with the next following (i.e. the sealing and palm-bearing) figurations of the 6th Seal, but with the 7th Seal: and of that Seal must make what he can. And what will this be? Will the 7th Seal's subject (and so the grand ending of his first Apocalyptic series of visions) be *the half-hour's silence in heaven*; or will it be *nothing*? The objector must make his election. Let my readers never fail to remember and to press this. I have had to notice the last point already, in my particular review of certain such structurists of the historical school in a previous Number:² and I think that exemplification and illustration will make the argument hence resulting, very clear and convincing. So as to the point of *structure*.—And then, 2dly, as regards all objectors and their counter-schemes, the question of the construction of the *imagery* of the 6th Seal's primary vision will come up: and there must be enforced on them the necessity of plainly stating how they expound the *elemental convulsions* of the 6th Seal's primary vision; whether *literally* of the

¹ Compare Apoc. x. 7, xi. 14, 18, 19; and xv. 1, 5.

² See p. 567 *suprà*.

physical convulsions of nature, or *figuratively* of political or politico-religious revolution. If in the *latter* sense, then their exposition is pro tanto in favour of that which I advocate. If in the *former* sense, then we must ask them to explain how, after the stars had actually struck our earth,¹ the earth could still continue in its orbit; and with inhabitants good and bad remaining on it, so as the second vision of the self-same 6th Seal, i.e. the sealing-vision, represents to us. If I mistake not, they will be found to shrink somewhat sensitively from this question: and, when prest with it, to confess to the wish either of ejecting that sealing vision itself from the seven-sealed Book;² or of ejecting the subject figured therein from the place assigned it by St. John, *after* the preceding primary vision of the 6th Seal, and as *in chronological sequence* to it.³ But wherefore? From any Scriptural internal evidence suggesting such notions? Not at all. There exists no internal evidence of the kind whatsoever. The one and only reason for the thing is that their own literal theory of the primary vision of the 6th Seal imperatively requires it. Now I trust my readers will think with me that the sound way of reasoning in such a case is the very reverse; and that the theory which involves such downright violence to all internal evidence must be itself a false one.

The observations just made apply to *all* objectors to my suggested view of the structural place, and historical intent, of the 6th Seal. In regard of the two different classes of objectors, viz. that of *Futurists* generally, and that of certain *Historical Expositors*, the argument may be urged yet further by showing in detail the failure of each and either counter-view of the Seals, propounded by the one or by the other. And this I have already done, as regards objectors of the *Historical* school, fully and at length in my Paper No. II. of this Appendix.

As regards the *Futurists*, since their view is antagonistic to my own, not in respect of the Seals only, but of the whole Book of the Apocalypse, I think it better to reserve my criticism on *them* till the end of this Commentary. It will be found in Part II. of the Appendix to my 4th Volume. But let me here just so far forestall as to say that the Futurist theory of the Seals, though specious perhaps at first

¹ Olshausen, on Matt. xxiv. 29, says that such a particular in a vision as *stars falling to the earth* tells of itself that it must be taken symbolically.

² So Dr. Todd, as noticed in my Vol. iv. App. Part ii. § 3.

³ So Mr. Barker, as noticed in my Vol. iv. Ibid. § 4.

sight from its simplicity, breaks down utterly on examination. The Seals exhibit, they say, the signs mentioned in Matt. xxiv as signs precursive of Christ's coming;—the preaching of Christ's gospel over the world, wars, famines, pestilences, persecutions, and a revolution in which the sun and moon are to be darkened, &c. But in the 1st Seal little indeed is there of evidence for *Christ's* being the rider of the white horse :¹ so little that Mr. Kelly, one of the most zealous of all zealous Futurists, makes him *Antichrist*. In the 2nd Seal *civil wars*, to which its prophecy is restricted, ill suit with that of nation rising against nation. Yet more, passing on to the 3rd Seal's symbols, with its 5lb. of barley at a denarius, and its plenty of wine and oil, to convert *this* into a symbolization of *famine* is nothing less than an immense absurdity.² With the failure of which the centre of our expositors' counter-line is broken, and so the whole Futurist idea of parallelism between the two prophecies overthrown. As to their view, finally, of the first vision of the 6th Seal, its fatal inconsistency with the immediately consequent Sealing vision has been already just before noted.

§ 3. OBJECTIONS AGAINST MY EXPLANATION OF "THE THIRD PART" IN THE APOCALYPTIC TRUMPETS.

(See page 361.)

OBJECTIONS have been made in two or three critical notices of my Work³ to the particular political and territorial *tripartition of the Roman world* referred to by me, as explanatory of "*the third part*" spoken of in the prophecies of the four first Trumpets :—objections grounded partly on its alleged inconsistency with the explanation received alike by myself and most of my reviewers of a similarly express fractional designative in the 6th Trumpet; partly on its alleged inconsistency with the facts of the history to which under one and another Trumpet I apply it. They have been urged by none, I believe, more fully than by Mr. Birks, in his lately-published Work on the "Mystery of Providence;" so that an answer to him may be regarded as an answer to all.

¹ I must beg my readers to familiarize themselves with the argument on this point, as drawn out on my p. 124 Note ² *suprà*. ² See my p. 164—168 *suprà*.

³ E. g. in an early number of the Quarterly Journal of Prophecy; as well as by Mr. Birks in his *Mystery of Providence*.

And let me premise, before entering on my reply, that Mr. Birks has really himself no presentable theory of "the third part" to offer in substitution. In accordance with his structural theory of the Apocalypse,¹ as recommencing its historic prefigurations of the future (from after St. John's time) with the new series of the Trumpets, he supposes the Roman empire's immediately following prosperous octogenarian period, from Nerva to the 2nd Antonine inclusive, to be *a season of intercession* symbolized by the vision of the incense-offering angel.² On which we have only to ask, What period it might not just as well have symbolized, since when was the time that was not to the Church a season of intercession? And if, as Mr. B. says, it was offered under persecution, where in the prophecy is there a hint of such persecution?—Then further he supposes the voices, thunderings, and lightnings, on the Angel's casting fire on the earth, as meant of the civil tumults and barbarians' preparation, during the 70 years next following; from the 2nd Antonine's death to Philip's death, and the accession of Decius, A.D. 248 :³—symbols these significant indeed of wars and commotions; but with nothing at all distinctive in them, so as to fit them to Mr. Birks' proposed period more than to twenty others. And then next comes the 1st Trumpet, with its *third of the earth* burnt by the hail mixt with fire; and then the 2nd Trumpet, with its *third of the sea* turned into blood, on a great burning mountain being cast into it; and then the 3rd Trumpet, with its *third of the rivers* made bitter by a fiery meteor falling into them; and then the 4th Trumpet, with its *third part of the sun moon and stars* darkened and eclipsed:—all which calls on him for his counter-view of *the third part*. And what this counter-view? It is still the same in the main that I referred to as put forth in a much earlier publication by him and Mr. Bickersteth, when noticing their explanation of the *4th part of the earth* in the 4th Seal, in my critique on their Church-Scheme of the Seals now reprinted in No. II. of this Appendix; ⁴ with just however certain addenda and alterations, here and there, intended apparently to meet a part of my so made objec-

¹ At p. 549 I have mentioned Mr. Birks' subsequent abandonment of this structural theory, and adoption of the same that I follow myself. But, for the reasons given at p. 550, and referred to again at p. 568, I think it well to reinsert my present allusion to it, as bearing on the earlier verses of Apoc. viii. As regards "the third part," here chiefly discuss, he has not intimated to me any change in his opinion.

² *Mystery of Providence*, Ch. i. p. 16, &c.

³ *Ib.* Ch. ii. p. 35.

⁴ See p. 564 *supra*.

tions. The *third part of the earth* is always, says Mr. Birks in his late publication on the Apocalypse, the *third in succession of Daniel's four great prophetic empires*, i. e. the *Greek* empire; while the *fourth part* of the earth, so as in the 4th Seal, means the *fourth in succession of Daniel's four empires*, i. e. the *Roman*.¹ But what the grounds for so extraordinary a *successional* sense to the phrase before us? Because, says he, (this seems to me his chief reason,) out of the many times in which this phrase, *the third*, is used in other Books of the New Testament, it is always, or all but always, used in an *ordinal*, or *successional* sense; and therefore here too might with reason be expected to be used similarly:² and if so used here, and in the sense of order and succession, of what so naturally as of Daniel's four successive empires on the prophetic earth; the connexion of Daniel's prophecies and the Apocalyptic being so intimate? But can it really be the case that that phrase *the third*, when conjoined so as here with a noun of *territorial* or *local* significancy in the genitive, is used elsewhere in the New Testament in an *ordinal* or *successional* sense? Assuredly not. The cases Mr. B. refers to, as if parallels, are all cases where a noun implying *order* and *succession* is exprest, or understood, after the numeral adjective;—*the third hour*, *the third time*, *the third husband*, and so on. But what have these to do with such a phrase as that under consideration, *the third part of the earth*? Because *the tenth hour of the day*, in John i. 39, means the tenth in the sense of order and succession, are we therefore to seek out some ordinal or successional sense to the same numeral adjective, when St. Paul tells of *the tenth of the spoils* given by Abraham to Melchisedec?³ Our friend, however unintentionally, has been evidently practising a delusion on both his readers and himself.—Indeed it looks as if, in fine, he had half waked up to a consciousness of the delusion. For he suggests that there may perhaps be intended a *partitive* sense to the Apocalyptic phrase, as well as an *ordinal*; and sets to work to try if he cannot make out the two senses in accordance. Out of Daniel's

¹ pp. 62, 63.

² pp. 63, 64. I speak of this as his chief reason; because his two other reasons in proof of such an "ordinal" view of the numeral adjective being "grammatically probable," seem to me really scarce worth the mentioning:—viz. 1st, that there is no mention in the Apocalypse of *one-half* of the Roman earth, but only of *one-third* and *one-fourth*; 2ndly, because the fourth part is thus introduced; "When he had opened the 4th Seal I heard the 4th living creature say, Come and see: and behold a pale horse; . . . and power was given them over the 4th part of the earth."

³ Heb. vii. 4.

four successive empires, he argues, the two first had pretty much the same territorial dominion, viz. that of central Asia: (a supposition not quite correct; but which may be granted for argument's sake:)¹ and thus, taking the whole prophetic world of Daniel's and the Apocalyptic visions into account, from the Indian frontier Eastward to the Atlantic Westward, it might be considered as in a manner territorially tripartited; the Babylonian and Persian being the same first third, taken *partitively*; and the Greek territory (that of the 3rd empire *ordinally*) another *partitive* third. But would not then the Roman territory, or territory of the 4th empire *ordinally*, be a *third* also, (the remaining *third*,) *partitively*; whereas, according to Mr. B.'s hypothesis, and to suit his explanation of the 4th Seal, it ought to be *partitively a fourth*?—The theory is evidently altogether unfounded; indeed, I may say, impossible. It would be easy to show how, in its application to *history*, (so as made by Mr. B.,) it palpably fails. I just give one specimen pretty fully below.² Enough however has

¹ Nebuchadnezzar's Babylonian empire extended further West, according to Berosus, than the Persian; the Persian, if I mistake not, further East. See p. 564 Note ⁴ *suprà*.

² My exemplification is from the 2nd Trumpet:—"The second Angel sounded; and as it were a great mountain burning with fire was cast into the sea: and *the third part of the sea* became blood: and the third part of the creatures that were in the sea that had life, died: and the third part of the ships was destroyed."

Originally Mr. Birks had explained this simply as symbolizing "the fall of Rome: A.D. 365—412." So in the Scheme in Bickersteth's Guide, 6th Ed. p. 363, 7th Ed.* p. 294. But a change in the chronology now appears. The *1st Trumpet* he expounds of that irruption of barbarians over the Roman earth, from A.D. 250 to 268, which I consider to have been figured in the 4th Seal's Death on the pale horse: and, in regard of which, the difficulty I felt from the universality of the destruction over the Roman world during that period, as compared with the apparent prophetic restriction of the destroying agencies (on the usual reading of Apoc. vi. 8) to the *fourth* part of the earth, will suggest the difficulty Mr. B. must have in reconciling a period of such universal destruction with the 1st Trumpet's restricted *third* of the earth. Then Mr. Birks has a 4th Chapter headed, "The Pause of Judgment;" which he explains of the 100 years' interval of comparative freedom from judgment from A.D. 270 to 365, including the mighty Constantinian revolution and fall of Paganism; though there is not a word to answer to such a pause in the Apocalyptic Prophecy.—And so he comes to *the second Trumpet*, which he applies historically to *the extinction of the Western Empire*: including the successive stages of its fall, from the first Gothic irruption under Valens, A.D. 365, to the abdication of the Western Emperor on Odoacer's bidding, A.D. 476. But how, the reader will be thinking, can this be made to accord with Mr. B.'s theory of *the third part*; seeing that the Apocalypse makes the *third of the sea* become blood, which, according to that theory, ought to be the *Eastern or Greek* empire: whereas Mr. B.'s history is all about the fall of the *Western or Latin* empire, the 4th of Daniel's empires, and (as he says) the *fourth* of the earth in the Apocalypse? Thus (See pp. 119, 131, &c.) the volcanic mountain burning with fire he considers to be figurative, not of the *destroying agency* in this case, so as in the case of the hail and fire cast on the earth in the 1st Trumpet; but of the *subject*

* In the 6th Ed. p. 359, this Scheme is noted as by Mr. Birks.

been said on the *grammatical* sense of the expression to prove that his view of it is out of the question. Some *territorial* or *political* tripartition of the Apocalyptic or Roman world, correspondent with the era symbolized, *must*, I conceive, be intended. The only question is, what ?

And since, as between Mr. Birks and myself, there is entire agreement of opinion as to the fact that the only two other territorial tripartitions of the Roman world which can compete with my own fail to answer to the conditions of the prophetic problem,—I mean the Continental tripartition of Europe, Asia, Africa,—and the Imperial tripartition, on Constantine's death, between his three sons,—there seems no need of enlarging on that point, or adding to the argument against each and either of them, drawn out in the body of my Commentary on the subject.¹ My present duty is simply to support the view there given, as the tripartition preferred by me; and to show that the objections made against it are vain.

The objections then that have been made are fourfold:—1. that it secures no harmony between the 4th part of the earth in the 4th Trumpet, and the 3rd part (now our main question) in the Trumpets:—2. that it was a tripartition very brief and evanescent; lasting as it did scarce a year during the joint reigns of Constantine,

of destruction, i. e. the Western empire, as torn up, cast into the sea of barbarians, and extinguished. "The first wave that burst on the empire was the invasion of the Alemanni." (121.) But does the prophecy speak of the sea as *coming up with its waves* against the mountain? Not at all. The prophecy plainly makes the volcanic mountain to fall as the destroying agent into the sea, and the sea to suffer; so that "the third part of the sea became blood." Again, if "the sea" generally is the barbarian flood invading, what is to be said of the "*third part of the sea*," in accordance with Mr. B.'s theory? Says he, it means "that the tribes of barbarians *who were connected locally, or by treaty, with the third empire*, would suffer slaughter and bloodshed themselves:" as well as "that they would *inflict it on the subjects of the empire*." (151.) And so he refers to the mass of certain of the Goths scattered through the Asiatic part of the Eastern empire, before Theodosius' accession, as the first point in the solution; (a massacre perpetrated before ever the sea of barbarians had touched the burning mountain;) and to certain defeats that some of the barbarians sustained. But let me ask was Rhadagast, who of all those barbarians perished most cruelly when invading Italy, connected locally with the Greek empire?

It is surely needless to go further. If this is all that a man like Mr. Birks can make historically of this theory of the third part in the 4 first Trumpets, construed according to the requirements of his Apocalyptic structural theory of the Seals and Trumpets, what must be thought of that theory of *structure*, and that theory of the *third part*? Indeed but for the fact of Mr. Birks' valued name being attached to it, I should not have thought it worth the while to notice the theory. For it is not that I have selected a weak part, and that other parts of the historic application are strong. I do not think there is a single point of strength in the whole.

¹ See my p. 360 *suprà*.

Licinius, and Maximin:—3. that it is inconsistent with the sense which I admit attaches to *the third part of men* spoken of in the 6th Trumpet, that being explained of the *Greek* empire destroyed by the Turks:—4thly, and finally, that it does not agree with the facts of the histories of Alaric, Genseric, and Attila, to which I apply it, under the three first Trumpets.¹—I will answer these objections in succession.

1. As regards the 1st, then, I felt in my former editions² the want of a manifest harmony and connexion between the *quadripartition* of the Apocalyptic earth in the 4th Seal and its *tripartition* in the early Trumpets; though such a harmony and connexion between them did not seem to me to be a thing essential. But now that, after very much thought and consideration, I have settled on Jerome's reading in the 4th Seal, "*on the four parts of the earth,*" the harmony and agreement between the two Apocalyptically noted divisions becomes really striking: and I could hardly express it better than in Mr. Birks' own language, when thus narrating the facts of that epoch; "In October, 1812, Constantine defeated Maxentius; and the previous *fourfold* division became *threefold.*"³ For, as I have stated in my Chapter on the 4th Seal, there was for some years, when the plagues of the 4th Seal were most fiercely raging, that selfsame *quadripartition* of the empire pretty nearly, *de facto*, which Dioeletian, just at the close of the period included in that Seal, established *de jure.*⁴ And, as Mr. B. says, it was out of this *quadripartition*, simply by Constantine's overthrow of Maxentius and the then adding of *his* territorial dominion to his own previous one, that the empire past into the form of a *tripartition*.

2. As regards the 2nd objection I have to reply that a division of empire, even though transient, may yet, if it occur at some great crisis such as prophecy loves to depict, and still more if prophecy has actually depicted it, be well had respect to, even more than many less transient divisions, in the after figurations. Now of the pre-eminent and critical importance of the æra of the tripartition of the empire in 313, under Constantine, Licinius, and Maximin, who can doubt? It is set forth prominently on the *historic* page, as connected with the first edict of perfect toleration to Christianity in

¹ See for the objections, Birks pp. 59, 60.

² The three first.

³ 1b. p. 60.

⁴ See my p. 202 *suprà*.

the Roman empire. And then *prophetically* it is seized on, according to both Mr. Birks' and my own view of the vision of the Dragon and Woman in Apoc. xii, as an epoch too momentous to pass over without express prefiguration: and in that prefiguration a prominent notice of *the tripartition in question* occurs; the Dragon, the inspirer of the Roman Heathenism, being figured as having but one *third* only of the empire under his sway, when making his last great fight as a Roman ruling power against the Christian Church.¹ It was thus a *tripartition* of the Roman world *stereotyped* in prophetic symbol.—And though, during the interval of some 70 or 80 years after, till Theodosius' death, the tripartition was not actually revived, yet there was perpetually, as I have shown in my Commentary,² what we may regard as a certain reference to, and reminiscence of it, in the fact of the central Illyrian division being sometimes shifted to the Western division of the empire, sometimes to the Eastern: until at length, just at the time of the Goths' first grand outbreak, in other words just at the epoch (as I construe the prophecy) before the 1st Trumpet's sounding, Alaric first attacked South-East Illyricum, then was officially appointed ruler of it; and in fact for the next 3 or 4 years, from 396 to 400, ruled that division so independently alike of the West and of the East, as to have virtually very much re-constituted the old primary tripartition of the Roman world; its tripartition into *the Western Empire, Eastern Empire, and Illyricum.*³

3. As regards the next objection, to the effect that I suppose *one* of the thirds of the empire to be meant in certain visions, and *another* and *different* third in another of the visions,—viz. *the Eastern third* in the vision of the 6th Trumpet, where the horsemen were loosed from the Euphrates “to slay *the third part* of men,” as well as in the vision of the Dragon and Woman, Apoc. xii, 4,⁴ but in the four first Trumpets *the Western third*,—it does not seem to me to have any good foundation. It is the *definite article prefixed* which gives it its chief apparent strength. Indeed, except for this, I presume no

¹ See my Vol. iii. Part iv. Ch. 1.—That Mr. Birks construes the time of the vision of Apoc. xii. similarly, appears from his Scheme of Sacred Chronology, appended to Mr. Bickersteth's Guide to the Prophecies (7th Ed.), p. 416; where we read thus:—“A.D. 313, Travail of the Church, Apoc. xii. 2.” ² pp. 361, 363 *suprà*.

³ Thus Mr. Birks is incorrect in saying (p. 60) that “this particular division never reappeared.” It virtually reappeared, as I have stated, at the exact epoch that preceded (in my view) the 1st Trumpet's sounding.

⁴ Though here indeed, besides “the third part” held by the Dragon, the other two parts were *implied* also, as held by the Woman.

objection of the kind would for a moment be raised. For in the passage from Ezek. v. 12 cited by Mr. B. (p. 64), and also by myself before him,—“*A third part* of thee shall die with the pestilence, and *a third part* shall fall by the sword round about thee, and I will scatter *a third part* to all the winds,”—not *the same third*, but *different thirds*, are one after another respectively signified; and no one would object that such an understanding of them is not proper and natural. Indeed it must strike the reader that the very nature of the statement in Ezekiel *requires* that a different third should in either clause be meant; the other two thirds being in the prophetic clause itself otherwise disposed of. Now turn to the original Hebrew text of Ezekiel: and we shall find that in the two latter clauses of the verse, though the English version renders it “*a third*,” the Hebrew expresses it “*the third*.”¹ Which being so, and that the Hebrew prefix of the *definite* article, in such a case of the numeral adjective, is but tantamount to the English prefix of the *indefinite* article, and St. John’s frequent Hebraistic idiom in the Apocalypse being a thing notorious, we may hence I think infer that the expression of “*the third*,” alike in the vision of Apoc. xii, and in those of the four first and the 6th Trumpets, is to be regarded as but a Hebraism, and as tantamount to our English *a third*.—Admitting which, and considering that in the prefiguration of the four first Trumpets *one third* of the Roman empire was depicted as given up to desolation, it seems to me that the *a priori* probability, on coming to the 6th Trumpet’s later woe, would be that *the third of men* spoken of as “to be killed” under *it* would mean a *different* third from the former, not the *same* third; and the mention of the four angel-destroyers *from the Euphrates*, as its appointed desolators, seems almost to fix it, in that case, as the third nearest to the Euphrates.

4. There remains only Mr. B.’s 4th objection, that *the facts of history do not answer to my theory*; and that, in regard of each Gothic host and leader whom I consider to be figured in the three first Trumpets respectively, viz. *Alaric*,² *Genseric*, *Attila*, not merely was there a certain surplusage of ravage accomplished by them beyond the limits of the Western empire, but the East was, in *Alaric’s* case at least, and *Attila’s*, “their *chief* theatre.” To the correctness of this state-

¹ השלישית. So too 2 Sam. xviii. 2, 2 Kings xi. 5, 6, and 2 Chron. xxiii. 4, 5; where the English version is *a third*, the Hebrew original *the third*.

² Conjointly with *Rhadagaisus*. See p. 619.

ment I altogether demur. Let us look to history; and see in the records of each of these three chief Gothic executors of God's judgments against the Roman empire, how the case really stands.

As regards *Alaric* then my readers will remember that I consider the primary insurrection of the Goths under his leadership, immediately after the great Theodosius' death, A.D. 395, and ravaging of the South Illyrian provinces of Macedonia and Greece, until, being made Viceroy of Illyricum by the Eastern Emperor, he thereby, in fact, as before observed, reconstituted virtually the old tripartite division of the Roman world,—I say it may be remembered by my readers that I regard all this as answering to the *thunders, lightnings, voices and earthquake* that followed on the Angel's casting fire on the earth, immediately after the opening of the 7th Seal, and *preliminarily to the sounding of the 1st Trumpet*.¹ I so explain it because, 1st, I conceive that those lightnings, thunderings, &c., were meant to be pre-significations in symbol of the general character of the events destined to follow under the seven Trumpets, in which the 7th unsealed part of the Apocalyptic scroll was to be evolved; just as, on the sounding of the 7th Trumpet, the symbolization then immediately occurring of the thunders, lightnings, voices, earthquake, and synchronic opening of the temple in heaven, (a sign this last quite peculiar,) was indicative of what was to follow in the seven vials that evolved that 7th Trumpet:—also, 2dly, that I conceive there must have been events on earth answering to those symbols of the prophecy; events similarly preliminary, and similarly significant too, to a discerning eye, of what was to follow.²—There is nothing new in this view of the intent of such preliminary symbols. It is one adopted (though with different historic and chronological explanation) by Mr. Birks himself; and surely is altogether reasonable. Which admitted however, all that Mr. B. has to urge against my making the Western Roman empire (or *Western third* of the Roman world) Alaric's grand sphere of operation under the 1st Trumpet at once falls to the ground. For after those preliminary transactions, and during the time of his establishment (A.D. 396—400) “*on the verge of the two empires,*” as Gibbon says, in his government of the Eastern Illyricum, he felt irresistibly impelled, as by a kind of secret

¹ See pp. 372—375 *suprà*.

² See *ibid.* for the one example; for the other Chap. i. of Part v. in my Vol. iii.

and preternatural influence, distinctively against *the Western empire*.¹ And from his first movement Westward A.D. 400, down to his death in the extreme south of Italy, A.D. 410, it was *the Western empire, and Western empire alone*, that was the scene of *all* Alaric's ravages. —So too of all those of his coadjutors in the work of desolation, viz. Rhadagaisus and his Vandal hosts from the Baltic: the latter pointedly included by me in the 1st Trumpet,² though Mr. Birks seems to represent me as restricting it to Alaric, and Rhadagaisus *personally*;³ the hosts of which latter chief, after his death, extended their desolations over *Gaul* and *Spain*.

Next as regards *Genseric*.—Premising here that alike the Western third and Eastern third, or Western empire and Eastern, had *its own proper part of the Mediterranean sea* attached to it, with the islands and transmarine provinces inclusive, (notwithstanding Mr. Birks' strange disclaimer of there being any such correspondent division of the *sea*, as well as of the *land*,⁴) it only needs that we state, with the dates, Genseric's chief acts of conquest and ravage, during the long 48 or 49 years of his career, to see whether it was *the Western third of the sea*, or the *Eastern third*, that was the chief sphere acted on by *him*. I abstract in what follows from the Universal History and Gibbon. — A.D. 429 Genseric crosses from Spain into Africa with his Vandals; 430—439 progress of conquests; 439 takes Carthage, and begins his reign there. "Casting his eye towards the sea, he resolves to create a naval power; and the fleets that issued from the port of Carthage again claim the empire of the Mediterranean." "439—455 Naval power of the Vandals." 440 he ravages Sicily: 442 Valentinian yields to him the African province: 455 he sails up the Tiber, and sacks Rome: 456, sailing against Gaul and Italy, he is repulsed by Ricimer near Corsica.—Rejecting the Greek emperor's request not to ravage the Western Empire, in 457 the Vandal fleet is surprised at the mouth of the Liris in Campania; "but Majorian (the Western Emperor)'s strictest vigilance was insufficient to protect the long-extended coast of Italy from the Vandal depredations:" 460, on Majorian's preparing an expedition

¹ See pp. 375, 376 *suprà*.

² pp. 376, 377.

³ Birks, pp. 60, 204.

⁴ Mystery of Provid. p. 60. Would Mr. B. argue that the islands of Sicily and Sardinia appertained as much to the Eastern empire as to the Western; or vice versâ those of Cyprus or Samos to the Western? Would he have it that the transmarine Provinces of Egypt and Cyrene belonged as much to the West as to the East; and vice versâ those of Western Africa to the Eastern empire?

against him, Genseric attacks the Roman fleet near Alicant (in Spain), and destroys it: 461, Genseric ravages the coasts of Sicily and Italy, and conquers Sardinia: 462, the Western Emperor begs help from the Eastern Emperor against the Vandals; who declines granting it, because of a treaty with Genseric: so “the fury of the Vandals was confined to the limits of the Western empire:”¹ 462—466, yearly descents on the coasts of “Spain, Liguria, Tuscany, Campania, Lucania, Bruttium, Calabria, Venetia, Dalmatia, Epirus, . . Sicily:”² 467, Genseric, incensed against the Eastern Emperor in consequence of some neglect of his wishes, ravages the Peloponnesus and Greek islands, and appears once before Alexandria, but unsuccessfully: 468, Genseric destroys by fire-ships, in the neighbourhood of Carthage, a Roman fleet of above 1000 sail, sent against him by the two united emperors: 468—472, Genseric re-conquers Sardinia,³ also Sicily, and “all the islands between Africa and Italy;” then ravages the coasts of Italy, Peloponnesus, and the Greek islands. 475, Genseric makes peace with the Eastern emperor. 477, Genseric dies.

Such is the chronological abstract of events. From the year 429, when he crost over on his destroying mission into Africa, until 467 or thereabouts, it seems that there was no ravaging by him of the Eastern empire. After that, now and then, its coasts came in for a share, but a comparatively small share, of the Vandal ravages. Conquests of islands by them in the Eastern part of the Mediterranean there was none. It was only when allied to and helping the Western emperor, that the Greek fleet was burnt, conjointly with the Western fleet, and this in the Western waters. Does it need more to show how truly it may be predicated of Genseric, and his Vandals, that *the Western third of the great Roman sea* was distinctively the *chief* theatre of their conquests and desolations?—Let me add, what was omitted in my Commentary, that the contemporary poet Sidonius almost adopts the figure of the 2nd Trumpet in describing them. “It was,” says he, “as if Mount Caucasus [the native volcanic mountain of the Scythian Vandals], transported into burn-

¹ Gibbon vi. 189.

² Gibbon (vi. 187) inserts *Greece* before Sicily, but with the date 461—467. I here eliminate *Greece*, because its ravaging by Genseric's fleet was not till 467.

³ Sardinia had been momentarily taken from the Vandals just before, by the great Roman naval expedition in 468.

ing Africa, did thence yearly cast its desolating fires on our coasts." ¹

Last as to *Attila*. Respecting him my reader will observe, by reference to the historic sketch in my Commentary,² that into that which might be considered the *Eastern third proper* (the same that constituted Maximin's and Licinius' dominion successively, when making the last war against Christianity) *Attila never penetrated*. The surplusage of his desolations, I mean over and above those on the lines of the Upper Danube and the Rhine in the Western empire, and on its Alpine fountains and valleys, was confined to those parts of the Eastern Illyricum which in the prophecy, as I conceive, were considered in a manner distinct from both *the one prophetic third*, and *the other prophetic third*, or *Eastern third* and *Western third* of the Roman world.—Now, as before intimated, the fact of some surplusage of action, beyond the sphere specially marked out in prophecy, seems by no means to negative the application of that prophecy to a particular agent. It suffices, I conceive, to show that the *grand* and *chief* sphere of the agent's destroying action was the particular territory or empire particularly marked out in the prophecy. Was the Turks' destroying career restricted to the Greek Byzantine empire? Assuredly not. But it was the *chief* sphere of their destroyings and of their success. And so I conceive that both Mr. Birks and myself are justified in explaining

¹ Hinc Vandalus hostis
Urget, et in nostrum numerosa classe quotannis
Militat excidium: conversoque ordine fati,
Torrida Caucaseos infert mihi Byrsa furores.

On which passage Gibbon observes, "the poet seems inspired by his subject; and expresses a strong idea by a lively image." vi. 187.—I presume that the *furores Caucaseos* are meant of volcanic fires; as I know not what other *furores* of a mountain could well be said to be cast upon a country. That Caucasus is one of the mountain-ranges of volcanic action will be found stated in the scientific Treatises on such subjects.

With regard to the 2nd Trumpet's figure, and reference of it to the burning "*furores*" of Caucasus, as transported into Africa and the neighbouring seas, the following illustrative passage has met my eye in Zornlin's *Recreations in Physical Geography*, p. 272, on "Volcanic Regions." After stating that there is a marked indication of energetic subterranean heat between the Caspian and Black Seas, and that in this [Caucasean] region, near Baku in Azerbaijan there is situated the remarkable tract called *The field of fire*,—a tract which is the native country of Zoroaster,—the writer proceeds to speak of the inexhaustible springs of *naphtha* in it. This, he observes, from its lightness floats on water; and that "the inhabitants by the Caspian frequently in calm weather form a splendid exhibition by pouring whole tons of it into that sea. Being then set on fire, and borne on the surface of the waves, it presents the appearance of a *sea of flames*."

² See pp. 380—382 *suprà*.

them to be the Euphratean horsemen entrusted with the special commission under the 6th Trumpet, "that they should destroy *the third* of the men." The case is the same here.

So ends my reply to Mr. Birks' objections. Of course my readers will not forget further the corroboration of the view of the Apocalyptic *third part* here advocated which arises out of the fact of the next or 4th Trumpet's symbolization of *the eclipse of the third part of the sun moon and stars*, in the Apocalyptic firmament, coinciding so strikingly, both in respect of subject matter and of chronology, with the next great event on the page of Roman history, viz. *the extinction of the Western emperors and empire*. I have at p. 359 noticed this, as that which originally predisposed me to my view of *the third part* in the four first Trumpets; and at p. 382—385 have illustrated it from history. If any one would wish more distinctly to realize the strength of its corroborative evidence, let him look to what theorists holding Mr. Birks' views have to offer in its stead. Of necessity they cannot expound it to mean *the extinction of the Eastern emperors and empire*: for there occurred no such extinction, at the time preceding the 5th or Saracenic Trumpet, to which Mr. B. refers it. It means, he says, the *partial obscuration or eclipse* of the Eastern empire, A.D. 540—622, from Justinian to Heraclius. But, on Mr. B.'s theory of *the third part*, the *third of the sun* must needs mean *the whole imperial ruling power* of the Eastern or Byzantine empire; and its eclipse consequently the eclipse of its *whole* imperial power, i. e. its *total eclipse*, or *extinction*. And, besides that there was no such total eclipse of it in the æra referred to, we have to remember that the æra is one that includes at its commencement some of Justinian's triumphs in Italy; and issues at its close, immediately before Mahomet and the Saracens, in Heraclius' splendid course of victory against the Persian invaders of his empire: which splendour Gibbon, as cited by Mr. B. himself,¹ compares to "the brightness of the meridian sun."

¹ p. 225.

§ 4.—OBJECTIONS ON MY EXPLANATION AND APPLICATION OF
CERTAIN OF THE APOCALYPTIC SYMBOLS.

(See pp. 125—127, 505—516.)

ERE considering objections of the character above noted, it may be useful to turn retrospectively to *the Apocalyptic symbolizations* whence my inferences as to the things predicted have been drawn; seeing that already almost the whole body of the Apocalyptic symbolic imagery has been brought into play.

It will have been observed by intelligent readers that there is the greater facility for comprehending and forming a judgment on the correctness or incorrectness of my application of them, from the circumstance of my having regarded and explained the symbolizations, more certainly than any preceding expositor, as having some of them a certain local fixedness and permanence on the Apocalyptic scene; so as to serve, in fact, like a kind of *point d'appui* for all that was more passing and changeable.—Thus I have throughout supposed *the temple*, with its triple divisions, to have constituted the foreground of vision to St. John; and all, agreeably with St. Paul's use of the figure, as emblematic of *the Christian Church*:—the Holy of Holies, with God's throne in it, and its saintly and angelic attendants, representing that part of the Church which has past into his heavenly presence; the Holy place, with its golden incense-altar, the earthly worshipping Church as apparent distinctively to the eyes of God; and the open altar-court, with its brazen altar of burnt sacrifice, the same earthly worshipping Church as visible (like the corresponding court in the Mosaic tabernacle and the temple of Solomon) before the eyes of men. Again, I have throughout supposed *the Apostle St. John* to have sustained the character of representative of the apostolic line, through each successive age prefigured, of *the then living faithful ministers of the Gospel*: always with a Christian eye observing what might pass upon the mundane scene; and moreover, on two *extraordinary* occasions, himself speaking and acting. Once more, I throughout regard *the Apocalyptic landscape*, which was stretched out beneath and around the Apostle St. John and the temple with which he was associated, to have been the fixed miniature of the Roman world; with its sea and land, its chief political divisions, and its fron-

tier rivers too, (e. g. the Euphrates,) marked upon it; and with its firmamental sky, and sun moon and stars, as figures of the place of political elevation, and of the chief ruling dignities.—For this general view of the intent of the several symbols specified I gave reason, as we past on, from other Scriptures couched under the same imagery, and where their meaning is clear and undoubted. Nor indeed was there any material novelty in this my general view of them; various other expositors of successive ages having taken much the same.¹ What was more [new was, as I just now said, the carrying out the idea of them as the permanent standing scenery of the Apocalyptic prefigurative drama: and rigidly construing the phænomena that successively past on one part of the standing scene or another, and the subsidiary symbolic impersonations also that from time to time appeared on it, with reference to the local spot of their appearance, as well as to the chronological order of time and succession.—Hence, on the one hand, certain distinct and very³ important inferences, which had previously been more or less overlooked by expositors:—for example, as drawn from the Apocalyptic *temple-symbol*, my inferences severally as to the intent of the vision of palm-bearers seen by St. John to enter it, at the time when the tempest-winds were just about to burst upon the Roman earth under the 6th Seal; that of the incense-offering in it on the opening of the 7th Seal; that of St. John's measuring it, as will appear in my 2nd Volume, and casting out certain heathen abominations from its altar-court, ere the ending of the 6th Trumpet-woe; and as to that of its appearing opened to the world, with those holy mysteries of God's gospel-covenant which its ark symbolized, in visible local association some way with the firmamental sky of the Apocalyptic standing scenery, at the æra of the opening of the 7th Trumpet, and during the outpouring of its 7 Vials.² Hence too, on the other hand, as already hinted, a far greater facility of testing the correctness of an exposition of the symbols; professing, as it does, to view them as thus continuously and consistently significant.

On my construction of these *standing local symbols* there have been

¹ See on the Apocalyptic scenery and symbolization my primary and introductory notice, Vol. i. pp. 97—104.—My copious sketch of the history of Apocalyptic interpretation, in the Appendix to my 4th Volume, will afford to the readers ample facility for comparing my views on this point with those of other previous expositors.

² See this Vol. i. pp. 298—305, 327—337; also Vol. ii. Part iii. Ch. vi. § 2, and Vol. iii. Part v. Ch. i.

made two chief but almost contrary objections :—viz. 1st, that urged by futurists, who would have the Apocalyptic *temple* to be literally that of Jerusalem, and the *firmament*, (in the 6th Seal at least,) with its sun moon and stars, to be the literal firmament physically convulsed at Christ's second coming ; views altogether and palpably untenable, in my apprehension, and on which I have elsewhere fully entered :¹ 2ndly, that made by certain historical expositors opposed to my view of the details of some chief *local divisions of the Apocalyptic earth*, (the often recurring *third* more especially,) and who prefer to construe the sea, land, rivers, &c., as meant wholly and only in an emblematic sense, not a chorographic or territorial : on which point of difference I have also sufficiently entered, where the course of the exposition brought the subject before us.²

There remain the objections made to my view of certain of the *detached symbolic living figures*, or *impersonations*, that were exhibited from time to time on one part or other of the Apocalyptic scene : among which that made by Mr. Lord of New York against my view of *the horses and horsemen of the four first Seals*, and that made both by himself and others³ against my view of *the Euphratean horses and horsemen of the 6th Trumpet*, seem to me best to deserve notice ; as being each specimens of a class, and specimens perhaps of all others the most notable and characteristic.

I. THE HORSEMEN AND HORSES OF THE FOUR FIRST SEALS.

Mr. Lord's objections to my view on this part of the Apocalyptic visions were expressed primarily and more moderately in his own Comment on the Apocalypse, published at New York in 1847, a year after the publication of the 3rd Edition of my *Horæ* ; afterwards, and in language less becoming and moderate, in a review of my Book in Dr. Berg's Protestant Quarterly Review, Philadelphia, 1848. In the latter publication he reiterates his main objection so often, that I should think it must have been wearisome to himself as well as to his

¹ See generally my examination of the Futurist Schemes in the 2nd Part of the Appendix to my 4th Volume, Sect. 3 and 4 : also my notice on the 6th Seal in the Paper preceding the present in this Appendix, ad fin. ; and that on the temple-altar in the Appendix to Vol. ii.

² See on my view of "the third part," &c., not only my primary argument pp. 353—365 *suprà* ; but also my supplementary Paper, No. IV., Sect. 3 in the Appendix to this same Volume : further, on the mixt symbolic and chorographic force of the emblems, *ib.* p. 103.

³ Especially the Rev. T. K. Arnold.

readers. He affirms it however to involve *a great law of true symbolic interpretation*;¹ one hidden, not from the author of the *Horæ* only, but from the mass of prophetic expositors alike of our own and of preceding ages. And thus probably to his own mind he has justified that unwearied repetition of the same thing, by the thought alike of its importance, and of its having been until his own enunciation of it a hidden secret.²

The objection has reference to my expounding the horsemen of the three first Seals to be representative symbols, each one of a class or succession of men to whom in real life such badges attached as attach to the horsemen in vision. After quoting from my Book passages in which I state this as my guiding principle in the interpretation of those introductory symbolizations of the Apocalyptic prophecy,³ he objects that quite a different law of interpretation of prophetic symbols is laid down by Christ himself, or by the angel communicator with St. John: to the effect that the symbols are not *specimens* of, or of *the same order* with, what they represent; the stars in vision denoting not stars, but messengers of the Churches;

¹ So in the Section on "the Laws of symbolic Representation," at pp. 22—36 in his Exposition. "The symbols of the Apocalypse and all the prophets are taken, in all cases where the subject is of a nature to admit it, from objects or phenomena of a *different* class from those which they are employed to represent. . . Thus, when symbols like the four first Seals are drawn from the military and civil chiefs of the Roman empire, they denote, *not* such actors and actions in that civil and military state, but analogous agents and agencies in some other body of men." p. 25. "This is the first great law of symbolization." p. 28, &c. And so in his Review of the *Horæ*, pp. 7, 8, &c.

² "Mr. Elliott's faults are not wholly peculiar to him. . . There are works issued every year on the Apocalypse and Daniel that are marked by the same misconceptions. There is not one indeed of the long series who have published on the symbolic prophecies since the Reformation, who has entered into any inquiry whether these symbols are to be interpreted as mere specimens of the agents and acts which they foreshow, or as representations of agents and agencies of a different order. There is not one who has not, without assigning any reason, explained them partly on one of these hypotheses, and partly on another. . . Their explanations accordingly are not grounded on any law. They are mere systems of ignorant conjecture, and rash assertion; inconsistent with themselves, and without authority from the prophecy. In the many volumes of Mede, Whiston, Daubuz, Cressener, Bishop Newton, Faber, Cunningham, Frere, Keith, Habershon, and a crowd of others, there is not we believe a single explication that can be vindicated on any of the views which they have advanced on the nature of symbols. This is a startling truth." *Berg's Protestant Review* for 1848, p. 106.

This is a specimen, though indeed but an inadequate one; of Mr. Lord's style of criticism:—made up as it is of sentences of the same objurgations, repeated again and again with little variation. Like a succession of driving hail-gusts, having no solidity or hardness but that of its own dogmatic assertions, it will be found to melt innocuously almost as soon as it comes into contact with its object.

³ e. g. Vol. i. p. 127, and also in my general Preface.

the candlesticks churches, not candlesticks; the heads of the wild Beast orders of human rulers, &c., the horns dynasties of kings. Which being so this must be taken as *the law* of prophetic symbols: and so my construction of the three first Apocalyptic horsemen set aside, as resting on a different interpretative principle.¹ Such is his objection.—But can it stand? Surely it scarce needs any suggestion of mine to make the more intelligent of my readers recognise the unphilosophical nature of Mr. Lord's generalizing induction from certain particular examples of symbolization. In order to establish a "*law*" of symbols, such as he talks about, he ought to have cited and examined into *all* the exemplifications of symbolic prophecy given in the Bible; and seen whether his rule, or law, would apply to all. Had he done so he would have found that facts were in other cases directly against him. In Pharaoh's dream, e. g. the seven good ears of corn, and the seven withered ears, were *specimen-symbols* of seven harvests of good ears of corn, and seven harvests of withered ears respectively.² And the same too of the seven fat kine, and the seven lean kine. Again, turning to the Apocalypse, we have St. John as the living representative on the scene of vision of faithful ministers of the apostolic spirit; and the two sackcloth-robed witnesses as representatives of a class and line of witnesses for Christ's truth, through successive ages, such as the Paulikians, Waldenses, &c., of the same order and character that is ascribed to the two witnesses: and this, not according to *my* view only, but according to *Mr. Lord's* own view and interpretation.³ Hence, himself being the judge, his supposed general "*law*" of prophetic symbols proves to be no law at all; but only an unwarranted cramping and narrowing of the symbolizations, in a prophecy where God has markedly used them in all the noble fulness and variety of the imagery of other Scripture. Which being the case, his objection to my exposition of the *representative* symbols of the three first Seals at once falls to the ground.

Such is Mr. L.'s grand objection to my interpretation of these in-

¹ Review, pp. 4, 5, 6, 7, &c. To make my absurdity the more evident he adds:—"On Mr. E.'s theory the wild Beast of seven heads and ten horns would foreshow that a monster precisely like itself was to appear on the earth." p. 8. Also p. 4, &c. Mr. L., as before said, is never weary of repeating the same objurgation, or objurgatory argument.

² Somewhat similarly Josephus, B. J. ii. 7. 3, speaks of Archelaus having seen in a dream nine *ears* of corn, in signification of nine years of reigning: each *ear* being the representative, as Mr. Greswell observes, (i. 274,) of a *harvest*.

³ Lord's Commentary, pp. 25, 251, 253, &c.

troductory Seals. I see that he adds, as a further though lesser objection, that in construing the *horse* to mean the Roman people, or something of a *different* order from the symbol, while the *horseman* is construed to mean, in each of the three first Seals, something of the *same* order of agents, I am inconsistent with myself, as well as with the Scriptural law of symbols. In answer to this it will suffice to refer him to Zech. x. 3, "The *Lord of hosts* hath made them [the house of Judah] as his *goodly horse* in the battle." Here the *Lord of hosts*, the *rider*, is the Lord himself; yet the *horse* ridden is the symbol of *the Jews*.

Ere concluding this head I must beg to express my satisfaction at the testimony given by him, even when making his objections, to the accuracy of my historical application of the very various and peculiar badges of the symbols of the three several Seals: copying, as he all but does, my own explanations of the symbolic impersonations. For he makes the horseman of the symbol of the 1st Seal to be "doubtless Trajan, who in the year 96, immediately after the visions in Patmos, was adopted by Nerva;" and adds that "Hadrian and the Antonines, who followed him, princes of a similar character, and under whom the empire continued to flourish, may also be considered as embodied in the horseman;"¹—further, that "the individual taken for the symbol of the 2nd Seal is perhaps Quadratus, [the Prætorian Prefect,] the first in the long series of conspirators and usurpers, that rapidly followed each other from the beginning of the reign of Commodus to the accession of Diocletian; . . . which usurpers and rivals took peace from the earth:"²—also that the symbol of the 3rd Seal is similarly "taken from political life in the Roman empire, and is a ruler who reduces his subjects to want and misery by taxation; as is denoted first by the *balance*, the symbol of a civil magistrate, as a *bow* or a *sword* is of a warrior; next by the *wheat* and *barley*, the *oil* and the *wine*, which indicate that he exercises authority over those articles; thirdly, by the *price*, which implies that he determines the rates at which they are to be valued: . . . and finally by the colour of the horse, which is indicative of affliction." Moreover, as to the exact person or time intended in this symbol of the 3rd Seal, Mr. Lord, still copying the Horæ, adds that "it is doubtless *Caracalla*, who commenced a system of excessive taxation, and was followed by a long train of similar oppressors."³

¹ Review, p. 67.² *Ib.* pp. 74, 75.³ *Ib.* pp. 105, 109.

So writes he, accordantly with myself, as to the prototype of these several symbols; though in the most marvellous manner, and by the rule of contraries, making them to *mean* something quite different from those actors themselves and their actions. For he supposes these successful Roman warriors, military usurpers, and oppressors by taxation, to be severally but types of other actors, somewhat similar in character, and of nearly the same commencing date, but with agency only in matters of *religion* and *the Church*. Now, where any one expositor is a declared and vehement antagonist to the system of another, it cannot of course but be peculiarly satisfactory to the latter to find his antagonist thus, by borrowing and copying from him some of the most characteristic, original, and important points in his commentary, doing homage, albeit without acknowledgment or confession, to its truth and accuracy.¹

II. THE HORSES AND HORSEMEN FROM THE EUPHRATES, OF THE 6TH TRUMPET.

I select this example of detached symbols of a *different* character from what they symbolized, as being perhaps of all others the most complex and peculiar, i. e. according to the interpretation of it given in the *Horæ*;² and consequently that against which one might à priori have expected that objections would be made. And, as it was to have been expected, so it has proved. The Rev. T. K. Arnold has here been the chief objector. And I think that I cannot better exhibit to the reader a view of the objections to which the interpretation is subject, and answers that may be given, than by citing from my reply to him in the *British Magazine* of June 1847 that part which relates to some chief details of the symbols, and my explanations of those details severally.

Let me premise that, as St. John tells us that he only *heard* the *number* of the Euphratean horsemen, it is my impression that what

¹ The rather because Mr. L. often accuses me of *historical* inaccuracy.—On other points, if Mr. Lord will look more carefully into the thing, he will find that his accusations of me on the score of inaccuracy are generally founded on his own misrepresentations either of me, or of historic fact. Where such is not the case, had he used my 3rd Edition, (an Edition published a year before his own Commentary, and two years before his Review,) instead of the 1st, he would, I believe, have found the few *real* incorrectnesses noted by him already corrected.

² So given there, as the reader knows, after many other expositors, from Foxe downwards. See my *History of Apocalyptic Interpretation* in the Appendix to Vol. iv. Sections 5 and 6.—The complexity and peculiarity of the symbol will appear indeed in every interpretation of it.

he saw in the vision was but one individual horse and horseman. For though it is said, "Thus I saw *the horses* and *them that sate on them*," in the plural, yet it is not very infrequent with the evangelists to use the plural for the singular.¹ Supposing which to be the case here, there is no need to apply what appeared in the monstrous form seen in the vision to each particular horse and horseman of the whole number. Rather it might be construed as a collective symbolic type, like the seven-headed dragon or beast, of the whole body of the Euphratean invaders.²—This premised, I proceed with my extract from the British Magazine.

1. First comes up in Mr. Arnold's criticism and objections my explanation (after Mede and others) of the *fire smoke* and *sulphur*, that seemed to issue from the horses' mouths in vision, as symbolic of the artillery to which, as a principal instrumentality, both modern and earlier historians refer the capture of Constantinople by the Turks, and consequent destruction of the Greek Empire. "And the heads of horses were as the heads of lions, and out of their mouths issued fire, and smoke, and sulphur: by which three was the third part of the men killed; by the fire, the smoke, and the sulphur, which issued out of their mouths."—On this, and my explanation of the fire smoke and sulphur all conjointly, as the one destroying agency of artillery, Mr. Arnold objects thus. "We have here *three* destructive agencies, emphatically distinguished as *separate agencies*. It is first stated generally that the third part of men was destroyed by these three; and then, to prevent as it were a mistake, the three are again separately enumerated, each with its own article, *by the fire*, and *by the smoke*, and *by the brimstone*."—My reply is obvious. Mr. Arnold is anxious, as we have elsewhere seen, that the Apocalyptic language should be regarded and explained as "inspired Hebrew poetry." And I therefore cannot act more in accordance with his wishes and

¹ "It is usual in the evangelists to ascribe that to *many* which agrees only to one of them. So that is said to be written in the *prophets* which is only written in *one of them*: as will be evident from comparing Mark i. 2, Mal. iii. 1; John vi. 45, Isa. liv. 13; Acts xiii. 40, Hab. i. 5. See Glasse, Lib. iii. tr. 1. de Nomine, Can. 27." Whitby on Luke xxiii. 40. Elsewhere, on Matt. xxvii. 38, Whitby illustrates the same from comparison of Luke xxiii. 36, John xix. 29, saying that the *soldiers* brought Christ vinegar, with Matt. xxvii. 48, Mark xv. 36, saying that *one of the soldiers* did it:—also Matt. xxvi. 8, saying that the *disciples* had indignation, with John xii. 4 saying that *one of the disciples* had indignation.

² This will be an answer to some objections by Mr. Lord.

his judgment than by referring, on the point of objection here mooted by him, to the use of similar constructions of language in the writings of the Old Testament. Take then the example in Levit. xiv. 52. I read there; "And he shall cleanse the house with the blood of the bird, and with the running water, and with the living bird, and with the cedar wood, and with hyssop, and with the scarlet." According to the rule laid down by my critic against me, all these ought to be separate and distinct agencies of purification. But what, in fact, was the case? That the blood of the bird killed was to be received in and mixed with the running water, then the cedar-wood hyssop and scarlet together dipped in it, and then the mingled blood and water sprinkled by them on the house; *all uniting together* to constitute one single act of purification. Take another example from Gen. xix. 24; which I adduce, though otherwise less appropriate than the former one, because two of the self-same instrumentalities of destruction are specified as in the case under discussion. "Then the Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone (or sulphur) and fire from the Lord out of heaven; and he overthrew those cities, &c." Was the fire here spoken designative of one agency of destruction, the sulphur of another; the first altogether separate and distinct from the second? By no means. "Quum duo nomina substantiva, vel synonyma vel diversæ significationis, jungantur, eorum alterum vicem adjectivi cum emphasi sustinet: ut hic, *Et pluit sulphur et ignem*; id est, *ignem sulphureum*." So Robertson in his *Clavis Pentateuchi*, ad loc.: and I observe that Rosenmüller compares Gen. iii. 16, "I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception;" in the sense of thy sorrow *in*, or *as connected with*, thy conception.—Mr. Arnold advances yet another argument against my explanation; viz. that it is *the balls of lead* propelled by means of an explosive power, of which the brimstone is indeed one ingredient, "that are the real instruments of destruction in the modern artillery; while the fire and smoke, by which the explosion is accompanied, are both *perfectly innocuous*." But are they indeed innocuous, if considered causally? It is curious to contrast Chalcondylas' notice of the invention of gunpowder and cannon, and of the Othman Turks' use of them against his country and people, with this statement of Mr. Arnold's; "Omnis potentia *in ignem*, ut causam, referenda est." And, on the question, whether an intermediate causal agency may not properly have the final effect predicated of it, let us refer again to

examples in the Hebrew Scriptures for information. We there read David's prayer, Ps. li. 7; "Purge me with *hyssop*, and I shall be clean." Was then the *hyssop* by itself in any wise of purifying efficacy? Its only efficacy consisted in applying the blood of purification. Again, to cite another example, we read in Daniel ix. 27 of *the abomination making desolate*. Now if we explain this, as most expositors do, of the idol-standards that accompanied the Roman army which besieged and destroyed Jerusalem, were these standards, we ask, the actual *instruments* of Jerusalem's destruction and desolation? They were but, we know, that destroying army's *innocuous*, though significant and necessary, accompaniments. Still more does the case apply to my purpose, if we explain the phrase to mean the *Jewish abomination of sin*, brought into the temple, as inducing God's judgment.¹ As to the propriety of depicting the fire smoke and sulphur as issuing from the horses' mouths, if intending to *figure*, so as I construe it, the fire smoke and sulphur *literally* combined in the discharge from the Turkish artillery against Greek Christendom, it may perhaps be well to suggest as an illustrative parallel that well-known and awful passage in Isaiah xxx. 27, 33: where, with reference to the fire and sulphur literally destined to be employed in the final judgment on this our earth, (for I suppose it will be allowed that there is in the passage this reference,) they are depicted by an anthropathic figure as proceeding from the Almighty's mouth, and kindled by his breath.²

I have now gone through Mr. Arnold's objections on this head; objections on the strength of which he is pleased to designate this particular in my solution, as "not only very unsatisfactory, but *absolutely absurd*:" and my appeal is to the intelligent and candid reader, whether Mr. A. has been successful in proving its absurdity *at all*.—I must not pass on without adding that he has here further favoured us with a detached fragment and specimen of his own

¹ Such is the opinion I incline to on that passage. See it exprest to that effect in the Appendix to my Vol. iv. Part ii. § 5.—And so nearly, as I have learnt since that was written, Dr. Alford (now Dean of Canterbury) is inclined to explain it.

² "Behold the name of the Lord cometh from far, burning with his anger: his lips are full of indignation, and his tongue as a devouring fire.—For Tophet is ordained of old; yea, for the king it is prepared; the pile thereof is fire and much wood: the breath of the Lord, like a stream of brimstone, doth kindle it." I presume Mr. Arnold will not differ from me in supposing an ultimate reference to the great conflagration and judgment. Compare Ps. xviii. 8; "There went up a smoke out of his nostrils, and a consuming fire out of his mouth."

counter-view of the Apocalyptic symbol; a favour the more to be prized as it is so rare. "The smoke," he remarks, "as being itself one of the *τρεις πληγαι*, must be a *thick pestilential vapour* emitted by the avenging monsters." But *must*, as I have had occasion to observe more than once before in this controversy, is a word often used somewhat rashly and inconsiderately by Mr. Arnold. Will he have the goodness to mention where in sacred Scripture the word *καπνος*, or its Hebrew equivalent, is used *per se* to signify a destructive pestilential vapour? Even the example from Ovid, (and how, with his sensitiveness about treating the Apocalypse otherwise than as inspired Hebrew poetry, could he resort to such an illustration?) I say, even this example from Ovid of the brazen-footed bulls of Colchus seems ill to support him; as it was not from anything pestilential in the bulls' breath, but from the heat of the fiery blast, that the surrounding herbage is fabled to have been dried up and withered.¹—Moreover, by the exegetic law that he has laid down for himself and others, he is bound to explain the sulphur, equally with the smoke and fire, as separately and by itself a distinct agency of destruction. But how such an acting of the pure sulphur, whether explained literally or figuratively? I cannot but think that if he will be so good as to favour us with his explanation of this particular of the symbol, and also of the "avenging monsters" themselves, of whose description it constitutes a part, Mr. A. will find that he has involved himself in difficulties of which the solution will not be easy.²

2. We come next to the *horse-tails*. "For the horses' power is in their mouth and in their tails:³ for their tails were like unto serpents, having heads; and with these they do injury (*αδικουσι*), or injustice."

On the "*have*" and the "*associated with*," I do not wish to enter further: save and except to protest against Mr. A.'s assertion, as quite unwarranted, that I must know "that the question, whether we *are*, or *are not*, *associated with* the things we *have*, was never mooted, and is entirely irrelevant." I neither did know it, nor know it now. It seemed to me, and still seems, to have been very much

¹ "Tactæque vaporibus herbæ Arent."

² Mr. Arnold says that "my solution contains no explanation of the agreement between the fire, smoke, and brimstone, and the *θωρακας πυρινοvs υακιωθιοvs* (= nigricantes or ferrugineous) *θειωδεις*." He has overlooked my remark in the *Horæ* (see p. 509 *suprà*) that these adjectives significative of colour seem to have been chosen with reference to the *πυρ καπνος* and *θειον* so prominent in the symbol; as symbols were frequently borrowed from anything remarkable in the living type.

³ So the MSS. of the best authority.

the hinge on which his irony about that part of my interpretation turned.¹ And, as unthinking readers are often caught by burlesque and irony, I thought it both fair and right to shape my reply in a form of burlesque in return. But let that pass. As an almost universal rule, the less of burlesque that is introduced with controversy about sacred subjects the better. And, as I remain fully persuaded of the propriety and truth of my solution of this part of the Apocalyptic symbol, let me endeavour to propose and support it in a manner which I almost hope will convince Mr. Arnold himself that it is not so liable as he has supposed to objection.

The horses then in the symbol *had* tails; and these horse-tails, ending as they did in serpent-like heads, (for such seems evidently to have been the nature of the heads,) presented to the view a serpent-like appearance. Agreed thus far, we are also agreed, it would appear, in the opinion that there must have been some pointed intent and meaning in so singular a part of the symbol. But, if so, what the meaning and the force according to Mr. Arnold? His reference to the real or fabulous amphisbena (itself singularly inappropriate, as it seems to me, even for that purpose²) was only suggested, he himself now tells us, "as an illustration of a head placed at the end of the tail." But he further suggests, after Heinrichs and Ewald, that these serpent-like heads at the end of the tail emitted fire smoke and brimstone, as well as the lion-like heads in front; in order thus both to add to the terribleness of the symbol, and to show in what manner the serpent-like tails took their part (as he asserts it is directly stated that they did) in the destruction of the third part of men. On which let me observe that his assertion on this point seems to be grounded on a mis-reading of the sacred record. For, instead of "the death of the third part of men by the fire smoke and brimstone being connected with the statement about the tails being like serpents by the conjunction *for*," so as Mr. Arnold asserts, there is an intervening clause, headed by the same conjunction, between the one clause and the other.³ Moreover there seems in that

¹ See the quotation from his pamphlet given by Mr. Arnold, *British Magazine*, p. 424.

² Because it is *no other* part whatsoever of the symbol but the horse-tails that is noted as presenting a snake-like appearance; and, consequently, all that was snake-like was, as a snake, *with but one head*. It is easy to see how the horse-tails, if at all twisted, as we often see them in real life, in serpentine folds, and with a snake's head at the end, might present the appearance described.

³ "By these three (plagues) was the third part of men killed; by the fire, and by

same record an express distinction between the effect of the lion-like heads as *killing*, and the serpent-like heads as *doing injury or injustice*. As to the idea of the tails emitting fire brimstone and smoke, it exists only in the imagination of the expositors ; and, in the absence of any express scriptural declaration on the subject, it appears to me that we are bound to suppose the intended mode of the symbolic serpent-heads, which were appended to the horse-tails, doing injury, to have been the same as that in which serpent-heads in real life do injury ;—namely by their bite and the venom discharged with it. Thus Mr. Arnold's suggestions seem in no way to help us to any rational explanation of the purport of this very remarkable particular in the Apocalyptic symbol. Nor do I know any view of the symbol which offers it, except that which I advocate : which view, as the reader knows, supposes the horse-tails in the vision to have prefigured the horse-tail standards of the Turkish Pashas, and so the Pashas themselves ; who, following in course after the overthrow of the Greek empire, oppressed, and with venom like as of poisoned serpents embittered, the lives of the subjected Greek provincials. The only question is, whether this explanation be admissible, as that which is accordant with the analogy of other parallel scriptural symbolic imagery, or not.

The reader will have observed that all which my solution requires to be allowed me is, that to the body of an animal symbolizing a nation, there may properly be appended the badge of some ruling magistracy of that nation, in sign of the magistrates themselves ; and, further, that to this badge there may be appended, in addition, some emblem indicative both of the personality attached in the divine idea to the badge spoken of, and also of the character of them to whom it should belong.

And to show that I am warranted in requiring this admission there is nothing more needed, I believe, than that I refer to two scriptural examples for authority and illustration. My first *example* is from Ezek. xix. 10, &c. We have there a figure of Judah and its ruling magistrates borrowed from the vegetable world. "Thy mother is like a vine planted by the waters : . . and she had strong rods, for the sceptres of them that bear rule : . . but she was plucked up in

the smoke, and by the sulphur, which issued out of their mouths. For their power is in their mouth, and in their tails. For their tails were like unto serpents, having heads ; and with these (*ἀδικουσι*) they do injury."

fury ; and her strong rods were broken." Here the vine that had strong rods for the sceptres was a symbol of the Jewish nation : and the strong rods, which were a part of the vine, (just as much a part of it as the horse-tails of the horses,) designated the sceptres, or magisterial badges, of them that bore rule, and so the rulers themselves. Respecting the character of these rulers, however, and their official rule, no intimation was to be given ; and therefore the addition of no further emblem was there required. Not so in my second example from Daniel vii. We there read of a *little horn* rising among other horns from out of the head of the fourth Beast, "*with eyes as the eyes of a man.*" Now the Beast itself depicted, as we know, the body of the fourth and last great ruling mundane empire ; and the horn, from being a common symbol in the sacred writings for ruling power and strength, was taken to signify the king himself to whom that power would attach ; while further, to express the character of this king—in other words, of Antichrist,—there were added eyes, as the eyes of a man, at the extremity of the horn ; in signification either of Antichrist's craft, or of his pretensions to a universal episcopate. Surely, with the exception that the emblem in Daniel appeared in *front* of the body of the symbolic animal, that in the Apocalyptic passage under discussion *behind*, the parallelism between the two is obvious ; and quite sufficient to justify my interpretation as one not unaccordant with the analogy of Scripture.

But this, says my critic further, "is such a *riddle-making* style of dealing with the prophetic Scriptures as deadens all sense of meanness and incongruity, even in men of cultivated minds." It is not the first or second time that Mr. A. has thus pointed his satire against the *riddle-making*, as he is pleased to call it, or *riddle-solving*, in the Horæ. Thus, in the Letter now before us, with reference to the allusion supposed by me in the prophecy to the Turkish dress, he writes thus ; "This literal (!) fulfilment of what such a fulfilment would turn into an inspired conundrum:" and again, in an earlier Letter, with reference to my supposition of an allusion to Nerva's Cretan extraction, in explanation of the bow in the hand of the rider of the white horse, "It is a conundrum unintelligible for any but the genealogist."¹ I have thus been led to reflect what it is precisely that he means by such remarks ; and what the view he takes, and would

¹ See British Magazine for March 1846, p. 332.

require to be taken, of prophecy and its dark sayings; but I have reflected in vain. Mr. Arnold does not surely mean to deny that it was intended there should be riddles or enigmas in prophecy; enigmas such as the fulfilment alone would or could explain. What, to take a case or two from unsymbolic prophecy, of Elisha's prediction to the nobleman in Samaria, "Thou shalt see the plenty with thine eyes, but shalt not eat thereof?"¹ What of Ezekiel's saying about Zedekiah; "I will bring him to Babylon, yet shall he not see it, though he shall die there."² These were riddles only to be explained in the fulfilment. And so too, to take a case of prophetic symbol, how was the full propriety of the symbol of a *he-goat* to designate the Macedonian empire discoverable, until that very symbol had been stamped, and known to be stamped, on Macedonian coinage?³ Nay, if we turn to Mr. Arnold's own view of the present prophecy, what does it present to us, in whole and in part, but *an immense enigma*; only to be resolved, if he suppose its solution to be ever intended, by some extraordinary facts and phenomena yet future:—viz. the enigma of "avenging monsters," that are to kill men by smoke, in the sense of pestilential vapour, and also by fire, each as a distinct separate agency; and, in order to this, to make their discharges from the *tails* as well as from the *heads*!!⁴ In truth it seems to me, judging from prophecies which all Christians allow to have been fulfilled, that not only while a prediction remains unfulfilled, but even after its meaning on all main points has been made clear by the fulfilment, there may still be expected to remain in it certain minor details, that will continue to present somewhat of difficulty and of enigma to the accurate investigator.

Finally, let it be remembered, as indeed already before intimated,⁵ that both this figuration and that of the scorpion-locusts in the 5th Trumpet, which are decidedly the boldest and most complex of all the Apocalyptic symbolizations, are used in reference to *Asiatics*, whose own style of writing and speaking most deals in such imagery. See, in proof of this, the very illustrative description, by a Turkish

¹ 2 Kings vii. 2, 17.

² Ezek. xii. 13; 2 Kings xxv. 7.

³ See Dan. viii. 5. I have given an engraving of a Macedonian coin with this device in the 3rd Volume of the *Horæ*.

⁴ As a further illustration of the absurdity of certain semi-German critics that impeach the Turkish historical interpretation, let me refer to M. Stuart. "The Turks and other Orientals train their horses to the assault with the hinder part as well as with the front!!"

⁵ See p. 516 *suprà*.

historian, of the same subject of the Turkish artillery, given p. 512 *suprà*; in which description imagery is used similar to, and almost as highly figurative as, the Apocalyptic.¹ In truth, so applied, they are just as appropriate and characteristic as the simpler symbols of the first four Seals in their application to *Roman* subjects: and thus, like the former, in the very fact of their boldness, and, as Mr. A. calls it, grotesqueness, do but furnish additional evidence in proof of the ever marked propriety of the Apocalyptic figuration and the truth of my historic interpretation.

¹ It may be well to suggest further, for comparison, a somewhat highly figurative personification of modern war, with its use of artillery, even by a non-Asiatic poet, Lord Byron, in his *Childe Harold*, i. 39:--

“See where the giant on the mountain stands,
 His blood-red tresses deepening in the sun,
 With death-shot glowing in his fiery hands,
 And eye that scorches all it glares upon:
 Restless it rolls, now fix’d, and now anon
 Flashing afar; and at his iron feet
 Destruction cowers, to mark what deeds are done.”

END OF VOL. I.

DATE DUE

~~JUN 15 1992~~

~~AUG 29 2003~~

~~SEP 22 2003~~

~~OCT 9 2003~~

~~FEB 18 2004~~

BS2825 .E46 1862 v.1

Horae Apocalypticæ; or, A commentary on

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00069 3673