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Preface.

If the reader should demand an apology for the length of some of the articles in this Volume of the Bibliotheca Sacra, it may perhaps be found in the fact, that the work purports to be a collection of Tracts and Essays, and was intended to exhibit a full and thorough discussion of the various topics which may at any time be taken up, so as to be of permanent value as a work of reference. The nature of it is also such, that articles cannot well be divided. It has, however, been a matter of effort with the Editor, to give to the work as great a variety as seemed compatible with these higher objects.

The publication of the last Part has been delayed, in order to effect an arrangement which will greatly add in future to the strength and resources of the work. Of this arrangement, when completed, due notice will be given.

It will be perceived that several of the communications from Palestine are from the Rev. Mr. Wolcott, who has traversed the country and explored Jerusalem with the eye of a keen and intelligent observer, and whose remarks have furnished several important corrections to the Biblical Researches in that country published by the Editor. These corrections are specified in their proper places. My sole object has ever been the truth; and as in the multitudinous details comprised in that work, I could not hope for perfect accuracy without being more than human, so I have rejoiced to make any corrections resulting from a more exact observation and a like love of the truth. In a letter dated Nov. 8th, 1842, Mr. Wolcott adds a testimony to the general accuracy of the Biblical Researches, which I venture to subjoin here, for two reasons: first, because, as his corrections of that work have been spread before the public, it is no more than right that his testimony in its favour should also be made known; and secondly, because intimations have reached me from various quarters, that some of its statements and positions in respect
to the topography of Jerusalem and some other places, are likely to be assailed, in carrying on a crusade in favour of the reputed site of the Holy Sepulchre. Mr. Wolcott writes as follows:

"In reference to the few slight corrections in the Biblical Researches, which I noted, and which I perceive you have published, it is but fair to say of that portion of the work which I had the opportunity of collating and verifying, that my constant surprise was, that so few mistakes should have occurred in so wide and varied an examination; and that with nothing was I more impressed, than with the minute accuracy of your observations. The few additional explorations which I attempted, were obviously suggested by the Researches. I had the advantage of standing on your platform; and was reminded, at every step, how comparatively meagre would have been my acquisitions in Palestine, without the aid of your book. And such, I venture to say, will be the experience of future observers.

"The above testimony is at your service, if you think it will be useful. Had I anticipated the publication of the corrections which I sent, I should have accompanied them with similar remarks."

Union Theological Seminary,
New York, Nov. 26th, 1843.  
  
  E. R.
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V.
THE NUMBER OF THE BEAST IN THE APOCALYPSE.

By M. Stuart, Professor in the Theological Seminary, Andover.

The first question to be asked is: To which of the two beasts described in Rev. c. 13, does the number 666 in v. 18 refer? One beast John sees ascending from the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon these horns ten diadems or crowns, and upon the heads names of blasphemy. To this beast Satan or the dragon gives his power and his throne, that is, employs him as it were his vicegerent. Divine honours and worship are challenged by this beast, and fierce and bloody persecution is carried on by him against Christians who refuse to pay the homage that he demands, Rev. 13, 2—9. A second beast, moreover, is seen by the author of the Apocalypse, rising out of the land, differing from the first in many important respects, yet animated with the like bitter hostility against the church. The nature of this second beast is graphically described by the appellation "false prophet," which is given him in Rev. 16, 13. 19, 20. 20, 10. Instead of seven horns, he is furnished with only two; and even these are said to be like the horns of a lamb. In other words, this symbol indicates, that the second beast is not possessed of the civil and military, or compulsive, power of empire; but only of a subordinate influence which is exerted in another way than that of force. The horns of a lamb present rather the show, than the reality, of weapons adapted for contest by force. But still, there are other influences not less mischievous than assault by violence. The second beast is represented as "speaking like a dragon," Rev. 13, 11. The meaning of this simile is not obscure. A dragon, according to the idiom of the New Testament, means a huge old serpent. The sly cunning and deceitfulness of the serpent have been proverbial, from the time when Satan, under the guise of a serpent, misled our first parents in paradise. The second beast, then, speaks as the dragon did on that occasion; that is, he speaks craftily, deceitfully, in a manner adapted to allure and ruin those whom he addresses.
The writer of the Apocalypse goes on to exhibit the various ways in which he deceives men, and leads them to do homage to the first beast. As it is not my object at present to pursue any inquiry respecting these, I shall advert merely to what immediately precedes the text, which is the particular subject of our present attention. It is worthy of remark, what skilful jugglery is practised by the second beast, or false prophet, and how graphically John describes it. "It was given to him [the second beast] to communicate breath (πνείμα) to the image of the first beast, so that this image might even speak, and might cause that those who did not worship the image of the beast, should be slain," Rev. 13, 15. Trickery of this sort has long been well known, and often practised. The statue of Memnon, on the banks of the Nile, as Strabo tells us, was accustomed to utter a melodious sound when the sun rose, and a moaning one when it went down. Memnon, king of Ethiopia and Upper Egypt, was the fabled son of Aurora and Tithonus, and grandson of a Trojan monarch. Becoming an auxiliary to the Trojans during the siege of Troy, he was, as the story goes, slain by Achilles in single combat, and his death was very significantly commemorated by his subjects, by erecting the statue in question. Of the fact that such a statue apparently uttered sounds as above described, there is no good reason to doubt; but the cause of this has been discovered only in recent times. It was apparently occasioned by the striking of a stone in the lap of the colossal image, which gave forth a ringing sound.*

How easily the like might be done in regard to other statues, and how often it has been done, it were useless to particularize here, inasmuch as no one is any longer ignorant of such devices. Even the lips of a statue may easily be made to move by machinery nicely adapted to this purpose. Easier still is it to give the statue the appearance of breathing or expiration. A tube connected with the mouth or nostrils, and managed by an adroit person behind the scenes, would make the delusion complete.

That John speaks of these things as being actually done by the image, namely the beast breathing and speaking, is in accordance with the usual idiom of the Scriptures on such occasions. Thus is

* Wilkinson's Thebes, etc. p. 35 sq.
it in respect to the magicians of Egypt, Ex. 7, 11. 12, 22. Thus also, as most suppose, respecting the witch of En-dor, 1 Sam. 18, 11 sq. although in fact the raising of Samuel is not there attributed to the witch. It is thus that the Saviour speaks of the sons of the Pharisees as casting out demons, Matt. 12, 27. So John describes many Jews as believing on Christ, John 2, 23; although the context shows clearly that they only professed to believe on him; and the same thing occurs again in John 8, 31sq. and also in respect to Simon Magus, Acts 8, 13, comp. vs. 22. 23. It were easy to accumulate examples of the like character, which would serve to show, that when the sacred writers narrate things of such a nature as those which are now before us, they often speak in the language of common parlance, or in conformity with external appearances. This may suffice to exonerate John from the charge of believing and affirming, that the false prophet could really give breath to statues, and cause them to speak. There can be no doubt, as it seems to me, in the mind of any candid and intelligent reader, that the writer of the Apocalypse sets forth the whole doings of the second beast as matters of fraud, guile, and trickery; I mean every thing by which the false prophet contrives to make his idol resemble the true God, either in its appearance or in its achievements.

The manner in which the death of those who refuse to worship the image of the beast is brought about, may be explained in a few words. By causing the statue of the first beast to breathe, the most palpable evidence is seemingly given of a living and active spirit within. The populace, naturally convinced by such an apparently unequivocal sign of the living power and true divinity of the statue, readily obey its commands, and fall upon those who refuse to worship it with all the violence which superstition can inspire.

Nor is this all which the false prophet achieves. By his devices he occasions a decree, that all shall receive the mark of the beast, that is, of the first beast, upon their foreheads or their hands. The mark in question would openly proclaim, that all who should receive it were the worshippers of the beast, inasmuch as it was to be impressed on some part of the person which always remained uncovered. This mark was usually, among idolaters, some device or symbol expressive of something belonging to the idol-god or
his rites. When a mere symbol was employed, which was usually the case, there was something of mystery about it, which served to increase religious awe, and to show, at the same time, that the person who bore this symbol on any part of his body, was one who had been initiated into the secrets of the divinity whom he worshipped.

The second beast is as cruel as cunning. He brings it about by his artifices, that none should either buy or sell, who did not bear the mark of the first beast. In other words, those who decline to worship the first beast, are prohibited from all business—intercourse with their fellow men, and consequently from all the means of obtaining a livelihood, and are thus exposed to the miseries of starvation.

So much for the craftiness and cruelty of superstition and idolatry. But now to our main point: What is the mark or symbol, which is borne by the worshippers of the beast?

It seems to be of two kinds; two rather in appearance than in reality. No person could buy or sell unless he had the χάραγμα, i.e. the impression or stamp of the beast, either upon his forehead or his hand. But what is this χάραγμα or stamp? According to John (v. 17) it is either the name of the beast or the number of his name. The first of these seems to be the name of the beast or of his idol, written probably in letters somewhat peculiar or curious, but still readable in the common way of reading. But the second is altogether of a mysterious and symbolic character. The number of the name seems to mean, that certain letters, which are or may be expressive of some particular number, are at the same time expressive of such a name as would indicate the beast which is to be worshipped. Thus far, however, we are told only of the general nature of the second species of mark which the worshippers of the beast bore. It is quite probable, from the circumstances of the case, from the usual mysteriousness of the second kind of symbol, and from the manner in which John speaks of it, that the great mass of idol-worshippers received this second mark rather than the other. As both, however, come in the end to the same thing, both might be, and both seem to have been, allowed. But the number-symbol, it is easy to see, would naturally obtain a general preference, on account of the general mysteriousness of its character.
Having mentioned the number of his name, the writer pauses for explanation; for surely no conjecture could be formed as to what the name must be, unless some particular number should be specified. John therefore proceeds to say: Ἡ δε σοφία έστιν· ὁ έχων νῦν ψηφιάτες τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ· ἀριθμὸς γὰρ ἀνθρώπου έστι, καὶ ο ἀριθμὸς αὐτοῦ χιλιά. Here is a matter which demands the exercise of wisdom; let him who possesses understanding reckon the number of the beast, for it is the number of a man, and the number of it is 666.

Several phrases in this verse need some illustration. Here is wisdom conveys an idea somewhat different, according to Hebrew usage, from that which the words in English seem to suggest. The Jews, as appears by the Rabbinical dialect, were accustomed to call any thing πράγμα wisdom, which was said summarily, obscurely, or in the way of a mere hint. In allusion to this it is said in Prov. 1, 6, that the object of the book of Proverbs among other things is, to give understanding of “the words of the wise and their dark sayings.” Proverbial sentences are often dark, from their pithy, sententious, and frequently enigmatical character. So in the case before us; when the writer exclaims: Here is wisdom, he evidently means to say, that here is a matter which is somewhat enigmatical or obscure, for the explanation of which wisdom is needed. The sequel shows plainly that such is the sentiment; for the writer immediately adds: ὁ έχων νῦν ψηφιάτες τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, that is, ‘Let him who has the requisite intelligence, (νῦν being an equivalent for the preceding sophia,) reckon the number,’ etc. In other words: Not every person can read and understand what follows; but let him who is skilled in matters of this nature, compute what name the letters which may designate 666 will make; for this is the name of the beast.

It is worthy of remark, that John employs this mode of expression, viz. here is wisdom, only in cases where he is going to say something which is more or less obscure or enigmatical. Thus in Rev. 17, 9, he exclaims, “Here is a meaning which comprises wisdom!” for so we may translate ὁ δε ο νῦν ἔχων σοφίαν. Or if any one hesitates as to such a version, he may render the phrase still more literally thus: “Here the mind which possesses wisdom!” that is, here a wise mind is needed in order to explain
what follows. The sequel of this passage is the dark saying concerning the seven hills, and the seven kings, and the beast which is the eighth, and was one of the seven, etc. vs. 9—11.

Thus it is plain, that when John is about to utter any thing which he knows will be enigmatical to some of his readers, and for the explanation of which special care is needed, he gives them warning, by telling them that σοφία, i.e. special sagacity, is needed in order to make a right interpretation.

In the verse before us, Rev. 13, 18, the supposition is made, or it is tacitly implied, that sagacity may unfold the true meaning: "Let him who has understanding, reckon the number of the beast." Some hints to aid him, however, the author does not neglect to give. First of all he says, that the number of the beast is the number of a man. What is the meaning of this declaration?

One of two things it seems of necessity to mean; either, first, that it is such a number as men usually employ; or, secondly, that it is a number, the letters of which designate or name a man.

Examples of such a nature as would justify (so far as the mere form of expression is concerned) the first meaning, may be found; thus Rev. 21, 17, "And he [the angel] measured the wall thereof 144 cubits, μετρον ἀνθρώπου man’s measure," that is, cubits as estimated by human measure, and not by angelic. It is evident that μετρον ἀνθρώπου is here added by the writer, merely in order to be explicitly understood and to exclude all useless conjecture. In Is. 8, 1, we find a command to the prophet, that he should write certain words with a man’s pen, as our version has it; but the original, σφην γράφει, seems plainly to indicate the ordinary writing of men, the usual characters which they employ. These were enjoined, in order that they might be legible to all. Corresponding with this in sentiment is Hab. 2, 2, "Write the vision, and engrave it upon tablets, that he who runneth may read." But if we should explain the phrase in Rev. 13, 18 by these examples, what sense could it make, when taken in connexion with the context? 'Let the intelligent man reckon the number of the beast, for it is such a number as men employ, and the number is 666.' But do not men employ other numbers besides 666? And if we understand the phrase in the manner just proposed, what else
would be asserted, even at the most, except that the number of the beast is a number, and nothing more? And what possible meaning could this have, which would accord in any measure with the context? The followers of the beast are marked on the forehead or in the hand. How? Either with the name of the beast written out, or with a symbolic designation of this name, made by letters, usually indicative of certain numbers. But the mode of exegesis now under discussion would exclude such a designation, and limit the mysterious letters to the mere ordinary significance of numbers. What need of 'wisdom' to unravel these? Or to what can 666 pertain, when considered merely in an arithmetical point of view? Does it relate to time, or descent, or possessions, or attributes, or to any of the like things? It is plainly impossible to make out any tolerable significance of the passage in this way.

We must come then, as it seems to me, to the second meaning given above, viz. that the "number of a man" means a number, which, when expressed in letters (as was usual), designates the name of a man; and here, of course, the name of the man who is symbolized by the beast. It is the context which forces us upon such an interpretation; for the other exegesis would make no tolerable sense. The design of the writer plainly is, to give a hint, purposely somewhat obscure and enigmatical, by way of answer to the natural question: Who is meant or symbolized by the first beast? The reasons why he did not speak out plainly and unequivocally, were cogent ones. But of these more will be said in the sequel.

Bengel explains the phrase under examination in a singular way: "It is a number according to which all men are wont to compute, and not angels." But do not men employ other numbers also in their computations? Like to this is Hartwig's interpretation: "A number which a man may write or engrave without any great difficulty."1 Bengel had his reasons for such an explanation as he has given; and these were, that it was necessary to understand 666 as a mere numeral adjective relating to time or years, in order to make out his periods. It is unnecessary to occupy a moment in refuting the view either of Bengel or Hart-

1 Apol. der Apokalypse, II. p. 215.
wig. Both are inconsistent with the requisite significance of the text.

What name, then, of a man symbolized by the beast, can be made out of letters which indicate 666, on the supposition that we employ the Greek alphabet in the computation?

It is evident from the nature of the case, that there is a great variety of combinations of numbers, indeed an almost endless variety, which being put together, will amount to 666. It is plain, therefore, that letters which designate numbers, or are the representatives of them, are capable of the like endless variety of combinations, which may amount to the number, or form the name in question. Of course there is room here for boundless play of the imagination and fancy, if any choose to indulge them; and seldom indeed does an opportunity of this nature present itself, which is not embraced by minds that are peculiarly prone to conjecture and fancy.

It is no part of my design to produce and refute at length all the extravagancies, which have been exhibited to the world in commenting on the text before us. But the reader may naturally expect that some account of this matter should be laid before him, and especially an account of the manner in which the early Christian fathers explained the text which is under consideration. My first object then will be, to give a brief historical view of what has been done; my second, to show, if it may be within my power, what our text most probably does mean.

Fortunately we have a passage in Irenæus, which gives us a somewhat graphic view of the state of feeling in his day, with respect to the matter before us, and of the opinion entertained as to the meaning of the number of the beast. Observe the cautious manner in which this good Father approaches the subject. His language is: "It is more sure and less dangerous to maintain the fulfilment of [John's] prophecy, than it is to conjecture and divine certain names; inasmuch as there is a multitude of names which will amount to the aforesaid number. The question now is, Which of all these shall be [the beast] bear, who is to come? We speak thus, not for want of names which would indicate the requisite number, but out of reverence to God, and zeal for the truth."

1 Contr. Haeres. V. 30. 3.
“EvwOvos has the requisite number; but we affirm nothing in respect to it. [The want of any appropriate significancy is good reason for rejecting it. It means nothing, and nobody; unless indeed there is some implied reference to Gessius Florus (AvOvos i. q. flos), the procurator of Palestine.] Αὐτωύως also designates 666; and this is exceedingly probable, inasmuch as the last empire [the last of the four described in Daniel] has this appellation. For they are Latini who now reign; but in this we will not glory. Τέταρτος, the first syllable with ι and τ, is, of all the names current among us, the most worthy of credit.” He then goes on to give some reasons for preferring this; which are, that the name has six letters (corresponding with the other sixes), that each syllable has three letters, that it is old, and unusual. By the last allegation he means to say, that neither the Roman kings nor gods have any of them such an appellation. He then alludes to the ancient Titan in the fable, who was one of the giants that made resistance to the gods, and thinks that this would tally well with the character of the beast. Finally, he says: “We, however, do not mean to run into any danger respecting the name of Antichrist, as pronouncing positively respecting it; for if his name was designed to be openly exhibited at the present time, it would have been manifested long ago, by him who saw the apocalyptic vision.”

It is not necessary to examine the reasons of Irenæus for preferring Τέταρτος. They are merely factitious ones; and nothing is more evident, than that Αὐτωύως lay deeper in his convictions, —“valde verisimile est.” Still, he dared not to urge it, on account of the hazard which would be incurred, by appearing as the advocate of an opinion so reproachful to the Roman government. To suppose the Hebrew John to be dealing here with the Greek mythological Titan, would be greatly aside from probability; not to mention the change in the proper spelling of the name which Irenæus has made. To Αὐτωύως we shall again advert, in the sequel.

Victorinus (flor. c. 300), in his skeleton Commentary which has come down to us, has a note on the verse before us, which bids defiance to all critics and commentators. It reads thus: “Since he [John] refers to Greek letters, the sequel will complete the requisite number: A. N. L, T. CCC. F. M. L. X. L. O. L.
DIFFERENT EXPLANATIONS.

XX. CCC. II. EVN. LCC. N. V. III. P. CIX. K. XXOLXX. CC. If the number of the beast is not to be known until this is explained, I apprehend we must wait a long time for the desired knowledge.

Andreas of Caesarea in Cappadocia, near the close of the fourth century, wrote a commentary on the Apocalypse, which is still extant. Like Irenæus, he supposes that if John meant that the name of the beast should be known, he would have declared it himself. It was unworthy, he says, of being inserted in such a sacred book. Yet he goes on to give, from Hippolytus and others, several conjectural names; which, as they lay claim to no more than conjecture, I shall barely repeat. Thus the Greek name 

$\text{Αἰμαπορίς}$ will make the requisite number; so the Latin 

$\text{Benedictus}$, or the Persian 

$\text{Sarmnacu}$. So the appellatives 

$\text{μακάς δυνάς bad leader, ἄληθῆς 
βλαβερός truly noxious, πάλαι βάσινας envious of old, and ἀμφό 
δίκης wicked lamb.}$

Arethas, the successor and epitomator of Andreas, has only repeated these in his Commentary. Primasius, bishop of Utica in Africa, a disciple of Augustin, has added, in his Commentary, the two appellatives, 

$\text{αὐτομοσ (for αὑτομος) dishonourable, and αρσυν-} 

\muσ (for αρσυνυμι) I deny; the form and invention of which show that his knowledge of Greek and of exegesis were on a par. To these Rupert of Dents (ob. 1135) has added 

$\text{Γενσρικος}$ or Genseric, king of the Vandals.

It is proper to note, before we quit the ancient exegesis of Rev. 13, 18, that there were some who applied the name suggested by Irenæus, viz. 

$\text{Tetan, to the Roman Titus, who commanded the army which} 

sacked Jerusalem and destroyed the temple. They regarded the name 

$\text{Τεταρτ, (in their view i. q. Titan or Titas,)}$ as designating a kind of 

$\text{γένος θεομελον, like Titan of old. So Hesychius thought, in reference to the passage before us: "Τεταρτ,} 

το τοι }\text{Αντιχιστων δύσωμα.}$. Of course, he supposed the beast in c. 13, to be Antichrist. So the venerable Bede: “This number [666] is said to be found among the Greeks in the name Titan, giant.” When the mild character of Titus Vespasian was urged as being utterly at variance with the character of the beast, as here

1 Biblioth. Pat. III. p. 420.
depicted, the advocates of the word Teitan found a refuge by resorting to Titus Flavius Domitian, the tyrant. Wetstein, however, has laboured to show, that both the father, Titus Flavius Vespasian, and the son, Titus Vespasian, are meant by John in his number 666. But in order to accomplish this, he changes χτ to χτ or 616, and the name Teitan into Teita; and to all this he adds, that Titus had the feminine name Teita given him by John, on account of his soft and effeminate disposition! I have only to say: Quodcunque mihis narras sic, incredulus odi.

Enough of such guesses in days of yore. More recent times have added something to the number, and but little to the probability, of these surmises, most of which are all but ridiculous. Thus we have had Ἀποστάτης or Julian the Apostate; Μουσέιος Muhammed; Βενεδύτος Pope Benedict IX; and other names of the like tenor. It would seem that nearly all the combinations of Greek letters, which will designate 666, have been made at one time or another.

Not content, however, with the Greek language, some have resorted to the Latin. They aver as a reason for so doing, that inasmuch as the author had Roman personages in view, it is probable he would reckon after the Roman manner. It should be remembered here, that in the Roman alphabet only C. D. I. L. M. V. X. are used as numeral signs. Only these letters, then, as they occur in proper names, are to be selected as numerically significant.

Bossuet found 666 in Datioles aVgVstVs, that is Diocletian. Here, and elsewhere, as in the older books, the V is used for U. The Huguenots, in the time of the persecution by Louis XIV, found the number of the beast in LVDoVICVs; as some of the republicans in France, at a later period, also found it in the name of the last LVDoVICVs. In a work so recent as A. D. 1817, by Opitius or Gehrken (it is not known which), the writer maintains, that inasmuch as the beast in Rev. c. 13, is to resemble those in Daniel, it is quite probable that the names of Alexander (Dan 8, 5—8), and Antiochus Epiphanes (Dan. 8, 9—12), are transferred to the beast; and the more so, because aLexanDer and antIoChVs make out 666.

I will not occupy much more of the reader's time, nor of my
own, in recounting such unseemly excrescences of the human mind. To show what minds, even very respectable, may excogitate in regard to the 666 of our text, I may mention that Boltén, in his version of the New Testament, (the original of which he held to have been Syriac,) supposes that the name Titus Flavius Vespasian, expressed in the Syriac, contains the number in question, and consequently, that this emperor is meant. Herdece, from whom we might expect better things, makes it out of סֵתִּירָן that is, Rabbi Simeon or Simon of Giora, one of the atrocious leaders in the Jewish rebellion. Mere sport of imagination, or at least vapid conceit, is Να Βονομάρτης, να βονομαρτης, that is Napoleon Bonaparte, in Greek or Hebrew, each of which is equal to 666. So נאשנוצר, the Corsican. More adroit than these guesses was that of Feuardentius, a Catholic editor of Ireneus. In his notes on that passage of Ireneus, which is quoted above, he suggests, that the name by which Luther was first called, was Martin Lauder, the letters of which, having the Greek significance given to them, amount to just 666. He goes on to say, that as all the attributes of the beast belonged to Luther, there is but little room for doubt that this is the true application.¹

But enough. I pass to the second object before us, viz. to show what the number of a man, which is 666, probably was intended to designate.

We have seen that Ireneus pronounces Αατινος to be valde verisimile. Moreover he says: “They are named Latin, who now reign.” The letters are exact as to the numeral amount; viz. 1, π 300, ε 5, η 10, ζ 50, ο 70, ε 200; the sum of the whole is 666. Then as to this mode of writing in Greek the Roman word Latinus, examples enough are at hand to vindicate it; e. g. Σαβινος, Φαντινος, Παυλινος, Αντινος, Αντιλινος, Μιτιλινος, Παπινος, Ουβινος for Vibius, etc. Even the older Latin is full of such orthography; e. g. solitii, diceis, capitei, preimus, etc. as is evident from the relics of Ennius. The significance, then, of Αατινος is appropriate; and the form of the word is not liable to any valid objection. Heinrichs says, however, in his Ex-

¹ With this may be classed a of the name of Captain Miller, recent jeu d’esprit in some of our the leader of the newest race of periodicals, which makes 666 out prophetra.
cursus on Rev. 13, 18, that John would have given Romanus the recent name, and not Latinus the old one, had he designed to mark the Roman empire. It seems to me quite differently. John undoubtedly designed to speak somewhat enigmatically. It was more consistent with this design, to use the old Roman word; which, however, could be understood without any serious difficulty.

But is there anything to show that the Roman or Latin empire is meant to be symbolized by the first beast? I cannot hesitate as to the answer which should be given to this question. John has given us in Rev. c. 17, particularly in vs. 10 and 18, an explanation so definite and graphic, that I cannot persuade myself that there is any room for doubt. Whoever reads chapters 13–17 with scrutinizing criticism, will be led moreover to see, that John employs ἰδίος as a symbol in two senses, differing somewhat from each other. Often he employs it as the representative of the Roman (heathen) empire generically, Rev. 13, 1. 2. al. In other cases it is used to denote the then reigning prince or emperor, e. g. 13, 12. 14. 17, 8. 11, and elsewhere. In the case before us there can hardly be a question, that the name designated, although the 'name of a man,' must be a name that was common to many men. Hence ἀνθρώπου, without any article, so that the sense would naturally be of a generic character.

In this view of the subject, the majority of recent commentators seem to be united. And if John designed to refer to the Greek alphabet as constituting the signs for the numbers designated, there can be no exegesis so probable, so far as I can see, as that which has now been given. The name is well chosen from the older idiom; it expresses the exact quantity specified by the text; it designates the empire with which in c. 12–19 of the Apocalypse, the writer is altogether concerned. Why should we seek for any better solution? Here is all the significance which the nature of the case demands.

But still, there may be some room for doubt, whether John meant to refer his readers to the Greek or the Hebrew alphabet, in the case under examination. The grounds of that doubt I will briefly lay before the reader.

Irenæus mentions that there were codices of the Apocalypse in
his time, which instead of \( \chi \zeta \) or 666, read \( \chi \varsigma \) or 616. He avows his preference for the former reading; and the principal reason seems to be, that 666 contains six hundreds, six decades, and six units. He does, indeed, aver, that 666 is the reading in all the more correct and ancient codices; but his judgment about the claims of 666 seems to lean upon his cabalistic reasoning about the triad of sixes, rather than upon the authority of manuscripts.

Are there not some weighty reasons in favour of the old reading \( \chi \varsigma \) or 616? This question may perhaps be best answered, by first making the inquiry: Whether John would most probably refer to the Greek, or to the Hebrew, method of computation! How is this matter in other parts of the Apocalypse, where the use of numbers is concerned?

There can be no doubt as to the answer which must be given to this last question. All the triads, the heptads, the tetrads, etc. numerous as they are in the Apocalypse, and all pervading as the two first classes of these are in the arrangement of the book,—all these are Hebrew and not Greek. All the periods of time, the 1260 days, the forty-two months, the three and a half years, the 1000 years, are all of Hebrew origin. Is it not probable then that the number 666 is to be made out rather from the Hebrew than from the Greek alphabet?

Other considerations are to be associated with these. It is clear that John meant to be somewhat enigmatical here; and for good reasons, as we shall see in the sequel. Such being his design, (for if it had not been, he would have spoken explicitly and plainly,) would it not be more easily accomplished by a reference to the Hebrew, than to the Greek, alphabet? Hebrew was understood by none, or almost none, excepting Jews. If John then originally wrote \( \chi \zeta \) or 616, nothing intelligible could be made out of it, by reference to the Greek alphabet. A Roman and heathen magistrate, in case the author of the Apocalypse were accused of slandering the emperor, and Rev. c. 13, were appealed to as proof of the fact, could make nothing out of v. 18 which would satisfy his mind. He would be most likely to attribute it to some hallucination of the writer, and to dismiss him. But not so the Hebrew reader; and such there were in all the churches of Asia.

\[1\] Contr. Haer. V. 30. 1.
The number 616 is made out by the plain and significant words \( \text{Cæsar of Rome} \). \( \text{Cæsar} \) was, we well know, a common name of the first twelve emperors. The number desired is easily made out from the Hebrew name just mentioned; thus, \( \text{P 100, ¥ 10, & 60, ¥ 200, ¥ 200, ¥ 6, ¥ 40} \); sum 616.

Thus, while mere Greek readers would be unable to make out any crimen laesae majestatis against John, on account of \( \text{Cæsar} \) or 616, Hebrew Christian readers of any considerable acuteness might find a better, that is, a more appropriate, name for the dominion or ruler symbolized by the beast, than could be made from 666, or \( \text{Aares-veg} \). The internal probability of the reading 616 seems, therefore, to be great; and to this must be added the fact, that not a few codices still exhibit this very ancient reading. The three continuous sixes in the other reading can be easily accounted for, from the cabalism and the mystical form and power of numbers, which the early ages of Christianity so often exhibit.

I will merely add here, that Ewald leans decidedly to the opinion in favour of 616.\(^1\) We cannot, indeed, acting as mere critics on the text, adopt this meaning with much confidence; but it appears to my mind, when all those things are well considered which have been suggested above, that 616 is on the whole a more probable reading, and at all events it is explicable in a more definite way, than 666.

It matters not, however, in regard to the main thing designed by the writer, which of these opinions one adopts. John means to say, but to say in an occult way, that the first beast is a symbol of heathen persecuting Rome. In c. 17 the writer seems to put this conclusion beyond all reasonable doubt.

This appears to be so plain, that I cannot but express my astonishment at a recent explanation, given by Züllig in his late Commentary on Revelation, of the meaning of 666. He says, that the Jews regarded Moses as a type of Christ; and inasmuch as Balaam was an adversary of the first Moses, so the Jews thought he would be of the second, i.e. of the Messiah. Instead therefore of giving credit to the declaration in Num. 31, 8 and Josh. 13, 22, viz. that the Israelites slew Balaam, he intimates that the Rabbins

\(^1\) Comm. p. 237.
believed in the recovery of Balaam from his supposed deadly wound, and that he lived and would continue to live until the coming of the Messiah, when he would have seven heads instead of one, i.e., possess seven times the power which he formerly had. This, Züllig tells us, fully explains Rev. 13, 3, which says, that the beast received a deadly wound and recovered from it. "This reference to Balaam which is so plain," he goes on to say, "is reduced to certainty as clear as the sun, by Rev. 13, 18. This riddle, proclaimed throughout the whole world, but never before solved, has given occasion to the most ridiculous misinterpretations." "This riddle, however," says Gfrörer in his review of Züllig, "has at last found its OEdipus."

What then, I would ask, is the éclaircissement of this new and wonderful OEdipus? It is this; Joshua (c. 13, 22), speaking of things which the children of Israel had done, declares that they had killed Balaam the son of Beor, the soothsayer. The Hebrew of this last clause, Züllig gives as running thus: מָלָא צְבָאֵל נָבָטֶה נָבָטֶה ; and these letters do in fact amount, with regard to numerical value, to 666. Thus, ב 2,ג 30, ו 70, ב 40, ב 2, י 50, ב 2, י 70, י 200,elyn 100, ו 60, ב 40; sum of the whole, 666. "Getroffen, er ist's!" exclaims the reviewer, 'he has hit the mark!' And in confirmation of this Gfrörer states, that he had long before come to the conclusion, that the Antichrist of the New Testament was Balaam in disguise.

Such then is the solution, pronounced to be "clearer than the noon-day sun," of this second OEdipus, who is come, not, like the second Daniel in Shylock, to judgment, but to give the hermeneutical art a new and unheard of éclaircissement. Yet no Sphinx need dash out its brains, as did that of Thebes, because of the solution.

To argue seriously against such an interpretation as this, would be to insult the understanding of my readers. More especially so, inasmuch as the Hebrew quoted from Josh. 13, 22, has been quite transformed by the new soothsayer who has appealed to it. The original stands thus: נַשַׂג מִלָּא צְבָאֵל נָבָטֶה. This settles the whole question. Züllig has merely garbled it. If he had not,

1 Studien und Kritiken, 1842, p. 823 sq.
yet to suppose that John believed in and adopted that putid fable about Balaam, which, if indeed it grew at all, (for I know of no evidence that it did,) must have grown up out of the veriest swamps of Rabbinism,—to suppose not only that John introduced it into such a book as the Apocalypse, and took it for granted that his readers would understand the allusion, is really beyond all critical endurance. I can only express my surprise, that the editors of the “Studien und Kritiken” should admit such a critique as that of Gfrörer; at least, that they should do so without apologizing or making any explanation to their readers. The Rabbins have indeed said many strange things respecting Balaam; some of which are, that he learned sorcery from two demons, that he was one of Pharaoh’s evil counsellors in Egypt, that he was born circumcised, that he practised bestiality with the ass on which he rode, that he had but one eye, and the like; but instead of making Balaam live down to the time of the Messiah, they speak of him as occasionally being conjured up from Gehenna, in order to render some assistance or information to sorcerers. Something new under the sun, Züllig may perhaps have the credit of doing; but his entire exegesis of the matter before us is nothing short of ridiculous.

The result of our examination is, that if we suppose the text to read χευ or 666, as our common editions have it, and the numbers to be counted in accordance with the designations by the Greek alphabet, the only probable word that corresponds is ἄρεως which Irenæus (who follows this reading) pronounces to be valde verisimile. This of course denotes the Roman power, by the use of a word that was in part antiquated when John wrote, but which would for that very reason be probably chosen in such a case as this. On the other hand, if we prefer a reading found in many copies in the days of Irenæus, viz. χευ or 616, and also still found in not a few codices, then we may resort to the Hebrew alphabet for explanation; in which case Caesar of Rome will be still more definite and graphic. Go which of these two ways we will, (and none other yet proposed is even slightly probable,) the result is the same for substance as to the meaning of Rev. 13, 18. The persecuting, the blood-thirsty, the impious, the

1 See the Indices under Balaam, in Eismenenger, Entd. Judenthunm, I. II
idolatrous, the blasphemous beast, is the Roman power as wielded by Nero, that incarnate fiend, who laid waste the church of God with unrelenting fury. I do not say that it is confined merely and entirely to Nero; but the description—the imagery of the whole—is drawn from him. He is the original of the picture. As I have before said, I do not see how c. 17 allows any good room to doubt, even if our conjecture be erroneous as to the name or names originally intended, that still the result would be the same from the explanation of any other name which John may have employed.

Having come then to some conclusion in regard to this matter, here is the proper place to assign some reasons, as I have engaged to do, for the mysterious or enigmatical manner of the communication which John here makes.

I must beg the reader here, if the Apocalypse is not fresh in his mind, and he has any doubt respecting what I am about to say, to read it from beginning to end. He will then be prepared to agree with me, that the book was written in the midst of a raging and relentless persecution of Christians by embittered enemies. In such circumstances, those who had professed the religion of Christ needed to be encouraged, comforted, guided, and assured as to the final event. The hearts of many were failing. Apostasy, under such circumstances, was to be feared. Hence the urgent exhortations of the writer of the Apocalypse, that Christians should persevere. To him that overcometh, in the mighty contest which was going on, the glorious rewards of victory are everywhere held out. Patient martyrdom, whenever this becomes necessary, is made an indispensable condition of enjoying the approbation of the great Head of the church; and a condition also, to the fulfilment of which not only a crown and a throne of glory are promised, but likewise a part in the first resurrection, when the Saviour shall make his cause triumphant over all opposition.

Such was the primary and immediate aim of the Apocalypse. That it was written under the bloody reign of Nero, or shortly after, is now a matter agreed upon by nearly all recent critics who have studied the literature of this book. I cannot turn aside here, in order formally to prove this. The exemption of Christian Jews, who are sealed in their foreheads as the servants of God, as related in chap. 7; the measurement of the inner sanctuary of the tem-
ple, to be preserved from impending destruction, c. 11, 1. 2; the express naming of the city to be destroyed, as "the place where our Lord was crucified," c. 11, 8; these and other concurrent circumstances put it beyond a reasonable doubt, that the Apocalypse was written before the destruction of Jerusalem. And if all this were not sufficient, the passage in c. 17, 10, which declares that five kings or emperors of Rome had already fallen, while the sixth is reigning when the writer is composing the book, marks the period of the composition too definitely to be called in question. It might easily be shown, moreover, that the tenor of the book renders it necessary for us to suppose, that the persecution was actually raging when it was written; and consequently, it must have been written during Nero's life, for persecution ceased immediately after his death. Indeed the threat implied in c. 13, 10, seems plainly to be directed against Nero, and to predict the violent death to which he speedily came.

But to return to our immediate object: What could John do, in circumstances such as those in which he wrote? Must he come out and denounce Nero by name, and incur the crimen laesae majestatis? This were certain death. This were to bring open reproach upon himself, and upon all Christians who read and approved of his book. Even still more; all such Christians would be involved in the like charge with himself, and of course a greater show of justice would be the consequence, in respect to persecuting the Christians. John, therefore, had a difficult and hazardous duty to perform. On the one hand, it was incumbent on him to warn, to encourage, and to console the persecuted; on the other, it was a hazardous thing for himself and his readers, to publish abroad that the Roman persecuting power was blaspheming God and murdering the innocent, and moreover that it would ere long be utterly destroyed. Seditious and misprision of treason would seem to be the charge, to which he would be exposed by such a course. What could he do then, in such a strait, except the very thing that he has done? His message must be delivered. It was from God. But as his message was to the suffering Christians, it was enough, in case the hazardous parts of it should be somewhat veiled or enigmatical, that it was still so composed, that men expert in the Scriptures, could easily unravel it. A mere heathen and
Roman reader, methinks, could make little or nothing out of Rev. 13, 18. One might apply to it what Daniel says respecting certain things that were to take place: "None of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand;" Dan. 12, 10. John did not wish to appear seditious, nor in reality to be so; but John must still be faithful to Christians, and open before them the glorious prospect of final and certain triumph. How then could he act otherwise than he has done? He has spoken enigmatically; but the enigma does not need a second Œdipus to explain it. Must we not excuse him, in such circumstances, for speaking thus? Or rather, must we not commend him for his skill, his caution, and his faithfulness? There may be readers, perhaps, who will doubt here; but if there be, I commend to them the reading and due consideration of 1 Sam. 16, 1—13; and trust that John will fairly stand acquitted of all double dealing or affected mystery, or even cabbalism, in respect to the passage before us.

In regard to this last charge, however, viz. that which respects cabbalism, I must say a few words. Most of the recent commentators, even those who put an estimate somewhat high upon the Apocalypse, have conceded that John here employs the cabbalistic art of managing numbers; or, in other words, that he gives to them a mystical meaning, in conformity with that practice of the cabbalists which has respect to numbers.

I cannot accede to this view of the subject. First of all I have strong doubts, whether any thing more than the mere germ of cabbalism existed in the days of John. Next, I cannot see, in the various kinds of cabbala, any near approach to John's use of 666. These may be comprised under three heads: 1. Notarikon (โนะริๆ), in which the single letters of a particular word were each made the representatives of some whole word; e.g. in Gen. 1, 1, the word אֱלָה may be considered as designating יָה, אֹת, אָדָם, Son, Spirit, Father, and consequently אֱלָה points us to the doctrine of a Trinity. 2. Temura (טומר, concealment), which indicates an arbitrary transposition of the letters of any word, so as to constitute another and different word; e.g. Gen. 1, 1 נַחַל תֵּבָע transposed makes נַחַל מַבֵּע, i.e. in the month תֵּבָע or September; which shows, say the cabbalists, that the world was created in that month. The only method which has the least resemblance to Rev.
13, 18 is: 3. *Gematria* (גמדריה, *gemurcaia?*) which means a computation of the numerical value of letters in one or more words, and then deducing the meaning from some other word which is of the same numerical value; e.g. Gen. 49, 10 ויהי עpotential 'Shiloh will come,' amounts numerically to 358, which is the exact numerical amount of מישא Messiah. Consequently the two Hebrew words in Gen. 49, 10 designate the Messiah!

Not the most distant resemblance can be found to John's use of 666, anywhere in the cabbala except here; and surely there is something here, which is quite remote from the manner in which he employs his mystical number. In *Gematria* the signification of a word is deemed equivalent to, or synonymous with, that of another word whose *numerical* value is the same; that is, the letters both of מישא and of מישא designate numerically 358; *ergo*, both must have the same meaning, or must refer to the same individual. But how has John shaped his enigma? The number 666, if expressed in appropriate letters, will constitute a name, which will lead the reader to know who is meant by the beast. No other word, designating the same number, comes at all into a comparison here. No conclusion is drawn by conceit or imagination from a mere accidental occurrence as to equivalency in numbers. The appropriate letters of a certain number are merely made the symbol, or rather constitute a name, of the persecuting power. There is room here, it must be acknowledged, for the exercise of skill and judgment, as to what the appropriate letters are. But as the circumstances of the case demanded indirect speech, or something in a measure enigmatical, none can justly complain of this. And even if the cabbala of the Rabbins had flourished at the time when John wrote, what reason is there to suppose him to have been acquainted with it? His Master was contemned by the Pharisees for not having any acquaintance with χαράματα, i.e. as they meant, Rabbinical learning, John 7, 15. Was the disciple who records this, better versed in these matters than his Master? Or if the presbyter John, at Ephesus, who is named by Papias as a disciple of Christ, and to whom some recent critics are inclined to ascribe the Apocalypse, was the author of Rev. 13, 18, is there any proof that he was versed in cabbala? Had Paul written such a passage, there would have been more
probability of his being able to draw from Rabbinical store-houses; for he was brought up at the foot of Gamaliel, and was doubtless well versed in all the so-called learning of the day. In a word, it remains yet to be made out, that any part of the New Testament exhibits the peculiar features of cabbalism. I am aware that it has often been assumed, of late, by some of the German critics; but I have never met with any satisfactory proof that the assumption is well grounded.

Let me venture, then, to invite my readers to take a view of ground that has not yet been occupied, at least to my knowledge, in order to illustrate the enigmatical mode of expression which the writer of Rev. 13, 18 has adopted. I will be as brief as the nature of the case will permit; merely suggesting, that as the illustration is from sources not hitherto employed for this purpose, I must say so much as will render my meaning plain and easily intelligible.

It seems scarcely necessary here to enter upon any vindication of the obvious position, that every writer conforms more or less to the usus loquendi of his time. This is true not only in respect to the idiom or diction which he employs, but also true in general with respect to the great outlines of his style and manner of representation. For example, and one too which is directly in point, among the later prophets Ezekiel and Daniel stand pre-eminent. No one, however, who has read their works with attention, can call in question for a moment the fact, that they differ exceedingly in their manner of representation from the older prophets. Nor can it be doubted at all, whether the Apocalypse does not more nearly resemble the books of Ezekiel and Daniel, than any other books of the Old Testament or the New.

If the question should be urged, Why John chose these models? the obvious answer is, that he conformed to the taste of the times in which he lived. The numerous apocryphal works of an apocalyptic nature, which were composed nearly at the same time with the Apocalypse, such as the Book of Enoch, the Ascension of Isaiah, the Testament of the twelve Patriarchs, many of the Sibylline Oracles, the Fourth Book of Ezra, the Pastor of Hermas, and many others which are lost, all testify to the taste and feelings of the times, when, or near which, the Apocalypse was written. If
this method of writing was more grateful to the times in which
John lived, it is a good reason for his preferring it.

As to the general style and manner of the Apocalypse, I may
presume so much as I have now stated, will be conceded. But was
there any thing in the usages of those times—any thing not con-
nected with cabbalism—which showed a tendency to such a mode
of representation as that adopted in Rev. 13, 18? 

In reading the Sibylline Oracles, which are a singular compo-
dition of different writings in different ages, and by writers of differ-
ent faith, but some parts of which were composed about the same
time with the Apocalypse, I have found several passages, the
manner and tenor of which are very nearly the same with those of
Rev. 13, 18. I shall advert, first of all, to a passage which appears
evidently to have been written about A. D. 120. The reader will
call to mind that these Oracles, so named, are written in hexa-
meter verse.

In the passage referred to, the writer undertakes to give a list of
the Roman emperors down to Adrian, with now and then a trait of
character, and a hint of their respective achievements. He begins
with Kaíasaq, meaning Julius Cæsar, whom he thus designates:

"Εστιν ἀνάξ πρῶτος, δὲ τις δέκα δὲς κορυφώσαι 
Γράμματος ἀγχομένον πολέμων δ' ἐπὶ πολὺ κρατήσει.

"He will be the first king of all, whose [name] begins with a
letter which amounts to twice ten; he will greatly prevail in war." 
The assumption on the part of the writer is, that what is here
uttered was written before Cæsar was born. The K in Kaíasaq
represents twice ten. To this the writer adds a second designation,
namely for the word Julius (Ἰωύλιος), which he expresses thus:
"Εξιν δ' ἐκ δεκάδος πρῶτον τίτοιν, "He shall have the primary
form [designation] from the decade, or number ten;" in other and
simple words, his first name shall begin with i, which designates
ten.

This may serve to give the reader a specimen of the original
Greek. For other examples I may confine myself merely to trans-
lations. The writer proceeds: "He who next follows is desig-
nated by the letter which stands at the head of the alphabet," that

1 Lib. V. v. 11 sq.
is, Αὐγούστος or Augustus. Of Tiberius he says: "He shall have the number 300 upon the first letter" [of his name], viz. η, 300. Then follows "he who has the mark of the number 3," viz. Παιός or Caius Caligula. Then comes "a king whose name is δέκα, twice ten, viz. Κλαύδιος or Claudius, υ for 20. Next follows "the dire serpent whose name has the sign of 50," viz. Νίκης or Nero, ι for 50. The three kings that succeed him, viz. Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, are not specified, because of the shortness of their reign. Vespasian, Ὀσμαναίας, "who exhibits the manifest mark of seven times ten" or ο for 70; his son, Titus, "whose first letter shows the sign of 300," viz. ι, 300; then "the fatal empire of him whose sign is four," viz. Domitian, δ for 4; "then the man of 50," Nerva, with ι for 50; next, "the man whose name begins with the sign of 300," Trajan, with ι for 300; and lastly, "the man who has the silvery name of the sea," viz. Adrian, whose name is like that of the Adriatic sea;—all these follow in regular succession.

Thus has the writer gone through with the whole class of the emperors, down to the time in which he lived. The principle which reigns throughout this whole exhibition is, that of comparing the first letter of the leading popular name of each emperor with the number which it designates. No name is actually mentioned, but it is simply referred to by indicating the number which is designated by part of its elements. It is essentially of the same nature, therefore, as the method adopted in Rev. 13, 18. The only difference is, that in the latter case the writer has made the number so large as to take in all the letters of the name intended.

But there are some other instances of a like nature, which follow still more exactly in the steps of John. It must, however, be remarked, that they are of a somewhat uncertain age, but probably belong to a later period, and may possibly have originated from the mere imitation of the Apocalypse, although there is no palpable evidence of this.

The following is a specimen of this later period. The passage in question runs thus:

1 Lib. I. v. 141 sq.
"I have nine letters, and am of four syllables; consider me. [Q. d. reflect well what name corresponds with this.] The first three have each two letters; the remaining one, the rest [of the letters]. Five of them are consonants. Of the whole number, there are twice eight hundreds, and three times three decades, with seven."

The occasion of such a description, as given by the Sibyllist, is, that Jehovah is addressing Noah, and propounding to him a secret or mysterious name by which he is called. As in respect to Rev. 13, 18 a great variety of conjectures have been made, so here. I shall not occupy any time with the discussion of these; but merely observe, that the Greek word ἀνύπορος (unspeakable) answers well to the description. It has nine letters and four syllables; the first three syllables have each two letters, the remaining one, of course, the rest. Five of the letters are consonants. The numeral sum is 1696; which lacks one of the requisite number; but by the aid of a unit, (the restorative and helping number, as the Pythagoreans say,) it amounts to just the required number.

Whatever word, however, may constitute the true solution of this, the whole passage is manifestly of the like tenor with that in Rev. 13, 18. It is the designation of a name, by the use of numbers represented by letters.

Once more; in the same book there is another passage still more exactly like to the one under consideration. It runs thus: 

Τόσασα φωνήσα τέρας, τάδ' ἄφως ἐν αὐτῷ
Διοσκυρ' ἀγέλλων, ἀποθην' ᾧ ἔδωκιν θρόνος.
'Οπτώ γὰρ μονάς, τόσασα δεκάδας ἐπὶ τούτους,
'Ἡ δ' ἐκατογάδας ὡστὶ, ἀποικόφως ἀνθρώπως
Οὗτοι δήλοις.

'Lib. I. v. 385 sq.
"Producing four vowels, and announcing doubly the consonants in it, I will recount the whole number. His name shall designate to unbelieving men eight monads [unities], as many decades added to these, and also 800."

There is much variety of reading, and perplexity among interpreters, in respect to the two first lines of this extract. I have given the text by selecting, from different readings, those which seem to make the only tolerable sense. The name to which the passage refers is plainly Ἰησοῦς Jesus; for so the preceding context manifestly declares. The writer is predicting the advent of the Messiah: "Then the son of the great God, clothed in flesh, shall come to men, made like to mortal men on earth;" after which follows the mystical passage above presented. The numbers of the name Ἰησοῦς agree with the numerical quantity expressed in the Greek verses; thus, ς 10, η 8, ο 200, ζ 70, υ 400, τ 200; whole sum 888. Moreover, there are four vowels and two consonants. Here then is a kind of exact counterpart of Rev. 13, 18; the name of the personage about to make his appearance is represented by 888, for the letters which make up this composite number, four of them being vowels and two consonants, will constitute the name in question. This last particular, namely, that which respects the vowels and consonants, is a little more minute and specific than anything in Rev. 13, 18; but in all other respects the parallel is perfect.

What may we conclude, now, from exhibitions of this kind, which we thus meet with in other ancient writings besides the Apocalypse? In respect to all the extracts from the Sibylline Oracles made above, I have not been able to discover any particular leaning upon the Apocalypse, or favouritism for it. Indeed, throughout the Sibylline Oracles, various as they are, derived also from many sources and composed at different periods, it is very seldom the case that they exhibit any particular dependence on, or connexion with, the Apocalypse. Of course, examples of the mystical use of numbers (if I may so express it), such as those exhibited above, and conditioned as they are, cast a strong light on the question: Whether John, in writing Rev. 13, 18, may well be supposed to have done nothing more than to conform to a suus loquendi of his day, which was by no means unfrequent? I cannot help thinking that this question should be emphatically answered in the...
affirmative. A writer who expected to be understood ἵνα τοῦ ἔρωτος ἐχάση τὸν νόημα (as he expresses himself), would not adopt modes of expression which would be regarded as altogether without precedent, and looked upon either as the product of mere caprice, fancy, or mysticism, or as being so dark and unintelligible that no reader could hope to attain to the true meaning. In fact we may well doubt, whether there appeared to John's readers, to be anything particularly strange or outre in the declarations made by Rev. 13, 18.

It is time to hasten to a close. But I must beg the indulgence of making a few remarks here; for this may not be inapposite on an occasion like the present.

I am aware that illustrations and arguments of such a nature as I have now employed, can be thoroughly understood and appreciated only by the few, who devote themselves in some good measure to the critical study of the Scriptures. The number of these is evidently on the increase, in our country. The particular reason why I have chosen such a subject for discussion, is the present state of our religious community in regard to the book of Revelation. There is, indeed, scarcely any thing new in the opinions relative to this book, which are published and urged upon the community from week to week; but it is somewhat new to find our community so much agitated as they are on this subject, and many of them driven hither and thither by every wind of doctrine. It is time that some metes and bounds were set, if indeed they may be set, to the surging flood that is sweeping so many of the incautious and unwary before it.

I regard it as a principle of interpreting Scripture, from which there can be no appeal, and to which no valid objection can be made, that we must have reference always to the times in which a writer lived; to the usus loquendi of his age and country; to the style and taste of his contemporaries; to the historical circumstances in which his work was composed; and of course, and above all, to the main design which he had in view. Every expositor who neglects these things, or who is ignorant in any considerable degree respecting them, is certain to go wrong in many respects. How can those be trusted, then, to expound the more difficult and abstruse portions of the Scriptures, who are acquainted neither with
the original language, nor with any of the attendant circumstances, of a scriptural composition? Let them be ever so honest and well-meaning, they must of necessity err in many respects.

It is in vain to deny this, or to appeal to the promises of Scripture, that true Christians shall always be guided in all their opinions respecting matters of revelation. The promises of this nature are practical ones; and as such they are fulfilled. The duty of men lies upon the very face of the Bible, and all men may understand it, who can read the Scriptures, and who are possessed of common sense. But how can such promises be applied to all those parts of the Scriptures which refer to things, or persons, or occurrences, in distant countries and ages, of which the reader has little or no knowledge? And if such an application is to be made, how shall we account for it, that sincere Christians may and often do differ in their interpretation of particular texts?

If the Apocalypse is ever to be understood in these latter days, it must either be explained by some inspired interpreter, or else the meaning must be obtained by the same process as that which we employ in the study of all other ancient writings. There are but two things which we can trust here; the one is inspiration, the other is the laws of hermeneutics. If any one can show a valid title to the former, let us hear him; if not, we can give him our ear only when he follows the proper laws of interpretation.

What estimate then is to be put upon mere fancy, imagination, mysticism, or guessing, in respect to the meaning of John in the Apocalypse? And is it not passing strange, that those who launch into these, do not once look upon the rocky shore covered with the wrecks of those who have before set sail in the same direction? Warn them of this, and they will probably stop their ears, and turn away their eyes. The enthusiasm which leads them to take such a course, forbids them to attend to the voice of warning. And the worst feature of all is, that they look with indignation or scorn upon all who doubt or call in question the safety of their course. Ignorance and enthusiasm are always confident. A sober and judicious man, who has well examined, may also attain to confidence; but his ears will always be open to any new voice which instructs, and his eyes open to any new prospects which are disclosed.

Never was any book abused as the Apocalypse has been. En-
thusiasts on the one hand, and skeptics on the other, have, although unwittingly, united their efforts to obscure and degrade it. May some more suspicious light speedily dawn upon the darkness of the churches, in respect to the true design and meaning of this peculiar and sublime composition!

That the conclusion to which I have come, in the preceding pages, respecting the number of the beast, is well grounded, can be thoroughly understood and appreciated only by him, who so reads the whole book as to be able to decide with satisfaction, what are the great aims and ends of its author. To me, I confess it would seem strange, if, after having done this, he should entertain any considerable doubt, whether the first beast, in chap. 13, is the civil, heathen, persecuting power of Rome,—of Rome as engaged in laying waste the church of God. If there be any thing clear in all the prophetic parts of this book, I must believe that this is so. Indeed, such are my views of this matter, that I should utterly despair of ever attaining to the true interpretation of any prophecy in the Old Testament or the New, if this conclusion be not well founded; for in coming to it, I am conscious that it has been my only aim, to follow out the simple principles of exegesis, let them lead me where they might. But still, I claim no exemption from error. I may have made a wrong application of these principles; or possibly I may have even mistaken the right principles themselves. I am still open to conviction. But until I see reason to believe, that one or the other of these misfortunes has happened to me, my present convictions must remain.

In the mean time, if any reader can make known "a more excellent way," let him speak. Discussion is, or should be, for the sake of eliciting truth; and I am very willing that my opinions should be canvassed. But let us not have conjecture instead of argument, nor fanciful guesses in the place of illustrations from analogy and from ancient history.
BIBLIOTHECA SACRA.

I.

THE JEWISH WAR UNDER TRAJAN AND HADRIAN.

By F. Muentzer, late Bishop of Copenhagen. Translated from the German, by W. Wadden Turner, Instructor in the Union Theological Seminary, N. Y.

[The following treatise of the late Bishop Muentzer, is intended to throw light upon a subject, on which, so far as I know, there exists no work in the English language. It collects and embodies all the fragmentary notices relating to a dark yet interesting portion of Jewish history;—a portion, too, having, as it seems to me, a very important bearing upon the right interpretation of those prophecies of our Lord, which are often supposed to refer solely to the destruction of Jerusalem. Had we the same minute and vivid picture of the extent and horrors of this last tragedy of the Jewish state and people, which is presented to us by Josephus in regard to the siege and downfall of the Holy City, it may be doubted, whether the interest and historical importance of that final overthrow would not be found to equal, or even to surpass, that of the antecedent catastrophe. The bearing of these events upon the prophetic declarations above alluded to, will be seen in another part of the present Number.

The article has been translated, at my request and with great accuracy, by my friend and colleague, Mr. W. W. Turner; and will at least help to fill out a chasm in the literature of our Historical Theology.—Editor.]

INTRODUCTION.

The protracted and bloody war carried on by the Jews and Romans under the emperors Trajan and Hadrian, is a subject which has not yet been sufficiently explained. Yet it is not only of great importance to Jewish and to the earliest church history, but must also very much contribute to lower the opinion almost universally entertained of the prosperity enjoyed by the Roman empire in the period from Nerva to Commodus. For a revolt repeatedly suppressed and ever breaking out anew,—in which in all probability the whole Jewish nation took part; which continued either
openly or secretly through a course of more than twenty years; in which several blooming provinces were laid waste, many hundred thousands perished by the sword and every other disaster of war, while countless numbers forfeited their possession and their freedom; and whose after-throes must have extended through the next following ages,—such a revolt can surely not be reckoned among the minor calamities. Indeed, the second Jewish war would certainly not yield in historical importance to the first, did we possess as correct an account of its occurrences as Josephus has left us in respect to the former. As it is, however, we can only determine from scattered historical fragments as to its extent, duration, and importance.

To collect and to arrange these fragments, is the object I have proposed to myself. A toilsome undertaking, truly. For all the notices are so brief, so incoherent, and not unfrequently so contradictory, that one can often only guess at the connexion; and success even here, often depends upon the fact, whether the writer who treats of this subject has acquired a true historical feeling; although this again is capable of easily leading into error. The most connected account is afforded us by Xiphilin's extract from the sixty-eighth and sixty-ninth books of Dion Cassius, and by Eusebius in the fourth book of his Ecclesiastical History. But how brief is even this! All else must be gleaned from solitary intimations in the remaining meagre historical productions of those times, the chronicles, and the writings of the Fathers. Ancient coins yield a few spoils; of inscriptions we have only a single one; and the notices scattered through the Jewish writers—partly of a very modern date—are of such a quality, that at first one must be inclined to pass them over altogether; although one afterwards feels induced to consult them also, though with great precaution and circumspection, and to make use of them where they appear in a measure to supply chasms, and where the mutual agreement of authorities speaks for the truth of the substance of what they state. If therefore there be found in this treatise a tolerably complete collection of what pagan and Christian writers have handed down to posterity concerning this war, it will be regarded as praiseworthy that I have made use of only such passages from the Talmud and the Rabbins as seemed to me worthy of some attention. The
modern writers that I have consulted are cited in the notes; among them I am most indebted to Boscage’s History of the Jews. The result of the whole investigation still remains doubtful; for we shall hardly ever be able to do more than to propose a somewhat probable conjecture, as to what may have been the connected course of the events of this war. Many of its occurrences are indeed known to us with certainty; but what was their succession in the order of time, and what their internal connexion, remains to be determined by a more or less successful treatment of the subject.

THE JEWISH WAR, ETC.

I. The Jewish war under Vespasian was brought to a close by the taking of Jerusalem and the destruction of the city and temple. The subjugated nation had now lost the central point of their religion, and thus were long deprived of the hope of seeing their old expectations of a Messianic kingdom in the Holy City fulfilled. The dislike and contempt entertained for them by the Romans had been greatly increased; and many thousands of Israelites who had survived the fortune of war, were deprived of their liberty, placed in the most wretched condition, and removed far away from their native land. But this last misfortune happened to those only who fell into the power of the conquerors with arms in their hands; for the many Jewish colonies which had settled before in the provinces of the Roman empire, and which, at least apparently, had kept themselves quiet during the war, were not involved in the misfortunes of the Jews of Palestine, and retained the undisturbed enjoyment of their rights and liberties; although it may readily be supposed, that the government watched them with greater strictness, and no longer favoured them in the same degree as formerly. One burden only they were all obliged to bear. The yearly tax of two drachmae, which every Israelite over twenty years of age paid to the temple as long as it stood in Jerusalem, 1 they were now com-

1 Petri Zornii Historia Fisci Judaici sub imperio veterum Romanorum, Alton, 1734. Already in the later times of the Roman republic, it was sought to prohibit the Jews from paying the tax to the temple. That the proconsul Flaccus laid such a prohibition on the Asiatic Jews, (i.e. those of Asia Minor,) is attested by Cicero, Orat. pro Flacco c. 67. The tax is mentioned also in the N. T. Matt. xvii. 24. It was half a shekel, Jewish currency.
pelled, if they wished to preserve their religious freedom, to pay to the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus; 1 and to what immense sums this tribute, although not very oppressive to individuals, must have amounted, may easily be imagined from the very remarkable populousness of the Jews, who certainly amounted to several millions. 2 Every one that knows the character of the Jewish people, their attachment to the religion of their fathers, and their bitter hatred against paganism, can imagine with what feelings they paid over this tax, held hitherto so sacred, to an impure idol-temple. No wonder, then, that whoever could, sought to escape from it. Many a one may even have denied being a Jew, in case he was able to obliterate the corporeal marks of his religion by a means to which St. Paul himself alludes; 3 especially after the authorities began to institute judicial investigations, one of which Suetonius reports as an eye-witness. 4 The universal contempt entertained for this unhappy people, together with the greediness of the officials connected with the revenue, may have given rise, under the tyrannical rule of Domitian, to many oppressive acts, false accusations, and harsh exactions of the tribute. And this moved the noble Nerva to the edict which, although it did not take off the tax, yet put an end to the misconduct that had been practised in its collection; 5 and was regarded as so benevolent, that the Senate sought to perpetuate the remembrance of it by a separate coin, bearing the legend FISCI IVDAICI CALVMNIA SVBLATA. 6 But that the government should hold the Israelites remaining in Palestine under a strict supervision, was very natural; and it cannot be made a matter of

1 Dion Cass. LXVI. c. 7, Καὶ άς ἐκεῖνων δήφαμον ἵπτας θεν, τοις τὰ πάντα μαύροι ώς ἡ περαιτέρωτα τῷ Καπιτῶλῳ. Αὐτῷ ην ἔτοις ἄπορον. So too Josephus de Bello Jud. VII. 6. 6. Φαρόν δὲ τοῖς ὧν δήποτε ἄφησεν Ἰουδαίων ἐπίφανες, δύο δημοκράτειν τόν κελέσαν ἀπ᾽ ἀυτῷ ημῶν ἔτοις τῷ Καπιτῶλῳ φίλοις, ὡσπερ πρόποροι εἰς τὸν Ἰερουσαλήμας τῶν συντελεόντων. 2Michaelis estimates the yearly poll-tax at half a million of Rix-dollars, and the whole population at from five to six millions of souls. Zerst. kl. Schriften III. p. 447 sq. 31 Cor. vii. 18. The instrument used for this purpose was called οἰκοδομητής. Celsus de Medic. VII. 25; compare also Joseph. Antiq. XII. 5. 1. 4 In Domit. c. 12. 5 That the tax was taken off at a later period, appears from Origen, Epist. ad African. Tom. I. Opp. ed. Rusei p. 28, Καὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων δήφαμον οἷς τοῖς τῶν τοιούτων οἰκοδομητήν. See also Zorn, p. 305. 6 Euseb. Doctrina Numor. Veter. VI. p. 405.
reproach to Domitian, that, on receiving information of the survivors of the family of David that were still living there, he had two relatives of Jesus, grand-children of his brother Jacob, brought to Rome. He convinced himself, however, of their innocence, and let them return to their homes in peace.¹

II. Still, all the hopes of the Israelites for better times had not yet expired. They continued evermore to console themselves with the expectation of the Messiah. Even supposing that Thedas² left no adherents behind him, there certainly remained many of the party of Judas of Galilee, who during the siege of Jerusalem had played so conspicuous and, for the people, so fatal a part.³ And that even the Alexandrine Jews still flattered themselves with hopes for the future, is probable from the drama of the poet Ezekiel, entitled the “Departure out of Egypt,” of which no inconsiderable fragments are found in Clemens of Alexandria, and Eusebius,⁴ and who perhaps lived towards the end of the first century of the Christian era;⁵ while the example of that wondrous deliverance of the Jewish people from Egyptian bondage, was well calculated to nourish and keep alive the expectation of a similar release from the Roman sway. Perhaps, too, the apocryphal Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, which appears to belong to the same period,⁶ had a similar tendency.

But on the one hand, the courage of the unhappy people was too much depressed by the destruction of their capital, for them to venture so soon again on attempts for their liberation, the result of which could by no means be doubtful. On the other hand, they

³ Six hundred that committed devastations in Egypt were given up by the chief Jews in Alexandria. How many may have escaped?
⁶ Fabricii Codex Pseudepigraph. Vet. Testamenti p. 519. Grabe’s Preface p. 496. This apocryphal work is cited already by Origen, Homil. XV. in Josuam. It may however have been afterwards interpolated by a Christian.
were perhaps somewhat tranquilized by the moderation which Nerva exhibited towards them, and by the mildness of the government of his successors. The fire, however, continued to smoulder beneath the ashes; and there needed only some external stimulus to accelerate the outbreak. Nerva, by his edict, had only sought to alleviate the abuses that existed in the requisition of the tax to Jupiter Capitolinus. But wise and philanthropic as Trajan was, and careful as he, and the Senate after his example, were in selecting the governors of the provinces, it surpassed human powers to hold in check all the subordinate functionaries; and many complaints never reached the Emperor, who, involved in arduous wars, was forced to be absent from Rome during a great part of his reign. Add to this the constantly increasing hatred and scorn entertained by the Romans for the Jews; and it will be easily comprehended how, by degrees, now that an age had already passed by since the destruction of Jerusalem, a new insurrection was prepared and ready to break out; and that, too, not at first in Palestine, where the people dwelt in smaller numbers, and perhaps also under heavier subjection, but in regions that had not suffered by the war, and where the Jewish colonies existed in wealth and comfort. And, although this revolt showed itself only in single provinces, yet, after weighing all the circumstances, it is more than probable that a great, perhaps the greatest part of the nation had a share in it, and favoured and supported it, at least in secret.

III. Egypt and Cyrene were, without doubt, the countries in which the Jews had spread themselves the most. Every one knows how rich, how powerful, and how highly favoured by the government that people were in Alexandria, from the time of the first Ptolemies. Not less fortunate was their condition in the province of Cyrenaica, so intimately connected with Egypt. The first Ptolemy had permitted them to settle there. The religious persecutions of the Syrian king, Antiochus Epiphanes, had induced many to betake themselves to this country, which was not subjected to his rule. In every city of Cyrenaica dwelt Jews in the full enjoyment of equal rights with the Greeks;¹ and their prosperity is evinced, not alone by their having together with the Alexandrians

a synagogue in Jerusalem, but also from the circumstance recorded in the inscription of Berenice, that in this city, as well as in Alexandria and other cities, and hence most probably throughout Cyrenaica, they were under their own magistrates. But here also they had restless spirits amongst them. Shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem, a weaver, one Jonathan, had succeeded in misleading about two thousand persons by promises of signs and wonders. It is true, that the wealthier and more respectable took no part in his project, and even gave warning to the Roman governor, Catullus. The latter fell upon the unarmed multitude assembled in a desert place about their seducer, slaughtered many of them, and caused three thousand more rich Jews to be put to death in Egypt; after which, he boasted of having obtained a victory over the nation. But when he communicated the matter to the Emperor, with many embellishments to his own advantage, and thereupon made his appearance in Rome with the prisoners, among whom Jonathan also was, Vespasian and Titus were informed, doubtless by the historian Josephus who was under accusation in company with other Roman and Alexandrine Jews, of the true state of the case. Jonathan paid the penalty of his crime with his life. Catullus, on the contrary, escaped the punishment he deserved, through the clemency of the Emperor, but died shortly after.

IV. Since that time, so far as we know, all had been quiet in the province of Cyrenaica; at least in appearance. Under Trajan's mild and at the same time powerful and victorious sway, the provinces of the Roman empire that lay at a distance from the frontiers, enjoyed an undisturbed repose; and it was not till he became involved in the arduous Parthian war, that the Jews could venture to take up arms. Their revolt, however, must have been concerted and prepared long before; otherwise it could not have spread so far, and with such violence.

Did we still possess the Ecclesiastical History of Aristo of Pella, which Eusebius has made use of; or the History of the Jewish War under Hadrian, by the rhetorician Antonius Julianus, who in all

1 Acts vi. 9; comp. also xi. 20. 2 Josephus de Bello Jud. VII. xiii. 1. 3 cap. ulti. 4 Wesseling, ib. p. 109.
probability was a contemporary, and of whom Minucius Felix and Gellius make mention; or were we better acquainted with the contents of the Samaritan Book of Joshua, so called; we should doubtless be more particularly informed as to the circumstances. As it is, we must content ourselves with what little we obtain from Dion Cassius, Eusebius, and some other, partly very corrupt, sources; and cannot even adduce, with certainty, the immediate cause of the insurrection in the province of Cyrenaica. Perhaps, however, it was no other than the fact, that there were then but few troops in those regions; inasmuch as Trajan had probably taken with him all the forces that could be spared from the provinces for the Parthian war.

It was in the year of Rome 868, A. D. 115, in the 18th year of Trajan's reign, under the consuls M. Vipstanus Messala and M. Vergilianus Pdeo, — when the Emperor had in the spring attacked and completely subdued Armenia, after expelling Parhamasiris, the king set up by the Parthians, — that the insurrection broke out in Cyrenaica. With incredible quickness, says Orosius, the Jews at the same time broke loose in different countries, as though they had gone mad. The flame of war soon spread to Egypt, and thus took a direction of the last importance to the Roman state. For Alexandria was one of the principal granaries of Rome, which for one third of the year was furnished with the necessary supply by the grain-flotillas that regularly sailed from that city. Consequently, the emperors had given their particular

1 In Octavius, edit. Ouzelli et Meurzii, p. 319.
3 Fabricii Cod. Pseudepigr. V. T. p. 887; in the extract from cap. 45, "Obsidio urbis Hieropolymitanæ par Adrianum fusa pertextit." Joseph Scaliger was in possession of this manuscript, which he presented to the library of the University of Leyden. Holtinger took a copy of it, and made known its contents in his Excercitaciones Antimorinianæ, and in other writings. Eichhorn's Introd. to the O. T. II. p. 457, edit. 1808. Extracts are also to be found in Reland's Dissertat. selectæ, Pars II, de Samaritaniæ; but unfortunately none on the Jewish war.
4 In the year 144—145 of the Alexandrine era. Zöege Numi Agyptii Imperatorii, p. 368.
5 Almelooven, Fasti Romani Consularis, 133, names the consuls M. Valerius Messala and C. Popilius Carus Pdeo Vergilianus. I have followed Eckhel in the text.
6 Histor. VII. 135, "Incredibili deinde motu sub uno tempore Judæi quasi rabie effrati, per diversas terrarum partes exararunt. Nam et per totam Libyam adversus incolas atrocissima bella gesserunt," etc.
7 Alexandria supplied Rome, af-
attention to Egypt; and it had been a maxim ever since the time of Augustus, to intrust the government of that country to none but a Roman knight, and to allow no senator or distinguished knight to make the journey thither without special permission.

The centre of the revolt was Cyrenaica. Thence it spread over the inhabitants of the country, who were slaughtered in droves. Dion Cassius, or rather his epitomist Xiphilin, draws a frightful picture of the barbarities committed by the Jews on the Greeks. They slew them, he says; they stripped off their skins, and then covered themselves with them; they sawed many in two lengthwise; they devoured their flesh, and wound the entrails round their own bodies; they cast them before wild beasts; they forced them to combat as gladiators with each other; and in such wise they put 920,000 persons to death.1

That the slaughter was immense, can by no means be doubted; even R. David Ganz, of the sixteenth century, says in Zemach David, one of the best Jewish authorities for the history of this war, that the Romans and Greeks slain in Africa by the Jews were like the sand on the sea-shore, that cannot be numbered.2 But the cannibal fury that the Jews are accused of is altogether incredible; as they would thereby have rendered themselves in the highest degree unclean. What we are to assume as true, is this: that in a sudden and widely extended rising they destroyed many Romans and Greeks; and that in the amphitheatres they threw many to wild beasts, or forced them to fight with each other. Indeed, it is known that they attended exhibitions of the kind;3 and they may have desired to repay the Romans in this manner.

1 Dion Cassius LXVIII. 32. p. 1145 Rein.
2 Eisenmenger’s Entdecktes Judenthum II. p. 654.
3 Even in Jerusalem, Herod the Great had built an amphitheatre for the celebration of the quinquennial festivals, in commemoration of the victory near Actium; Jos. Ant. XV. 8. 1. He there exhibited combats of wild beasts, and threw condemned criminals to them. Fights of gladiators were also produced by Herod Agrippa in the amphitheatre at Berytus; 1400 malefactors fought there together in mortal combat; Joseph. Ant. XIX. 7. 5. Eichhorn de re senecia Judæorum, p. 6.
for the combats with wild beasts, and as gladiators, in which the latter had employed the Jewish captives after the taking of Jerusalem.¹ The sawing in pieces, seems to have been a well known mode of execution among them.² But can that, which may have taken place in single instances, be supposed to have occurred throughout a general insurrection, in which men were slaughtered by thousands? At most, then, only some individuals can have suffered such a death. How the rising was suppressed, we know not. The quieting of Cyrenaica was probably a consequence of the restoration of tranquillity in Egypt; but it required a length of time, and cost rivers of blood, before this end was obtained.

Egypt appears to have been stripped of troops, which were probably needed by the Emperor for the Parthian war; for the revolt kept continually spreading. Its leader is named Lucanus by Eusebius; and by Dion Cassius, Andreas. Perhaps, like many Jews of that period, he bore a double name—one Jewish, the other Roman; for Lucanus appears to be a corruption from Lucius.³ The Jews flocked to him on all sides, and greeted him as the king of Israel. One nomos (district) after another was laid waste, as far up as the Thebaid; indeed, the Jewish bands appear to have pushed on beyond the boundaries of the Roman empire, even into Ethiopia, and probably to the state of Meroë, where many Jews resided.⁴ Even in Alexandria, where the nation found itself in the most prosperous condition, a revolt appears to have taken place, in which much havoc was committed; although the Jews can hardly have

¹ Joseph. de Bello Judaico VII. c. 2. 1. c. 3. 1. c. 5. 1.
² In this manner, according to Jewish tradition, the prophet Isaiah was put to death. The Epistle to the Hebrews also makes mention of this mode of execution, Heb. xi. 37; comp. Suiceri Thea. Eccles. in npiu. Reimarus accordingly considers this statement of Dion as not improbable.
³ Reimarus on Dion. The Arabic text of Abulpharagius calls him Luminum; the Syriac, Lumpisum: both of them corruptions.
⁴ It is probable that Jews had come from Egypt into Ethiopia. Comp. Basnage, Histoire des Juifs XI. p. 181, 5vo. Ancient traditions connect the Ethiopians with the Israelites. The kings of Abyssinia profess to derive their origin from Solomon and the queen of Sheba. That there were Jews in those regions at the institution of Christianity, is proved by the conversion (recorded Acts viii. 27) of the treasurer of queen Candace, or Hendaque; a name still extant in the traditions of the country, and which, according to Pliny, H. Nat. VI. 35, was the common appellation of the queens that ruled over it.
mastered that great and opulent city, of which they possessed only a single quarter. It was not till the following year, A. U. C. 869, A. D. 116, that the troops were assembled; and then apparently they were not sufficiently numerous, for they were driven back in the first battle. They retired however in good order to Alexandria, which city they also defended, and where they effected a dreadful slaughter among the Jews. Rabbi David Ganz, in the Meor Enaim, gives, according to the testimony of R. Asaria de Rossi, (in what age he lived is not accurately known,) the number of the slain at 200,000. Lucas and his comrades, however, seem to have given themselves no further trouble about Alexandria, but to have directed their efforts exclusively to the land of their forefathers; and if there be any truth in the tradition in Abulpharagius, that he led his hosts into Palestine, the expedition must have taken place at this time, and before the great general Marcianus Turbo could come to the assistance of the sorely afflicted province. This officer, who, little as we know concerning him, was accounted one of the best of Trajan’s captains, was now despatched by the Emperor against Lucuas with a body of infantry and cavalry. Besides the land forces, he had a fleet under his command, which, without doubt, was equipped in Syria or Phenicia, and was destined to keep the sea open; for this was now of the last importance, as the revolt had also broken out in Cyprus, and every thing depended on preventing Rome from lacking a supply of corn. We are thus obliged to conclude, that the Jews also possessed ships; which, as they were then masters of Cyrenaica and Cyprus, is easily explained. Turbo had at least two legions of regular troops, together with the auxiliaries belonging to them, but was obliged to purchase the victory dearly; for several bloody battles took place, in which many thousand Egyptian and Cyrenian Jews perished; and certainly many thousand Romans also. According

1 It lay by the sea-side; Joseph. c. Antion. II. 4. 2 Euseb. H. E. IV. 2. Orosius VII. 12. 3 In Zemnich David, Eisenmenger II. p. 655. 4 Ed. Pocockianus p. 76, according to the Arabic text. The Syriac, edited by Bruns and Kirsch, contains the same statement; see Bar- hebrai Chronicum Syriacum II. p. 54. 5 Spartanus in Hadriano, c. 4, 5, 6, 6. 15. Dion Cass. LXIX. 18. p. 1166. Fronto mentions him in the third letter to the emperor Antonine; Mailander’s edit. I. p. 7; in Niebuhr p. 6. His full name was Marcianus Livianus Turbo. 6 Euseb. IV. 2.
to the Arabic text of Abulphragius, Turbo sought out Lucuas in Palestine, and there destroyed his army. He speaks of many small skirmishes. This system of petty warfare was quite suited to the locality of Palestine; as will also be seen in the sequel of this history. The same Arabic text of Abulphragius states, moreover, that Lucuas was killed in Palestine.

V. In Egypt tranquillity seems now to have been restored. The slaughter of the Jews, whether in Palestine or in Egypt itself, terrified them all. But was it the Jews alone, and not perhaps the native Egyptians also, that rose against the Romans? That these latter were likewise turbulent, and bore the Roman yoke with an ill will, can scarce be doubted. The insurrection of the Bucoli under Marcus Aurelius, furnishes a clear proof of the fact. Were the dialogue of Philopatris found in Lucian’s writings genuine, the passage at its close, where Egypt is spoken of as subdued, might certainly be explained as referring to Trajan’s victory over the rebellious Jews and Egyptians. But this production belongs probably to a later Lucian, who lived in the time of the emperor Julian; as Wieland has lately maintained from internal grounds.

But great and extensive as the insurrection of Egypt may have been, still Alexandria was not comprised in it. It is true that, according to the Armenian version of Eusebius’s Chronicon, Alexandria, after having been destroyed by the Jews, was restored by the emperor Hadrian in the first year of his reign. But,

1 Turbo, however, is not named by Abulphragius.
2 What remains to us relative to the history of this insurrection, which was suppressed by Avidius Cassius, who afterwards laid claim to the purple itself, has been collected by Tillemont, Histoire des Empereurs II. p. 403; and by Zoëga, Numi Imperiorii Egypti p. 222. We have only one Alexandrine imperial coin of the 11th year of Marcus Aurelius, in which the insurrection broke out, given in Mionnet’s Description de Médailles antiques Grecques et Romaines, Tome VI. p. 305. Of the 13th year we have likewise only one (Zoëga 223), and of the 14th none at all.

Here belongs the insurrection of Cassius, in which Egypt was doubtless involved.
3 Wieland’s translation of Lucian, VI. p. 363 sq. He understands Tryphon’s words, “I also leave to those who belong to me the happiness of seeing the times when Babylon shall be destroyed, Egypt conquered, the Persians subjugated,” so far as they relate to the Egyptians, of the evil-minded and rebellious bands of monks and other Christians of this country opposed to the emperor Julian; and those comprised by far the greatest number. p. 419.
4 Chronicon Eusebii edit. Mediolan. 1518, “Hadrianus Alexan-
although the capital of Egypt may indeed have suffered much in these disturbances, and in those which perhaps broke out there shortly after Trajan's death, destroyed it certainly was not. Jerome even attributes the insurrection to the Romans. He must have thought that Alexandria had been taken by force from the Jews; which, however, cannot be proved. At any rate the imperial coins of this city continue numerous and without interruption from the eighteenth to the twentieth year of Trajan’s reign; and this clearly shows that it did not take part in any rebellion. The later coins also, although containing some allusions to conquests, give not the slightest hint of a destruction and important restoration of this city; which, however, in consequence of the zeal with which the Alexandrians flattered the emperors, and especially Hadrian, would certainly have been the case, had they been able to laud him as the new founder (Κυρήνη) of their city. It is not till the fifteenth year of his reign, that we find a coin on which the female genius of the city is represented kissing the Emperor's hand. But this can have no reference to a restoration of it in his first year. On the contrary, there is a coin of the kind

1 See Sec. IX, below.
2 Chron. Hieronymi ad ann. Hadr. primum. Hadrianus Alexandriam a Romania subversam restauravit.” zoëga proposes instead of Alexandriam to read Hierosolymam; Numi Imperat. Αἰγύπτιοι p. 101. But we have no need of this emendation, if we only understand the passage aright. Besides, the restoration of Jerusalem belongs to a later epoch.
3 Mionnet reckons not less than 126 of them. The coins struck by the Egyptian Nomoi in honour of Trajan are not taken into the account, because the latest of them belong to his 15th year.
4 In Mionnet No. 759, 760, 762, all of the 18th year of his reign. No. 759 represents the Emperor on the triumphal car; in No. 760 he is sitting with the goddess of victory at his side, and in front of him kneels a prisoner at the foot of a trophy; No. 762 bears a triumphal arch, on which stands a quadriga. Of his 20th year the following coins are worthy of notice: No. 777, Serapis seated, one hand resting on an eagle,—at the back of the throne a goddess of victory; No. 794, the Emperor on a quadriga in the act of being crowned by the goddess of fortune; No. 795, the Emperor on a triumphal car drawn by four elephants.

This title occurs not unfrequently on imperial coins and in inscriptions; e. g. ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑΤΟΡ ΙΑΠΙΑΝΙΟΙ ΛΥΝΤΗΙ ΚΑΙ ΚΤΙΣΘΗ, at Athens, Muratori Thesaur. Inscr. I. p. 234, 235; and at Smyrna, Smith Opusco. ex itinere Turcico p. 53.
5 Zoëga l. c. p. 122.
extant which was struck on the restoration of Libya, with the inscription RESTITVTORI AVG. LIBYAE. S. C. 1 It is true that Eckhel adduces as an objection to its genuineness the word AVGusto, which is found on no other coins of this kind applied to Hadrian; but he does not venture to decide in opposition to such a connoisseur as Pellerin. 2 Mediolanum, in his catalogue of imperial coins, has merely RESTITVTORI LIBYAE. 3 The year in which this coin was struck is uncertain; but it was probably in the early part of Hadrian’s reign, perhaps in his sixth year, provided that he was then sojourning at Alexandria 4 and made a journey thence to Cyrene, or that he conferred benefits on the province. The coin moreover was struck at Rome by command of the Senate.

VI. While Egypt was now in a state of repose, the insurrection raged in Cyprus. The number of Jews in that island was very great. The trade with Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt, had drawn many thither; and their condition must have been a very prosperous one. The leader of the revolt, of whom we know nothing further, was named Artemion. According to Dion Cassius, the Jews in Cyprus put to death 240,000 persons. 6 Eusebius states in his Chronicle, that they took Salamis, put the Greeks to death, and razed the city to the ground. 7 Jewish accounts also assert that they destroyed all the Greeks in the island and in the neighbouring countries, and that Trajan was obliged to send Hadrian his sister’s son to Cyprus, in order to subdue them. 8 All this is certainly exagge-

---

3 Imperat. Romanor. numisma. p. 177.
4 Zoëga p. 94. Eckhel doubts as to this first journey, and at any rate will not admit the validity of Zoëga’s reasons, l. c. p. 491. It is quite certain, however, that Hadrian was in Egypt in the 15th year of his reign. Comp. the recent investigations of Champollion-Figeac in the Annales des Lagides, I. p. 419, 420, 441, 443. He also assumes only one journey to Egypt.
5 At least he was in Libya on a hunting expedition, during which he killed a lion; Athenaeus XV. 21. Tom. V. p. 468. Schweigh.
6 Lib. LXXII. 32. p. 1046.
7 Τοις ἐν Σαλαμίνι της Κύπρου Ἐλλήνας Ἰουδαίους ανθρώπους τὴν πόλιν κατέστρεψαν. At Trajan’s 19th year. Beda has the same statement, taken probably from Eusebius; De nominibus locorum in Actis Apostolorum: “Salamis civitas, in Cypro Insula, omne Constantia diem, quam Traiani Principis tempore Judaei interficierunt omnibus accolus deleverunt.”
8 In Zehab David, in Eisenmenger II. 655.
rated: 240,000 persons, together with 220,000 in Cyrenaica, making altogether nearly half a million, would not so easily, or rather without the most strenuous resistance, allow themselves to be put to death; and so fruitful a country as Cyprus had at that time certainly not less than a million of inhabitants, of which however the Jews could not by far have constituted the largest part. Salamis also remained thereafter, as it had been before, the capital of Cyprus, and received in the time of Constantine the name of Constantia. Its bishop, Epiphanius, is also known to church history. It was at length destroyed by the Saracens, under Heraclius. It is therefore probable, that Salamis was plundered and set on fire by the Jews; an event which later historiographers have turned into a total destruction. Numismatics afford us no light, because we possess no indisputable imperial coins of this city. If, however, those which have the legend KOINON KTIPISN were struck in the capital of the island, as indeed is scarcely to be doubted, we have specimens of them from Claudius to Macrinus. The tumults in Cyprus were soon suppressed, we know not for certain whether by Marcius Turbo or Lucius Quietus. It appears that the Jews were completely exterminated; or at least they were driven out of the island; for Dion Cassius relates that none of this people could dwell there, and that any who were driven on shore by stress of weather, were immediately put to death. This also is not to be taken literally; and must, at any rate, be understood only of the period immediately succeeding the revolt.

VII. The circumstances of the period, without doubt, rendered the rising of the Jews in Mesopotamia still more dangerous. They were very wealthy and powerful in this province. Of the ten tribes who had been carried away in former times into the kingdom of Assyria, by far the greater part remained behind, when Cyrus and his successors gave the Jews permission to return to the land of their forefathers. The cities on both banks of the Euphrates in particular were filled with them. According to Philo, they were spread

---

1 Pococke's Description of the East, II. p. 216. Meurail Cyprus, in the third volume of his works, where the notices respecting Salamis among the ancients are collected, c. 20-23. But I find nothing concerning the destruction of the city by the Saracens.

2 Loc. cit. cap. 32.

over a great part of Babylon and other Satrapies. \footnote{Legatio ad Caium p. 1032, ed. Heschel.} They had their own patriarch, of the family of David, who was possessed of great privileges under the Parthian government. \footnote{Walch Historia Patriarcharum Judæorum, p. 96, 102, 246.} They came in multitudes to Jerusalem at the time of the festivals; and under Caligula, the prefect Petronius was so struck with their numbers, that he feared a powerful aid might come from that quarter, were the Jews to oppose by force of arms the Emperor’s decree to set up his image in the temple; and it cannot be doubted, that from the ruins of the Jewish state not a few escaped to their co-religionists in the Parthian dominions.

The hatred of the Jews against the Romans may easily be conceived; and in each Parthian war they no doubt devoted themselves with all their hearts to their protectors the Parthian emperors, to whom their assistance must have been exceedingly welcome. This too must have rendered a revolt in the rear of their army so much the more hazardous for the Romans. Trajan probably still remained with a part of his legions in Armenia; whence, as this country became tranquillized, he gradually withdrew into Mesopotamia. Here no doubt it was, in the regions which the Romans had not yet been able to occupy, that the Jews broke out into insurrection. The Emperor committed their suppression or entire expulsion to Lucius Quietus, \footnote{Eusebius, ἤπειρος τῆς ἄρρεν τῆς ἐκκλησίας αὐτῶν. Hist. Eccl. IV. 2.} a Mauritanian, who was considered one of his most distinguished generals, who had done him signal service in the Parthian war, and had taken Nisibis and Edessa; \footnote{Dion Cassius LXVIII. 30. p. 1044.} a proof how important the Emperor held the matter to be. Lucius subdued the Jews with much bloodshed, but incontestably with great loss on his own side also; for the bravery which the Jews were wont to exhibit when combating for their freedom and religion, is well known. Trajan was so well satisfied with the service done him, that he conferred on Lucius the governorship of Palestine; \footnote{Euseb. Hist. Eccl. IV. 2.} of course, with the charge of preserving tranquillity, and, provided there be any thing in the story of Lucius’s irruption, to put down him or his still remaining adherents. And thus Lucius appears to have restored order for a while.
VIII. With the disturbances in Mesopotamia we are perhaps to connect the martyrdom of St. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch; who it seems was tried in this metropolis of Asia, and then sent to Rome to be executed. The story of his martyrdom has often indeed been called in question; and especially by Martini. But how can the credibility of the most ancient church history be maintained, if we attack even those statements which are confirmed by the most respectable testimonies? Nevertheless, as the precise period of his death is uncertain, we must assume that Trajan sentenced him during his second stay in Antioch, in the year 115; his first visit to that city having been in A.D. 105. The Christians were not then so accurately distinguished from the Jews, but that the Emperor, although he might have obtained more correct information and better ideas respecting them from the trials held in Bithynia by the younger Pliny a few years before, was continually confounding them one with another; and this especially in the East, and in provinces that were filled with Jews, where the greater part of the Christians had previously professed Judaism, or were of Jewish origin. If now Trajan learnt that Ignatius was one of the heads of the Christians, he might easily regard him as a party to the Jewish attacks on the empire; and this it was—not the earthquake that had just devastated Antioch, and from which it is said the priests took occasion to accuse the bishop—that may have excited Trajan against the venerable old man. Indeed, the whole trial, as it stands (perhaps not wholly authentic) in the Acta Martyrum, exhibits an acrimony which in this noble and philanthropic prince is truly surprising; but which may be accounted for by supposing that he confounded the Syrian Christians with the Jews, or at least regarded them as belonging to the same party. That Hadrian also, at a later period, was not able to distinguish between them with readiness, will be seen in the sequel. If such be really the case, the reason is evident why Trajan, after having

---

1 Persecutiones Christianorum sub Imperatoribus Romanis; Comment. II. p. 12.
2 About the year 111. Semler's Christliche Jahrbücher I. p. 29.
3 Seidenstücker de Christianis ad Trajanum saque a Caesaribus et Senatu Romano pro Cultoribus Religionis Mosaicæ semper habitis. Helmstedt. 1790.
4 Schönck's Kirchengesch. II. p. 338.
5 In Ruinart Ant. Martyr. sincera et selecta p. 11.
passed sentence of death on Ignatius, did not cause him to be executed in Antioch; but sent him to Rome, there to be torn in pieces by wild beasts as a rebel. That is, it was an object with him to strike terror into the great body of Jews in the Roman empire by the cruel execution of one whom he regarded as a chief of their party in the East, and thus deter them from insurrections. All this, however, I offer as nothing but a conjecture, which perhaps has more plausibility than truth.

IX. Trajan died in the twentieth year of his reign, A. D. 117. Hadrian succeeded him without opposition; made peace with the Parthians, to whom he restored the provinces conquered by Trajan on the other side of the Euphrates; and hastened to Rome. But as soon as he found himself firmly seated on the throne, he commenced, apparently in the year 120, his celebrated tours through all the provinces of the empire. It is true, that of these journeys, historians have left us little on record; but there are so many monuments everywhere extant, relating to them, and they are testified to by so many inscriptions and coins, that they well deserve to be accurately investigated in a separate dissertation; which would doubtless furnish very interesting results. In the regions with which we are at present concerned we first find him between the years 129 and 131.9

Through all this period the Jews seem to have kept themselves tolerably quiet, if we except a brief revolt in Palestine, immediately after Trajan's death; of which Spartan and Eusebius make mention. The former speaks in general terms of insurrectionary movements in this country, with which perhaps the disturbances in Egypt, to which he also alludes, were connected.9

Eusebius, however, records that Hadrian in his first year subdued the Jews, who had for the third time revolted against the Romans, perhaps in Alexandria.4 It was therefore probably a remnant of

1 In Julii Pauli sententiarum receptarum L. V. tit. 22, de Seditiosis, (in Schulting's Jusprud. vet. Antejustiana, ed. Ayrer, p. 504) it is said: "Auctores seditiosis et tumultus, vel concitatores populi, pro qualitate dignitatis, aut in crucem toluntur, aut bestiae obijexantur, aut in insulam deportentur." So a Gallic rebel was thrown to wild beasts, Tacit. Hist. II. 81. The law was accordingly older than Trajan's time.

9 Eckhel D. N. V. Vol. VI. p. 481.
8 Spartanus in Hadriano c. 5, "Ægyptus seditionibus urgebatur. Lycia denique ac Palestina rebelles animos effecerant."
4 Chron. p. 381, ed. Mediolan. Hadrianus Judaeos, qui ter contra
the war against Trajan, which had been brought to a close a short time before, and was now completely extinguished. The breaking out of these disturbances may have been connected with the disgrace into which Lucius Quietus fell. For Hadrian, whose adoption by Trajan was very equivocal, conceived against this great general a suspicion of a design upon the throne, in consequence of an impeachment by his praetorian prefect Tatian; whereupon he deprived him of the command of the Mauritanian troops, who were very much devoted to him, as being their own countryman. This may have given the Jews courage to make a new attempt; which, however, can hardly have been of great importance. Since that time, all had been quiet in Palestine likewise. Hadrian was there in the year 130, A. U. C. 883; for we have coins of Gaza commencing with a new era, that of his visit to this city. To this period belong also the Roman coins that make mention of his journey to this country, and of the benefits conferred on it. On one of these the Emperor and the Province are represented as sacrificing together, with the legend: ADVENTVI AVG. JVDAEAE. On

Romanos rebellaverunt, ad obedientiam revocavit;” and in the Greek text: Ἀντιπατος Ἰουβαλως κατα Ἀλ-χαντίους στρατιάς ἑκάστης, from Syncellus.

1 “Lucium Quietum, sublatis gentibus Mauris, quo regebat, quia suspectus imperio fuerat, exarmavit, Mario Turbone, Judeis compressis, ad deprimendum inmultum Mauritanias destinato,” says Spartan, Hadr. c. 5; comp. Dion Cassius LXVIII. c. 32. p. 1146, and Reimar. Not. 203; also Titelemont II. p. 249. A few years after, Lucius Quietus embarked in a conspiracy against the Emperor with three other ex-consuls, and stoned for it with his life.

2 Crevier is of opinion that Hadrian transferred the command against the Jews to Turbo, in whom as an older friend, he placed greater confidence than he did in Quietus; and that it was not till after the disturbances were suppressed, that he sent him into Mauritania; Hist. des Empér. VIII. p. 22. The words of Spartanus cited in the preceding note are somewhat obscure; but as we know that Trajan despatched Turbo against the Jews, they seem to apply rather to this earlier event. Casaubon and Salmasius do not decide in their notes on Spartanus.

3 A couple of Alexandrine coins of Hadrian’s second year, (in Mi- onet VI. p. 147, No. 845 and 846,) where the Emperor is represented in a triumphal procession, (in 845 his chariot is drawn by four elephants,) may be referred to a victory. Probably, however, they relate to the triumph offered the Emperor by the Senate; but which, as it belonged to Trajan, he would not accept. Alexandrine adulation may, notwithstanding, have represented him as the hero of a triumph.

4 Eckhel III. p. 453.

5 Bunsen Histoire des Juifs XI. p. 357. I do not find this coin adduced by Eckhel.
the other the Emperor is raising the Province, which is kneeling on one knee, and around which stand three boys with palm-branches: the circumscription is, IVDAEA. This is the impress usually accom-
ppanied by the inscription RESTITVTORI of this or that province. ¹ Eckhel, however, thinks that Judea at that time was unworthy of any such benefit. But the numerous Greek and Syrian inhabitants had surely no share in the rebellion. I consider, therefore, that the word RESTITVTORI was omitted without any secondary design. Indeed, the impress itself shows the purport of the coin; and the first one, on which the Emperor and the Province are represented as sacrificing together, proves moreover that there existed no grudge on the part of Hadrian against the Greek and Syrian inhabi-
tants of the country.

During the Emperor’s stay in Palestine, a conversation may have taken place between him and Rabbi Joshua Ben Hannina on the resurrection of the dead, which is mentioned in the Talmudical book Bereshith Rabba. Hadrian was very inquisitive, and con-
cerned himself about everything. It is therefore not improbable that he also engaged in conversation with learned Jews. That, however, the Rabbi failed of satisfying him with his explanation, that the new body is formed from the bone Luz, may well be sup-
posed.²

In Egypt Hadrian seems now to have considered himself per-
factly safe as far as regarded the Jews. He noticed them, indeed, as he did every thing else that came in his way; but it was with a rapid and superficial glance. Thus in his celebrated letter to his brother-in-law, the consul Servianus, which Vopiscus has pre-
served,³ he says of them: “There is no Jewish, no Samaritan Rabbi, no Christian priest, that does not cast nativities, or inspect the entrails of beasts in order to predict from them, or busy him-
self as a quacksalver. Even the patriarch [of the Jews], when he

¹ Eckhel VI. p. 495.
² Eisenmenger II. p. 931. The Emperor is said to have demanded the proof for this doctrine. They brought him such a bone, which could not be ground in a mill, burnt in fire, or dissolved in water; and when it was laid on an anvil, the hammer split in pieces. In this narrative, at the name of Hadrian the wish is added, that his bones might be crushed! See more about the bone Luz in Eisenmenger I. c. and in Bayle’s Dict. v. Bar-cochba.
³ In the Life of Saturninus, just at the beginning.
FIRST YEARS OF HADRIAN.

comes to Alexandria, is compelled to humour the former [the adorers of Serapis] by worshipping Serapis, and the latter [the Christians] by worshipping Christ.” That there is a strong admixture of error in this statement, is clear as the day. But that the Jews did lend themselves to such loose acts, to which they joined the trade of begging, is shown by the following passage, among others, in Juvenal’s Satires, whose author was banished about the year 134, to Egypt;1 and which, though it applies only to the poorer sort, is yet remarkable enough, especially if we assume that the poet had before his eyes, not only the Roman, but likewise the Alexandrian Jews.

———Cophino sonoque relictio,
Arceanum Judaean tremens mendicat in aereum,
Interpres legum Solymarum et magna sacerdos
Arboris ac summi fida internuncio cesi.
Implet et illa manum, sed parcius ere minuto,
Quali acunque voles Judei somnia vendunt.

Juv. Sat. VI. 543 sq.

X. It was very natural that Hadrian, during the first years of his reign, while the Jews remained tranquil, should often occupy himself with them, and with pondering the means of securing the empire against their attempts for the future. One of these means was perhaps that of dividing the numerous population among the different provinces. But it may well have been difficult to find places for them. Asia, Greece, Italy, and Spain, hardly wished for any more of them than they had already. The coast of Africa offered, perhaps, the only tract of land whither he could have transplanted more than a small number; and even this may not have appeared to him advisable, when he reflected on the revolt in Cyrenaica. Accordingly, the statement in the Armenian Chronicle of Eusebius, that he sent a colony of Jews into Libya, which was entirely depopulated,2 is scarcely worthy of credit; and at most is to be understood only of a colony in general that was sent there, as the Greek text of the same Chronicle has it,3 and as is confirmed

1 That is, supposing Juvenal was actually banished to Egypt; which Frank, in his Examen Criticum D. Junii Juvenalis vitae, p. 8, considers a poetic fiction.
2 "Hadrianus in Libyam Judeo-

rum Coloniam misit.” In Hadrian's fourth year.
3 Chronicon. p. 382, Ἀποστέλλων εἰς Αἰγύπτιον ἐκμαθησαν Ἀδικίας ἤτοι-

μερή, from Syncellus.
THE JEWISH WAR UNDER TRAJAN AND HADRIAN.

by Orosius. The place is not specified more particularly. Libya was the name given by the Greeks to the whole coast of Africa from Egypt as far as Carthage, and perhaps still further. In the midst of such difficulties, it might very possibly be the case, that there were some grounds for a Jewish statement, that the Emperor entertained the design of driving the people entirely out of the empire. But its execution was impracticable. For whether should he send them? Their number might still have amounted to several millions. To cast these into the arms of the Parthians, the hereditary enemies of the Romans, would have been hazardous in the extreme; and to drive them into the wilderness among completely savage tribes dwelling on the north or south, would have been inhuman, contrary to the principles and practices of the Romans, and moreover exceedingly dangerous for the borders. The plan, therefore, supposing it was actually formed, remained unexecuted.

Another means Hadrian seems actually to have tried; and this was, gradually to extirpate the Jews as such, by prohibiting circumcision, the characteristic sign of their nationality, and to amalgamate them with the other people of the empire. This prohibition is mentioned in a few words by Spartan as the cause of the insurrection. He does not indeed fix the time; but it seems evident from his narration that the outbreak followed soon after. It may indeed be objected to Spartan, that the Romans were wont never to assail the national customs of the people subjected to them; and hence Casaubon understands this prohibition of emasculation, and regards it as an application of the older edicts of Domitian and Nerva against this practice. It would also have been a very impolitic act of Hadrian, who certainly was acquainted from his own experience with the Jewish mode of thinking, to imitate the nation

1 Histor. Heb. VII. c. 12, "Nam et per totam Libyan adversus incolas atrocissima bella gesserunt (Judaei); quae adeo tunc interfector eculorum desolata est ut nisi postea Hadrianus Imperator collectas aliunde colonias illuc deduxisset, abraham habitatore maneisset."

2 Hence too the name Libyphoe nices; compare Munter's Religion der Carthagier, 2d edit. pp. 107, 108.

3 Talmud in Abodah Zara c. 1, cited in Baasmage Hist. des Juifs XI. p. 331. But the account of the Emperor's deliberations is so fabulous, as not to be worth the trouble of repeating.

4 In Hadr. c. 14, "Moverunt ea tempestatate et Judaei bellum, quod vetabantur mutilare genitalia."

5 In the note to the above cited passage from Spartanus. See Schrevelius's edit. p. 63.
against himself in the highest degree by such a prohibition. It would not be consistent either with his customary prudence or with his general character; which, although not a noble one, was far from being bad or tyrannical.

But on the other hand, it is to be considered that the restless spirit of the Jews, and their striving after independence, had occasioned two such dreadful insurrections within little more than half a century; and that a ruler may well have thought himself called upon by these two examples—whether correctly or not—to put an end to such continual danger, by endeavouring to destroy the nationality of that people, even at the cost of their ancient customs and religious usages. But that not castration, but circumcision, was forbidden by this edict, is evident from the fact, that the former was not at all in use among the Jews. Besides, we have an account of an edict of Antoninus Pius, who revoked Hadrian’s prohibition as far as it related to Jewish children, and only forbade the Jews to adopt proselytes into their community by means of circumcision.¹

XI. Another means contrived by Hadrian for keeping the Jews in subjection, remains to be mentioned. This was the restoration of Jerusalem. This city had always been considered one of the strongest fortified places; and the difficulty which all hostile armies, and finally the Romans under Titus, had experienced in capturing this stronghold, sufficiently proves the importance of its position.² Surrounded by mountains, itself built on a rocky promontory almost completely isolated, forming the hill called Mount Zion, and that on which the lower city stood,—the reduction of Jerusalem, in the then state of the art of besieging, was necessarily a very tedious operation, and to be effected chiefly by famine; so that Hadrian, who in the journey from Syria to Egypt was at least in its neighbourhood, if he did not visit the place itself, must have been perfectly well convinced of the importance of this post. No wonder, therefore, that he determined to fortify it anew, and to

¹ See below, § XXVI.
² “Urbem arduam situm,” says Tacitus, “opera moleisque firmaverant, quis vel plana satia muniretur;” and thereupon describes the city pretty much at length; Histor. V. 11, 12. Michaelis has collected the history of its fortification, as well as could be done, in a note on this place. See his treatise on the results under Mount Zion and the temple, in his Zeitschr. f. Schriften III. p. 428.
send thither a colony, consisting indeed mostly of veterans, and
sufficient for the defence of the city.

Dion Cassius cites this determination of the Emperor, and the
carrying of it into execution, as a cause of the renewal of the insur-
rection.¹ Eusebius states, on the contrary, that Hadrian did not
send the colony till after the Jews were put down.² It is not dif-
ficult to reconcile both these apparently contradictory testimonies,
as Basnage has done already.³ The restoration of Jerusalem was
not the work of a few months; but the labour, when begun, was
interrupted by the revolt; and after this was suppressed, it was
continued and completed.

But ere we proceed further, we must collect the few notices that
have been preserved respecting the history of Jerusalem after the
capture of the city by Titus. Witsius and Deyling will be our
guides.⁴

It is true that Titus, after the burning of the temple, which he
would so willingly have spared, destroyed the city. But we cannot
conceive this destruction to have been complete, although Josephus
speaks of it in that sense.⁵ The same historian, however, informs
us that Titus left standing the three large towers, Hippicus, Pha-
sael, and Mariamne, probably with the wall connecting them, and
the western wall, as a shelter for the cohorts whom he left in that
neighbourhood;⁶ and these must also have had dwellings for them-
selves, their families, and their followers. It is very probable,
moreover, that Jews who had taken no part in the war, had per-
mission from the authorities, either expressed or understood, to set-
tle among the ruins. A few survivors of the tribes of Judah and
Benjamin remained there immediately after the destruction of the
city.⁷ But it is certainly going too far, when Eusebius affirms that

¹ Lib. LXIX. 12. p. 1161.
³ Hist. des Juifs XI. p. 337.
⁴ Herrn. Witsi. Miscell. Sacr. T. II. Exerc. X—XII, Historia Hier-
osolymae. Exerc. XII, Ab excidio
⁵ Tov σὲ ἄλλον ἄπαντα τῆς πόλεως
pevobolou (the three towers to be
shortly spoken of excepted) ὕστερος
πενελόπων τῆς ναυακοπτητῆς, ὡς
τῇ πώστε ὀλιγήρως πῶς ἐν ἐκ
παράσχειν τοῖς προσφεύσεις. De
Bello Jud. VII. 1. 1.
⁶ Ibid.
⁷ Basnage Hist. des Juifs XI. p.
255.
only half the city was destroyed by Titus; for this is at variance with all history, and we can only assume with the greatest probability, that Jerusalem under Titus, Domitian, Nerva, and Trajan, was indeed no longer a city, but that it still possessed inhabitants besides the Roman garrison, and was much visited by pious Jews who came to mourn over the ruins of their city and temple. Jerome also speaks of some remains of the city in the fifty years that elapsed between its destruction by Titus and the war with Hadrian. With this too agrees what we read in ancient authors respecting the war with Hadrian and the second capture of Jerusalem. Were Occo the numismatist a trustworthy man, we might cite an ancient coin pretended to have been struck under Hadrian with the legend ΔΙΟΣ ΝΑΟΣ ΙΕΡΟΤΣΑΛΗΜ, and conclude therefrom that the name Jerusalem still continued under Hadrian, before he brought his colony thither, and that a temple of Jupiter was built in the city. But the coin spoken of has remained unknown to later numismatists; and it is not at all probable that such a one has ever existed. The garrison of Jerusalem in its former condition, as they were neither a colony nor a municipium, could not have struck any coins; the erecting too of a temple to Jupiter upon the ruins, would certainly have been noticed by some Jewish or Christian author.

We confine ourselves, therefore, to the assumption that Hadrian, before the breaking out again of the war, had already begun to put his design of rebuilding and fortifying Jerusalem into execution. We remark only in addition, that he could do this without offending against the principles of the Roman state-religion; since this only forbade the rebuilding of a city once laid in ruins, in case the plough had passed over it, and the exauguration, or exfudation,

1 Demonstr. Evangel. VI. 18, Τότε μέν οὖσα τὸ ἡμίου τῆς πόλεως ἀπολύονται τῇ πολεμίᾳ ὡς φησὶν ἡ προφητεία, see Zachar. xiv. 2. The prophecy itself, in which it is said, Καὶ ἀλώσται ἡ πόλις . . . καὶ ἐκλίνοντα τὸ ἡμίου τῆς πόλεως ἄγαμανας, seems to have led Euseb. to this assertion.


had been thereby rendered complete.¹ We have no proof however that this ceremony did take place after the capture by Titus.² Josephus is entirely silent respecting it; and Jerome only relates, according to Jewish traditions which we also possess,³ that Titus Annius Rufus caused the plough to be drawn over the site of the temple.⁴ But that is said to have been done in Hadrian's time. And even this is very doubtful, since we do not know that the Romans observed the practice with respect to single buildings. There was therefore nothing in the Emperor's way, in case he wished to rebuild Jerusalem. Moreover, the Gracchi undertook to rebuild Carthage, which had been desecrated and laid waste with such solemnities,—although at a short distance from the old city; and from the ruins of Punic Carthage that of the Romans sprang, the fourth capital of the world!

XII. But the restoration of their metropolis in the shape of a pagan city was more than the Jews could bear. It is possible that they had for several years been silently preparing anew for the project of freeing themselves from the Roman dominion, and had long entered into secret compacts with the people of other oriental regions, to whom the yoke of their masters was equally hateful, perhaps even with Parthian satraps or with the Great King himself. It is only the enduring contempt of the Romans for the oppressed people, which renders it conceivable that they entertained no suspicions, and made no preparations, easily as they might have done so, to frustrate the plans of their enemies. They felt secure, probably because they had disarmed the Jews after suppressing their

² Although Scaliger, in the Animadvers. ad Eusebii Chronicon, and Valesius, in his notes to Euseb. Eccl. Hist. IV. 6, maintain this to have been the case.
³ In the Gemara Taanich, c. 4, where it says: "Quando aravit Turranus Rufus impius porticum, decreatum factum est, ut interficeretur Rabban Gamaliel." Hence Turranus Rufus is called in the Gemara Sanhedrin 'arum the impious; Zorn l.c. 321. The name Turranus Rufus (sic) occurs on a gravestone which was in the possession of Pope Julius III. Wolf. Bibl. Hebr. IV. 417.
⁴ Commentar. in Zachar. viii. 13, "Capta urbs Bethel [read Bethar] ad quam multa millia congerunt Judaeorum: aratum Templum in ignominiis gentis oppressae, a Ti- to Antonio Rufio."
PREPARATIONS FOR FURTHER REVOLT.

revolt. If Dion were to be believed, the latter devised a curious expedient for relieving themselves from this dilemma. It is said that they, meaning doubtless the numerous prisoners condemned by Trajan to the public works, were ordered to forge weapons for the Roman troops; but that they intentionally made them bad, so that when rejected as unfit for service they could keep them themselves, and thus become possessed of a large quantity of arms. But this statement carries with it an aspect so fabulous, that it is inconceivable how Dion could have given it the least attention. For how could Roman commanders, who necessarily knew well enough the spirit that animated the whole Jewish people, have suffered the workmen, and they too prisoners, to retain possession of arms, with which, bad as they might be, they could have wrought much mischief? and how could the superintendents of the manufacture have answered for such a proceeding? After the arms and accoutrements had been repeatedly found unserviceable, resort would certainly have been had to compulsory measures, to force the workshops to deliver better articles. The truth of the matter can only be this, that the Jews found ways and means of procuring and secreting arms; which with their extensive trade, and that too with people not under the Roman sway, could not have been so very difficult of accomplishment, especially if the whole nation were of one accord.

They kept themselves quiet notwithstanding, as long as the Emperor remained in the East. He had spent the year A. D. 130 in Egypt. The following year he had travelled to Syria, and thence had proceeded to the western provinces; to which of them is not known. We first meet with him, in A. D. 135, in Athens. The rebellion, however, broke out shortly after his departure from the East, as soon as he was considered far enough off, in the year of Rome 885, and 132 of the Christian era.

For the direction of a conspiracy so widely spread and accurately organized, and at the same time so profoundly secret and so exceedingly active, a leader was indispensably requisite. And now it was that such a one made his appearance. How long he may have already been busy in secret, rests upon conjecture. The war

1 Dion Cassius LXIX. 12. p. 1161.
however is so remarkable, as to make it incumbent on us to collect all the remaining accounts concerning him, which are at all worthy of credit.

XIII. This leader of the Jews is known to us by the name of Bar-cochba. 1 He has remained unknown to the Roman historians. But the Christian authors Eusebius, Jerome, and Orosius, make mention of him; and in the Jewish writers many scattered notices respecting him are preserved, which however are to be used with caution, as they are partly at variance with history and chronology, and in part are evidently fabulous. We shall therefore pay attention only to those writers from whom something may with probability be obtained for the elucidation of history; while of the others we shall here and there give a few specimens, sufficient to show their inadmissibility. Titus had already permitted the Jews, after the destruction of their capital, to transfer their great Sanhedrin to Jamnia. 2 It was placed under the patriarch, who was at the head of the academy at Tiberias; 3 and who, as well as the Babylonian patriarch, is said to have been of the tribe of Judah. 4 His power extended over religious matters, and perhaps to deciding as arbiter in civil disputes, when these were brought before him. But he can hardly have had the power of life and death, although he may occasionally have arrogated it to himself. 5 He was always, notwithstanding the title of שמעון (Prince) which he bore, 6 subject to the Roman authorities; and it will easily be perceived that this could not have been otherwise. Still his prerogatives may have augmented by degrees, and may not have been as great at first as they afterwards became, when an important rank was likewise conferred upon him in the Roman empire. 7 This was all done publicly. But the book 'Zemach David' represents the matter as if the Jews soon after the destruction of Jerusalem, and in spite of their victor, had made for themselves a sort of civil constitution. It assumes, that as early as under

---

1 Son of a Star.
3 Ibid p. 160.
4 Ibid. p. 139.
5 Ibid. p. 170 sq.
6 Ibid. p. 161. Maimon. de Synod. c. 1. 3, as given by Walch p. 120.
7 They bore the appellation Viri clarissimi et illustres, viri spectabilis, which Theodosius and his sons conferred on them. Walch p. 188.
Domitian, Bar-cochba commenced his reign, and also died under him; and that this Bar-cochba was succeeded by his son, and this latter again by his own son. The possibility of the thing, in itself considered, cannot be denied, if we take into account the spirit that animated the Jews; and with this might be connected the inquiries set on foot by Domitian after the family of David. But in case we could, with difficulty, make out the twenty-one years which this statement attributes to the dynasty of Bar-cochba, they would have already elapsed at the commencement of Hadrian’s reign; and this cannot by any means be reconciled with history. Accordingly, we cannot place the period at which Bar-cochba appeared earlier than towards the end of the reign of Trajan; and will endeavour to make use of the account of his dynasty in the course of this narration.

The number of adherents that he found, and the power that he exercised, render it very probable that he elevated himself by degrees. As king of Israel he had certainly nothing more to do than to imitate Eunus the prince of the Sicilian slaves, and to spirt fire out of his mouth from tow secretly lighted, in order to obtain for himself the admiration and reverence of the common people. This trick can only have prepared the way for him; his own talents must have helped him further on. He showed off no miracles before the learned. This he had no need to do; for, animated by national enthusiasm, they only sought a man who was able to lead them against the Romans.

Who he was, and what was his origin, is entirely unknown. If he gave himself out for the Messiah, he must have traced his pedigree back to David. But this is not fully proved. The name

1 Zemach David ad ann. 880, Millenarii 4. According to other statements, the reign in Betther (for of Jerusalem the Rabbins say nothing) commenced in the 53d year after the destruction of the temple, A. D. 120, in Hadrian’s first year; and Bether is said to have been taken under Romulus, in the 73d year after the destruction of the temple. Bartoloccci Bibl. Rabb. Ill. p. 693.
2 Florus III. 19.
4 “Sapientes nullum ab eo signum vel miraculum petierunt;” Maimonides Jad Hazakah, Tract. de regibus c. 2, as cited in Martinii’s Pugio Fidei p. 330.
5 That he really was of the race of David, is maintained by Lipmann of the 14th and 15th centuries, in the book Nizzachon No. 339; see Wolf Bibl. Hebr. IV. 417. The
Bar-cohba, son of the star, under which he is known to history, was given him because either he or his adherents maintained that through him was fulfilled Balaam's prophecy, Num. xxiv. 17, concerning the star that should rise out of Jacob. It was not until his death and the depressed condition of the Jews had proved how little he answered the great expectations formed of him, that he was called Bar-coziba, son of a lie. But whether he was the same whom Dion Cassius calls Andreas, and Eusebius Lucas, as Samuel Petit and Reimarus conjecture, we must leave undecided. These assume two Bar-cohbas, the first under Trajan, the second under Hadrian; an hypothesis that stands in connexion with the rabbinical story of the dynasty of three successive princes. But if the account in the Arabic text of Abulpharagius be well founded, Lucas had perished already in the war with Martius Turbo.

The Rabbins also, who ascribe to him the devastations in Cyrene, Egypt, and Cyprus, fix his epoch under Trajan. This we must leave undetermined.

The Jews flocked to him in multitudes, and anointed and crowned him king in the stronghold Bether; for that he had his seat in Jerusalem is not known to the Jewish writers. That he gave himself out for the Messiah, is not completely proved, as has been already remarked. There are indeed stories to the effect that he could not support the proof to which he was put, as to whether he, as was required of the Messiah according to an interpretation of the saying in Isaiah xi. 3, could distinguish the just from the unjust by the smell; and that Rabbi Akiba said of him, This is the king

tradition may indeed have been current as early as the time of Bar-cohba. Else Akiba and the learned Rabbins would hardly have owned him for the Messiah.

1 Echa Rabbatha, on the words of Lam. ii. 2, and Zemach David cited by Eisenmenger II. p. 654; also R. Gedaliah in Shalaheleh Hakkabala, cited by Bartolocci Bibl. Rabbinica III. p. 698. Synecellus in his Chronography (Script. Byzant. IX. p. 348) has the following singular remark respecting him: τῆς Ἰουδαϊκῆς πολιτείας Χορήγουτος (Χορήγου τις) ὁ μονογενὴς ἤγετος, ὡς ἐκ τούτου δηλεύουσι. Can he, as the pretended Messiah, ever have received the title μονογενής; ἡλικίας?

2 Obsevatt. Lib. III. 4, p. 318.
4 Zemach David, Eisenm. II. 655. His rebellion is placed, according to the Jewish mode of reckoning, in the year of the world 3880.
5 Zemach David l. c.
Messiah. Maimonides however calls him merely the great king. Meanwhile, whether he gave himself out for the Messiah or not, he was regarded as such by the populace; for the Messiah alone could be their deliverer from the Roman yoke. He however was not expected to come from the nobility, but out of their own midst. Indeed, according to his contemporary Trypho, whose dialogue with Justin Martyr we still possess, the Messiah was to be unknown when born, and should not even know himself or possess any power, until Elias should come to anoint him. But this Elias was most probably found in the person of Rabbi Akiba; although we do not know that it was he who anointed him in Bether.

XIV. Akiba, who had not sprung from an Israelitish stock, but had gone over to Judaism of his own free choice, had become the most zealous and learned of the Rabbins, and glowed with the same hatred against the Romans that fired all Israel. He deduced his pedigree from Sisera, the general of the Tyrian king Jabin, whom Deborah slew; but his mother was a Jewess. His whole history is mythic, and copied after that of Moses. Forty years he was an untaught shepherd; he then sued for the hand of his master's daughter, who however would marry none but a learned man. For four and twenty or (according to others) forty years he pursued his studies, and is said to have travelled much. He then began to teach, and served the people forty years long as superintendent of the schools, first at Lydda, and then at Jamnia; the number of his pupils was reckoned at 24,000. What God did not intrust to Moses, he is said to have revealed to him; and hence he is regarded as the teacher of the unwritten law. The Mishna began with his collections; and the book Jeziarah attributed to Abraham, but

De Messia scribitur, quod odorans erit et judicas; videbimus ergo, utrum tu odorando valeas judicare: cunctus vidisset quod non esset odorans et judicans, occiderunt ipsum.  

2 "Capta est Bether . . . et in ea regnabat rex magnus, quem puta- verunt Israelites et sapientium ma-
iores, eum esse regem Messiam;" so in Jad Hazakah given by Bartolo-
occi II. p. 723.  
3 Justini M. Dialogus cum Try-
phone c. 8 and 49.  
4 The Jewish writings are full of accounts concerning him. Comp. Jo. Henr. Othonis Historia Docto-
rum Mischnicorum, in Wolf's Bib-
iloth. Hebrew IV. p. 410; also Bayle's Dictionary under his name.  
which is now lost, was one of the works in which he deposited his wisdom. No wonder therefore that they even sought for him in the Old Testament. The words of Moses, Ex. iv. 13, "Lord, send whom thou wilt send," were applied to him; the passage in Job xxviii. 10, "his eye seeth every precious thing," was understood of him; and when at last he was executed by the Romans, some even referred to his death the celebrated passage in the 52d and 53d chapters of Isaiah. He had seen the temple while yet in its splendour, and was so much the more eager for its restoration. The exalted dignity with which he was invested as associate of the patriarch, must have considerably augmented the great influence he already possessed; and at the same time it furnishes us with a plain indication that the patriarch in Palestine, Gamaliel, and the entire Sanhedrin, had an understanding with Bar-cochba; which also appears evident from the Jewish traditions of Bar-cochba's transactions with the wise men.

Akiba not only declared Bar-cochba to be the king Messiah, with which the latter, even if he did not give himself out as such, was very well pleased; but he was also his most trusty counsellor, accompanied him everywhere, and on festival occasions assumed the office of his armour-bearer, by carrying before him his sword, the symbol of his dignity. That the old man of nearly six score years could not have attended him in battle, may easily be conjectured.

Bar-cochba seems also to have had a counsellor and assistant in Rabbi Tarphon, the successor of Akiba in the superintendence of the school at Lydda. His name at least occurs in the history of this prince. Several other celebrated Rabbins who took an active part in the war, and perished in it, will be mentioned in the sequel.

XV. Bar-cochba had at first the most complete success. In Palestine all the Jews united with him; and probably also the Samari-
tans, who at least are never mentioned as his enemies, this army must have been very considerable, although the statements of the Rabbins, who give it at 200,000 men, may be exaggerated; and he pushed forward his arms beyond the borders of the country into Syria. After the conquest of Jerusalem by Titus, many Jews had fled to the Galilean cities, Sepphoris and Tiberias; the descendants of these now fell upon the pagan and Christian inhabitants, and committed great slaughter among them. After the war was concluded, and these cities once more set free, they testified their gratitude to the Emperor in a remarkable manner: the former took a new name, Dioecesarea Adriana; and the latter erected a temple, which they called Adrianum.  

Bar-cochba at first endeavoured to draw the Christians of Palestine over to his side. But unable to prevail upon them to renounce their faith, and to participate in the insurrection against the Romans, whom he treated with great barbarity, he speedily turned his rage against the Christians also in the most dreadful manner; as is testified by Justin Martyr, Eusebius, and Orosius.

bellare voluerunt, Syriam ac Palestinam diripere consili: masoque exercitu, consili sunt.  

1 One of the many Jewish fables is, that he made trial of the bravery of the troops by chopping off a finger of each man. But the wise men then gave him a better piece of advice, which was, that he should let it serve as proof of a man's prowess, if he could root up one of the cedars of Lebanon while on horseback. Echa Rabbatha, in Martini Pogio Fidel p. 326.

2 Basnage XII. 147, 148. I know not from what sources Basnage has derived these statements.

3 Apol. I. c. 316, Βαρχισάν το της Ἰουδαίων ἀποστασίως ἀφεγηχτος Χριστιανὸς μόνος εἰς τιμος καὶ δικαιομένως καὶ ἀρχιερέας Ἰεροῦ τῶν Χριστοῦ καὶ πασχάδων, εἴπερν ἐγώ χριστός. Also in Euseb. IV. 6. It is not to be understood from the term μόνος, that he was not cruel to the Romans and Greeks likewise; but the Christians he specially tortured, out of religious hate, when he could not move them to apostasy. See the notes of the St. Maurites on this passage in p. 62 of their edition of Justin, (Paris 1742 fol.) of which I have made use.  

4 In loc. cit. and in the Chronicle: Τῆς Ἰουδαίων ἀποστασίως Χριστιανὸς τῆς ἤρεσις ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἡχημονικός ἰδιότητος ἡμᾶς εἰσερχόμεθα μὴ μονομοσαίοις κατὰ Ρωμαίους ἑρμασίαν, see at the 18th year of Hadrian. The same words are given by Jerome in his Chronicle taken from Eusebius, at Hadrian's 17th year: "Cochebas dux Judaice factionis nolentes sibi Christianos adversum Romanum militem ferre subodium omnimodis cruciatibus necat." Eusebius also calls him on this account, τὰ μὲν ἄλλα φωτιών καὶ λυπημένων ἀνάφα, H. Eccl. IV. 6.

5 Histor. VII. 19, "Judeos sane perturbatione scelerum suorum exagitatos, et Palestinam provinciam quondam suam depopulantes, ultima nece perdomuit (Hadrianus), utusque est Christianos, quo illi, Coch-
No long time had elapsed, when he became master of Jerusalem. It is true that all writers are silent as to this circumstance; but the many testimonies to its recapture under Hadrian, place beyond all doubt the fact that the Jews had possession of the Holy City. It was probably the colony sent thither by the Emperor, that was driven out. A few incidents have been preserved, which appear to belong to this period.

The surrounding region was dreadfully desolated. Wolves and hyenas made inroads on the city itself. R. Akiba therefore, according to the interpretation given by Samuel Petit to a passage in Aben Ezra, caused the celebration of the passover to be transferred from Mount Nisan to Mount Ijar. This seems to have reference to the journeys usually undertaken at the time of the festival; for it is certain that every one might keep the feast of Easter in his own house, even though there should be no hindrances—such as continual rain-storms, swollen streams, roads and bridges destroyed—to render the journey to Jerusalem difficult. But festival-journeys presuppose that Jews were living in Jerusalem, and that divine worship was at least in some measure restored. Again, Dion relates that, about this time, Solomon’s sepulchre tumbled down of itself, a prodigy that, considering the great antiquity of David’s family burial-place, was very natural, but which he regarded as a bad omen. He mentions, indeed, that this happened before the break-

ebas duce, quod sibi adversus Romanos non adversarentur, excruciatant. The Talmudists assert that Bar-cochba compelled the Jewish Christians, a great number of whom he induced to deny Christ, to submit to circumcision a second time; so Basilae XI. p. 361. He gives no citations. The tract Jehammoth, in the Jeros. Talmud, speaks of repeated circumcision, but without naming the Christians; as does also one Rabbi Nissim. "Plurimi," says the former, "qui praoperandum metu retractarant, dixerat Benczibae iecurum circumcidebantur." R. Nissim says the same, and names Bether as the place where it was performed; Lightfoot Chron. Temporum Opp. II. p. 143. Here reference seems to be made to Jews, who from fear of the Romans sought to render indiscernible the marks of their nation and religion.

1 Aben Ezra in Levit. xxi., cited by St. Petri, Eclog. chronolog. I. 14. According to Petit's reckoning, this was in the year 133.

2 Lib. LXVIII. c. 14. p. 1162. The same account is found in Cedrenus Script. Byzant. XII. p. 249; taken doubtless from Dion.

3 Respecting this tomb of Solomon which belonged to the family of David, and of which mention is made in the N.T. Acts ii. 29, comp. Michaels Kleine Schriften III. 457; and also Münzer’s paper on Solomon’s family sepulchre under Mount Zion, in the Antiq. Abhandlungen p. 97.
ing out of the war. But could the falling down of the old royal tomb presage any disaster to the Romans? It is probable, therefore, that this explanation did not occur till after the close of the war, and that Dion erred with regard to the time, and placed the event in a somewhat earlier period than that in which it actually took place. The Jews in Jerusalem might certainly, according to their way of thinking, have had reason to be terrified, when they saw the tomb of David and Solomon, whose kingdom they were then about to restore, fall down without any visible cause.

XVI. To these proofs are to be added those furnished by numismatics. We know from both the Talmuds, that coins were struck by Bar-cochba. That of Jerusalem says expressly, "Samaritan money, as for instance that of Bencoziba, does not defile;" and that of Babylon mentions the coins themselves. Of these some have descended to our times. There are, namely, four silver coins, three of which belong undeniably to the Emperor Trajan, while the fourth is somewhat doubtful; on these the Roman impress can still be partially discerned, although they are stamped over again with a Samaritan inscription. It is known that such recasting was practised in ancient as well as in modern times. On these restamped Samaritan coins we read, more or less completely, the name סִימוֹן; and on the other side ישראלי גאון to the freedom of Jerusalem. The traces of the legends remaining on three of these coins, (viz. R. OPTI . . . INC. OR TRAI . . . P. M. TR. P. COS. also the Greek . . . LECB. GEP. AAX . . .) besides the remains of the face, leave no doubt of their being restamped coins of Trajan. The first of them was struck in the year of Rome 863, A.D. 99; in which year the Senate conferred upon him the title of Optimus Princeps, though this does not appear

1 Tract Manass Sheni, "Moneta Samaritana, ut Bencoziba, non profanat."
2 The tract Baba Kama speaks of "Numa Cozibenni Hierosolymitani." The coins therefore, according to the Babylonian Talmud, were struck in Jerusalem. Both these citations from the Talmud are taken from O. G. Tychsen's Asserio Epistolae de peregrina Numerum Hasmoneorum origines, p. 19. He refers also to Abrah. Zacut in Jochassin fol. 23. 2. lin. 24.
3 Thus, for instance, the coins of Agrigentum, which the Carthaginians, when they became masters of that city, restamped with the head of Melkart, the Tyrian Hercules. See Prince Torremuzza's Sicilia veteres Numi Tab. X. No. 4, 5.
on coins before A. U. C. 858, A. D. 105. The second belongs in or after the year 856, A. D. 103, when he received the title of Dacicus; and the Grecian coin on which stands the date TIIA. (ἐκαρσος ἤ τις εὔσαρχος) was struck during his fourth consulate in a Syrian city, probably Antioch. A fourth coin is undistinguishable, and has only the Roman letters TR (Tribunicia Potestas). But this also doubtless belongs to Trajan or to Hadrian. Hence we now know that Roman coins in Trajan’s time, or soon after, were stamped over again by Jews or Samaritans. Which of the two effected this, is to us at present a matter of indifference, since the Jerusalem Talmud acknowledges the Samaritan money of Bar-cochba as also clean; so that there only remains the paleographic question, whether the Assyrian character alone was at that time employed by the Jews. This restamping of money, however, points infallibly to a war in which the Jews wished to have a coinage of their own. The name Simon, which we find on two of them, is the name of the prince; and who can this have been but Bar-cochba? It is true, we nowhere read that he was called Simon; but from this silence there is nothing to be inferred. We have likewise coins of the Asmonean king Antigonus, bearing his Hebrew name Mattathias, which is not otherwise known to us. This name Simon, however, extends still further. Among the Samaritan coins, which in former times were attributed without exception to the Asmonean princes, are found many whole and half shekels and copper pieces with the same name. The French scholar Henrin, so far as I know, was the first to whom the idea occurred that this was not Simon Maccabæus, but Bar-cochba; and he accordingly ascribed this coin to him. He is partially followed by Barthelemy.

1 See Barthelemy’s Letter to the author of the Journal des Savans, in Perez Bayer Numorum Hebraeo-Samaritanorum Vindiciæ, Valence 1790, in Append. p. IX. Two of these coins are there copied.
2 The affirmative is maintained by Tychsen in his Diatribe de numinis Hebraicus, Madrid edit. 1792, p. 36; also in the above cited Asertio Epistolae. p. 18. Barthelemy, on the contrary, is of opinion that the Jews retained the Samaritan character until forty years before Christ, and on monuments much longer. Mémoires de l’Acad. des Inscr. et Belles-Lettres XXIV. p. 59.
3 Barthelemy in Perez Bayer Numorum Hebraaeo-Samaritanorum Vindiciæ, p. IX, where the coin is engraved on copper; also Tychsen’s Diatribe p. 22.
5 In Perez Bayer p. XIII.
and O. G. Tychsen; and there are several reasons which favour this opinion. That the character found on the coins is not Assyrian, but Samaritan, is not so very decisive against their high antiquity; since the former, even if the Jews did bring it with them after the captivity, may have been regarded as a sacred character, while the common writing of the country was employed on the country's coinage. And this indeed is evidently the case; since the coins of Jonathan or John Hyrcanus, (for it is not quite certain to which of the two the coins so read belong,) and also of Antigonus, are likewise stamped with the Samaritan character. Neither would I build much on the circumstance, that Simon Maccabeus governed the Jewish nation eight years, while the coins bear the dates of the four first only; partly because, from the small number of Samaritan coins that have been preserved to us, those of his four last years may have been lost; and partly, because there was no law that money should be struck every year. It is just as little decisive, that the reading of the passage 1 Macc. xv. 6, where mention is made of the right of coinage which the Syrian king Antiochus Sidetes is said to have conferred on Simon, still remains doubtful. But more seems to be proved by the species of letter on the money attributed to Simon, inasmuch as the character here exhibited differs from that on the remaining Asmonean coins; and this without taking into account the circumstance, that all these are of copper, (perhaps because the Syrian kings reserved to themselves the right of coinage the precious metals,) while on the other hand we have silver coins bearing the name of Simon.

The difference of title is still more decisive. Simon is called on single coins מְשֶׁרֶדֶן יַעֲשֶׂה Prince of Israel; the same title as that borne by the patriarch, whom the Greeks named Ἰσαὰκος, or in Mesopotamia Ἀρχαὶ Ασσυρίας. On the contrary, Jonathan or John Hyrcanus and Antigonus are called on the coins וֹדוֹדֵה יִשְׂרָאֵל High-priest, after which follows the title מֶשֶׁרֶדֶן, or Πρίγγος, Prince of

---

1 In the two treatises above cited.
2 The Greek version of this book has only the words: Καὶ ἐπέφερα τὸν τὸμασμὸν τῷ τῶν τοῦ φῶτος. But the Syriac has: "Et tibi decreta pro lubitu faciendi potestatem concedo." Now what stood in the Hebrew text? It is also remarkable, that Josephus should know nothing of this right of coinage granted to Simon.
3 Tychsen Diatribe p. 25.
4 Tychsen Diatribe p. 19.
5 Walch Histor. Patriarch. p. 103.
Judah, not of Israel; and on one coin bearing the name of the Syrian king Alexander Bata, we read נבון יוחנן. King Jonathan. These two last reasons, together with the restamped coins of Trajan, seem to pronounce decisively, that all those which have the name Simon must be taken out of the class of Asmonean coins and be assigned to Bar-cochba.

We have then the following results:

1. That in the first disorder of the insurrection, before the new Jewish government was organized, it was the practice to recoin money of the Roman currency. How long this may have lasted, cannot be determined.

2. That Bar-cochba, however, as soon as he was able, coined his own money. The rich contributions of the Jews, that flowed to him from all quarters, (for the Jews of Palestine were too poor to afford him much aid in this respect,) procured him the requisite metal. This enabled him to strike coins of many kinds. Tychsen enumerates thirteen different stamps, one of which is of gold.

3. That the mint was at first, in the two first years, at Jerusalem, is at least very probable from the inscriptions ליבא דRootElementה נ jenterל in the Targum of the Talmud. For the inscriptions ליבא דerializerה נ יבאמ to the freedom of Jerusalem, and יבאמ דerializerה נ יבאמ to Jerusalem the holy, which alternate with the legends ליבא דerializerה נ יבאמ and ליבא דelerikה נ יבאמ, to the freedom or redemption of Zion or Israel; though these latter do not appear on the coins of the third and fourth years, but only on those of the first and second, and on some without a date.

4. That Bar-cochba either was called Simon, or that he assumed this name in memory of Simon Maccabaeus the deliverer of the Israelites from the Syrian bondage, in token that he would deliver his people in like manner from that of the Romans; but that this name fell into oblivion, because the people preferred to call him at first the “Son of the Star,” which according to the prophecy had risen over Israel; although they afterwards gave him the nickname of Bar-coziba.

It was probably one of his first concerns, when he saw himself

1 Tychsen Diatr. p. 23. Engraved on copper in the Table accompanying Barthelemy's Letter in Perez Bayer.
2 Diatrise p. 19. sqq.
3 The testimony of the Jerusalem Talmud, cited above, with respect to the Jerusalem money of Bar-cochba, hereby acquires a much greater weight.
in possession of Jerusalem, to restore the temple, of which at least the foundation-walls and subterranean vaults1 were still in existence; in addition to which an immense mass of building-materi-als must have been found under the ruins. This is so much the more certain, since Chrysostom,2 the Chronicon Alexandrinum, Nicephorus Callistus, and Georgius Cedrenus,3 give accounts of it. Here, too, appears to belong a coin on which is seen a portico with four pillars; in the middle hangs a lyre, a serpentine line runs beneath. Who does not here call to mind the brook Kidron? On the other side stands a manna-pot and a leaf or a small fruit. The inscription is γενεσης and ἀνασύνετης. The year however is wanting.4

We may regard it then as fully proved, that Bar-cochba had possession of Jerusalem; although the Jewish writers, the Samaritan Book of Joshua alone excepted, are entirely silent on the subject, and speak only of Bethera. Was it perhaps too painful to their feelings to speak of a third destruction of their capital? for

1 See my essay, cited above, on David's family burial-place, at the beginning. These vaults are also mentioned in the history of the capture of Jerusalem. Simon, the leader of the Zealots, had hid himself in them with many of his party, after Titus had taken the upper city, with the design of forcing an outlet into the open country, and thus making his escape; but when this project failed in consequence of the impenetrable nature of the rock, he again came above ground beneath the ruins of the temple, and surrendered himself to the Romans; Joseph. de B. Jud. VII. c. 2. [See Robinson's Palestine. ] pp. 446-452.) The Jews probably made use of the foundation-walls for the new structure: had they dug deeper, they would doubtless have met with the same disaster that befell their successors under the Emperor Julian.

2 Oratio III. in Judaeos, ed. Franc- coffin. 1698. Tom. i. p. 431, Kal ἐστιν φιλοτήτι τὸ εὐρύμενα, φύσι καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν προγάμων αὐτῶν παρα- σχευμα μαρτυρίαν et min gañ μὴ ἐπεχείρησαν ομοδομήσαν τὸν ναόν.

3 Chron. Alexandr. p. 598, Καὶ καθὼς (ὁ Αδριανος) τῶν ναῶν τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ, διετέλεσε τὰ δυο διώχωσιν, κ. τ. λ. Nicefori Callisti Hist. Eccl. III. c. 24, ἀπαισώντας δὲ τις τούτων (Ἀδριανοῦ) καὶ τῶν Ἰου- δαίων αὐτῆς φασὶν· πρὸς δειολογίας δὲ τινες, καὶ τὸν τῶν Ἰερουσαλήμ ναῶν ἀποκάθισε. Georgius Cedrenus, in Script. Byzant. XII. p. 249, Ἐκ' ὁμοοιοποιητάς τῶν Ἰουδαίων, καὶ τον ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ ναῶν ὀλοκληρώσων βουλεύσεως ὑφεστάτας καὶ αὐτῶν σφόδρα. It is hardly necessary to remind the reader, that the design spoken of by the two last writers does not exclude the idea of the building's having been begun.

4 Engraved on copper in Perez Bayer de numis Hebrew-Samarita- nia, Valentin. 1781, p. 141.
an occurrence so remarkable, and affecting them so nearly, they can certainly never have forgotten. Or did they purposely exchange the name Jerusalem for Bether? But then it is just as true that Bether likewise was captured.

How long Bar-cochba was master of Jerusalem, cannot be determined. From the fact that the coins of the two first years alone bear the inscriptions פאשת וידותשלפ פראשת and וידותשלפ קקשתosh, we can only draw the conjecture that his possession of the city may have lasted no longer than these two first years. It is true, that the coins of the third and fourth years also mention Zion and Israel; but then by Zion may be meant the nation itself, which always, even after it had lost Jerusalem, continued to hope for the recovery of its freedom.

XVII. At first, the Romans despised the insurrection. Yet they must soon have found that they had to do, not with single mobs, but with the entire Jewish people. Not only was all Palestine in motion, but the spirit of disturbance spread in every direction where Jews were to be found in the Roman empire, and broke out in covert or open attacks on the Romans; and the support that Bar-cochba received proves of itself how deeply the nation was involved in his undertaking. Almost the whole world, says Dion, was set in motion by the revolt of the Jews.\(^1\) Lucius Quietus was at a distance; and as Hadrian supposed that all was in perfect tranquillity, there were probably but few cohorts in the country. The insurrection accordingly proceeded so much the more quietly. The governor of Palestine, Tinnius Rufus, could effect nothing. The Romans were everywhere exposed to the attacks of the Jews; who, while they avoided coming to the decision of a battle, were exceedingly formidable in slight skirmishes, and could easily retire to the mountains. Great numbers of loose rabble joined them out of hatred to the Romans and love of theft; and thus the revolt assumed a very serious character. At length the eyes of Hadrian were opened. He found that none of his generals in the East were capable of managing the affair. Fifty places fortified either previously or by themselves, and nine hundred and eighty-five open towns and villages, were in the possession of the Jews.

\(^1\) Lib. LXIX. c. 14, p. 1162.
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They must therefore have spread themselves far beyond the boundaries of Palestine proper, into Syria, and perhaps into Phœnicia; and must also have obtained possession of the sea-coast, which rendered it much easier for them to procure supplies. And now came the capture of Jerusalem, or of Ælia, if the renovated city was already so called. Hadrian at length summoned from the extreme west the governor of Britain, Julius Severus, the greatest general of his time. Auxiliaries came from the remotest regions. This is shown by an inscription, which will be given further on. The struggle was protracted and dangerous. As late as under Hadrian's grandsons, Marcus Aurelius and Verus, Fronto speaks of it, and places this struggle on a parallel with the Parthian and British wars. The Jews were very numerous, and fought with the courage of despair. Necessity developed talent; perhaps, too, they obtained leaders from the kingdom of Parthia. Julius Severus attacked single bodies of troops, and cut off their supplies, doubtless by taking possession of the roads and passes; for Palestine, thinly populated as it was, could by no means furnish support to two hostile armies, and yet the Jews were able to keep up the war for four years. Consequently, in order to carry it on so long, they must have been able to obtain assistance and supplies by ways which the Romans could not for a long time block up. We are made acquainted, in the history of the first Jewish war, with the glens and mountain-caves that rendered the subjugation of Palestine so difficult to the Romans. These, and the subterranean passages intersecting each other, which possessed many outlets, and obtained air as well as light through openings from above, they now made use of, partly as hiding-places from which they made attacks upon the Romans, and partly as strongholds to protect themselves; and when it was necessary, they threw up walls in addition for their better defence. Caves and subterranean passages of this kind are

1 He was just as much esteemed for his integrity and prudence. After the close of the Jewish war, Hadrian sent him as governor to Bithynia, where his memory was long held in honour. Dion Cass. LXIX. 14. p. 1163.

2 In Fragm. ad M. Antoninum de bello Parthico ed. Mediol. II. p. 391, "Nonne a Parthia consularis seque vir in Mesopotamia trucidatus? Quid avo Vestro Hadriano imperio obtinente quantum militiae a Judaeis, quantum ab Britannis caesum?"

3 Dion Cass. LXIX. 13. p. 1161.
still to be seen in the desolated portions of Palestine; and the writers of travels speak of them with wonder.

XVIII. It is probable that the Romans had first to clear in some measure the region about Jerusalem, before they could think of besieging the city. Two years appear to have elapsed in this manner. It is true, Jerusalem had no longer the fortifications that made it so formidable in the time of the first Jewish war; but the city by its very situation was a fortress, and always difficult to subdue. Its capture does not admit of a doubt. It is testified to by Appian¹ and the Samaritan Book of Joshua,² which seems to have been about contemporary, as its proper text closes with Hadrian's times; and also by Eusebius,³ Chrysostom,⁴ Jerome,⁵ the Alexandreine Chronicle,⁶ Abulpharagius,⁷ Paulus Diaconus,⁸ Syn-

¹ De bellis Syrac. ed. Toll. p. 191, ἄρεωσελή . . . . . . . οὐ δὲ καὶ πελαμπώσεως οἱ πρόντοι Ἀδριανοῦ βασιλεύς καθήμενοι, καὶ οἱ θεοπαλαιόν οὐδεὶς ομοθετίσας κατάλαμφας, καὶ Ἀδριανὸς ἀθεῖς εἰς ἑαυτόν.
² In the extract from cap. 45, in Fabric. Cod. Pseudoepigr. V. T. p. 287, ὁ Οὐσίδιος ὤρια Αἱρεσολυμίαν περὶ Ἀδριανοῦ ὑπερτερισεῖν.
³ In the passage above cited from the Demonstr. Evang. VI. 18, Eusebius adds: μετ' οὗ πολίν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀδριανὸς Ἀναπόστολος κυριεύσεως αὐτοῦ Ἡροδατικῆς γνώμης τῆς λαοῦ τῆς πάλαι μέρος ἰδρύων πολακριβῶς καὶ αὐτὸς ἥμελπτατας ὡς ἦλθεν καὶ ἑος δύο μᾶρμάριον ἄροσον γενόθηναι τοῦ τούτου.
⁴ Chrysost. Orat. III. in Judeos, l. c. Ἡρῴδατι δυνατότερο τοῦτον οὐκ ὧν τούτοις ἑκατοντάκοιν ἔποιεν τὴν πρό-
τον πολεμίδα ἐπιτιθέντως . . . . . . συμβόλασις τότε τοὺς βασιλεὺς, πάντως ἐν ἀνάγιγον αὐτῶν καθήμενος παντε-
λοὺς ἀρματικῶς. Καθάλη γὰρ αὐτῶς ἴτανος καὶ χειροποιήμανος καὶ τὰ λαθ-
νᾶν ἀρασίδας πάντας, ὅσα μὴν ἀνα-
σχέθησαν ἤκουσι λαοῦ, τόν ἀδιάκριτον ἀτενὶ τοῦ ισωτήρα.
⁵ Comment. in Habac. c. ii, ὡς ὧν 

"Sub Tito et Vespasiano urbē capta est..." Comment. in Ezech. cap. v. 1, ὡς περευσθέντ' οἰκίσατο. Comment. in Ezech. cap. v. 1, ὡς Sub Tito et Vespasiano urbē capta est..." Comment. in Ezech. cap. v. 1, ὡς περευσθέντ' οἰκίσατο. Comment.
cellus, Cedrenus, Nicephorus Callistus, and Suidas. So that the silence of the Rabbins in opposition to all these testimonies, is of no consequence.

These furnish only the statement, of which I have already made mention, that the plough was drawn over the place where the temple had stood. They call the general by whom this was performed, Turanus Rufus. Jerome, who mentions it, names him more correctly Titus Annius Rufus. If there be any truth in the account, which, as was before remarked, does not completely accord with the Roman custom,—which was to draw the plough over whole cities, whereas here only a single building is spoken of,—it was done in order, by such a solemn desecration, to deprive the Jews of all hope that the Romans would ever suffer the temple to be restored. But then how could Julian, who was so zealous for the religion of the state, and for its customs so venerable in his eyes on account of their antiquity,—how could he allow, nay, even invite the Jews, to rebuild their temple on the same site where it formerly stood?

Of Bar-cochba's further fate we have no positive information. The sole incident related of him is, that he caused one Rabbi Tryphon, who counselled a surrender, to be executed. If the same Tryphon be meant, with whom Justin held his well known dialogue, the statement is false; for although that Rabbi may have been engaged in the war, yet he survived it, for he is mentioned in the desolatis, etc. ut nec lapis super lapi
dem secundum divinam vocem in iiis sit relictus, ultusque est Christi
anum, etc.
3 After having spoken of the at
tempt to rebuild the temple: ὁ φό
κτης (Ἄδριανος) καὶ αὐτῶν σφόδρα, καὶ πολίσθην γενομένων μεταξὺ αὐτῶν ἢ αὐτῶν ἐν ἡμῖν μακρά ψυχή, καὶ τὰ παλαιὰ λύσαν τῆς πόλεως καὶ τοὺς ναοὺς κατεργάσαν τεταρτά τούς 'Ιερουσαλήμ. Which, together with what precedes, seems to allude to the capture of the city.
3 Histor. III. 24. This contains the same accounts respecting the design of the Jews to rebuild the temple, and of Hadrian's destruction of the remains of the old city, almost in the same words.
4 S. v. Βαθύμαντα χρησιμένως: 'Ο Άδριανος καὶ θείες τὴν πόλιν ἀναφέρει.
5 Maimonides in Bartholocci Bībl.
Rabbin. III. p. 697, θέλει Turan
nus Rufus ex regibus Idumiaeis (h. e.
Romans) avarit templi solum et per circuitum ejus, ut adimpleretur quod dictum est Jerem. XXVI. 18."
6 In Zachar. c. 8.
7 Basnage Hist. des Juifs XI. p. 364. He appeals to Lent de Judae
orum Pseudepigrapha, p. 17.
dialogue relating to the close of the war. Of the death of the above-named R. Tryphon nothing is related by the Rabbins, although they often make mention of him.

The time during which Bar-cochba reigned is not given with exactness. The Talmud assigns him three years and a half, but places his death under Vespasian. The book Seder Olam gives him two and a half years. Eusebius places his death in the time of the siege of Bether, and says indefinitely that he suffered the punishment he deserved. Several rabbinical accounts make out that he died by the hands of the Jews on account of his crimes, or because he could not prove himself to be the Messiah. According to Abulpharagius, he perished in Jerusalem. The coins attributed to him have his name with the numbers of the two first years only, or else without any date. This seems to indicate that he died earlier. Moreover, the Jewish writers have many fables on the subject. For instance, they relate that his head was brought to the Emperor, who in fact was not then in Palestine; that the latter caused the body to be sought for, and a snake was found wound about its neck. They also quote Hadrian's words at the sight of the corpse: "Had this man not been killed by his God, no one would have been able to do him harm!"

The year of the taking of Jerusalem is given by the Chron. Alexandrinum, as follows: INA. A. I. TIL. ALAIOT AAAPIANOT TO B. KAI POTETIKOT. Hadrian's second consulate falls in the year A. U. C. 871, A. D. 118. His colleague in the same was Titus Claudius Fuscus Salinator. He held his third consulate with Q. Julius Rusticus; this was in the year of Rome 872, A. D. 119.

---
1 Dial. c. Tryphone, cap. 1 et 9.
2 "Barcochba regnavit tribus annis et dimidio."
3 Bartolocci Bibl. Rab. II. p. 346.
4 H. E. IV. 6, Καὶ τοῦ τῆς ἀπονομέον τινι δίδωσι την κυρίωσιν ἀυτήν.
6 "Cujus rei nuncio ad Hadri- num delato, misit ille copias quae ipsum interfecerunt et expugnatis Hierosolymitis Judaeos perdiderunt," etc. according to the Arabic text. The Syriac does not mention him.
7 Echa Rabbathi; also Baam. XI. p. 364.
Both consulates, therefore, were too early for us to assume that the capture of Jerusalem took place in either of them. The true state of the case may perhaps have been this; that in the year 119, Hadrian had begun to put his plan of restoring Jerusalem into execution. But then a long time must have elapsed before the breaking out of the war. It is, therefore, better to abstain from any precise designation of time, and content ourselves with the conjecture, that Jerusalem was recaptured by the Romans about the second year after the outbreak of the war, in A.D. 132. Probably it was in consequence of this event, that the Senate caused a coin to be struck with an allocation (so called) of the Emperors to the soldiers, and the circumscription EXERCITVS IVDAICVS. But it does not by any means follow from this, that the Emperor himself was with the army; for he carried on his wars by means of his lieutenants. Besides, we know very little of the history of those years in which the Jewish war took place; and cannot even determine where the Emperor remained during the whole time. We know only of his abode in Athens in the year 888, A.D. 135; where he had himself initiated in the Eleusinian mysteries, and was occupied in erecting the great temple of Jupiter. About the same time he began to suffer from ill health, and in this year Eckhel places the adoption of Ælius Caesar.

XIX. According to the book Zemach David, Bar-cochba was succeeded in the government by his son Rufus, and this latter by his son Romulus, who was also like his grandfather called Coziba. The whole dynasty is said to have lasted twenty-one years. As a voucher, there is given us R. Abraham ben David, who perished in the year 1391. Of this tradition the other writers know nothing. But when we reflect, that there must have been a dynasty which had the Jews under its rule, and probably kept itself as secret as possible, this silence of foreign, pagan, and Christian authors can determine nothing against the truth of the matter. Rufus was a cognomen known among the Romans. We find it also among the Jews. The Cyrenian Simon, who was com-

pelled to bear our Lord’s cross after him, is called ‘the father of Alexander and Rufus.’ A greater difficulty is caused by the name Romulus, which among the Romans at least was very rare. I find it in the earlier times only twice in the inscriptions collected by Muratori,—among the names of the freedmen of Livia, and (as Muratori thinks) of the marines of the fleet at Misenum. Once the name is given to an oriental of Emesa: to what time he belonged is uncertain, but he was no Roman; for the name of his father, Bigezenus, is quite foreign. It is also found a couple of times in Gaul and Britain. From written documents we know of a pretended martyr of this name under Trajan; also the son of the emperor Maxentius, of whom we possess coins; and a senator in Aquileia, in the time of the emperor Constantius. How much the name was formerly held in honour, is evident from the circumstance, that Octavianus, when desirous of laying aside his own appellation, which had been made odious by the cruelty of the triumvirate, would willingly have assumed this name, although he afterwards decided for that of Augustus. All this, however, is not completely decisive against the opinion that Bar-cochba’s grandson, who, as above stated, is said to have been likewise called Coziba, bore also the name Romulus. And if we suppose the name Coziba, perhaps with a somewhat altered pronunciation, to have been a family name, we can so much the more easily conceive how the majority came to be acquainted with one only, and to have attributed every thing to him. But in any case we are not to ascribe either to son or grandson the idea of Messianic dignity, which seems especially after the conquest of Jerusalem, to have disappeared; this family being doubtless regarded as a new Asmonean race, who were to procure for the nation its former independence.

XX. Jerusalem was now taken; but there was still one stronghold in the hands of the Jews, into which a considerable force must

have previously thrown themselves; since we cannot suppose that, on the surrender of Jerusalem, the Roman army granted a free retreat thither to a great body of fugitives. But doubtless all that could make their escape, or fight their way through, endeavoured to get to Bethar. Such, according to the testimony of Eusebius, was the name of this fortress situated near Jerusalem.\(^1\) Its site is not yet determined; and indeed it will hardly be possible to ascertain it, until at some future day a more exact investigation of ruins, and perhaps of inscriptions bearing its name, shall bring it to light. A place called Betarum mentioned in the Itinerary of Antonine, and which perhaps is the Bethbar of the Jerusalem Itinerary, divides opinions with the ancient Beth-horon.\(^6\) But this last is opposed by the circumstance that the name Beth-horon occurs unaltered in the Mishna; which also speaks of a Bethar,\(^3\) probably that situated in Idumea, of which Josephus makes mention.\(^4\) The Jerusalem Gemara and the book Echa Rabbathi designate the distance of this fortress from the sea at four Roman miles.\(^5\) We confine ourselves to following Eusebius, who places it in the vicinity of Jerusalem, and describes it as very strong.\(^6\) It must have been of considerable extent, as a large multitude of people found protection within it; and it probably had a naturally strong position on a hill, so that it could even hold out against a long siege. But it seems also to follow from this, that the military strength of the Romans must have been much weakened, and that they did not attack Bethar with great vigour. The accounts of the Rabbis moreover as to the extent of the city, are in the highest degree exaggerated. It had, say they, from four hundred to five hundred synagogues, in each

\(^1\) Hist. Eccles. IV. 6.
\(^6\) Reland p. 639 sq.; See also Bachriën’s Descrip. of Palestine, Part II. Vol. III. p. 227. Betarum between Cesarea and Lydda, and in the Jerus. Itinerary a Bethar between Cesarea and Antipatris, which are perhaps the same city. Beth-horon was distant 100 stadia from Jerusalem, Reland p. 634. By the Jews Bethar is called דומעס אפראסיוית; because, after the destruction of Jerusalem, watchmen it appears were posted there, in order to spy out those who went on a pilgrimage to the ruins, and to accuse them of doing it, either with a view to obtain the favour of the Romans, or else to make sale of their lands. Basnage XI. p. 349.
\(^5\) Reland p. 639 sq.
\(^3\) Josephus calls it בֵּרָסִיס—or in case the reading is correct, and it should not be בֵּרָסִיס. Reland p. 627 sq.
\(^4\) Reland p. 639.
\(^6\) [See Note by the Editor, at the end of this article.]
four hundred teachers, and in the smallest three hundred scholars; or, according to others, each teacher had to instruct four hundred children. ¹

At last the besieged were subdued by hunger and thirst, as well as by the attacks of the Romans. The city was captured with great bloodshed,² towards the end of the eighteenth year of Hadrian's reign, in the year of Rome 888, A. D. 135, on the 9th of the month Abh,³ in the same month of August in which Nebuchadnezzar formerly took Jerusalem. In this designation of time we are obliged to acquiesce; for the other specifications cannot be reconciled with history, and are besides self-contradictory.

The book Shalalsheleth Hakkabbala gives the seventy-third year after the destruction of the temple; and Zemach David, on the contrary, the fifty-third year after the same.⁴ Accordingly, in the first case, as Titus destroyed the temple in the year of Rome 823, A. D. 70, we should have to assume the year of Rome 896, A. D. 143, in which Antoninus Pius had already reigned five years. The second case would give the year of Rome 873, A. D. 123, when all was in profound peace, and in which Hadrian set out on his journey. Eusebius adds in his Chronicon one year more to the year 135; since he remarks at Hadrian's nineteenth year, that the war was then brought to a close.⁵ And it is very conceivable, that it may not have ceased immediately upon the taking of Bether; for else we should be obliged to assume, that all had been before restored to tranquillity. But a long interval must certainly have elapsed

¹ Tract Gittith, in Eisenmenger II. 644, and Echa Rabbathi ibid. Hadrian, it is said, burnt 480 synagogues. A hymn of lamentation which is sung on the 9th of Abh, contains this statement. If all the synagogues destroyed during the war be here intended, the number is by no means exaggerated.
² Jewish authors relate that the horses had to wade up to their mouths in blood; that the blood of those who fell rolled along in its current stones of four pounds weight; that the corpses of the slain did not undergo putrefaction; and that Hadrian caused his vineyard, (perhaps the villa near Tibur, of which they may have heard,) which was 18 Roman miles square, to be fenced in with them; Tr. Gittith and Echa Rabbathi. See Wolf's Bibl. Hebr. IV. p. 319; also Bayle's Dictionary. These are some specimens of Rabbinical histories!
⁵ Ἡμώνδτοι παντὶς αὐτίλακα, καὶ ἐ πρὸς αὐτοὺς πάλμος πέφυς λαχε, ἐπέκειν εἰρήστων πάντῃ τῆς πολιῶς ἡμῖνδεν, ε. τ. l. ad ann. Hadr. 19.
before fifty strongholds, and nine hundred and eighty-five towns and villages were all in the hands of the Romans. The closing scene of the war appears to have lasted three and a half years. In this Jerome and the Talmud coincide. The coins attributed to this period bear also four years; and on those of the third and fourth, as has already been remarked, there is no more said of Jerusalem, but they have the legends יִשְׂרָאֵל and יִשְׂרָאֵל וְיִשְׂרָאֵל.

XXI. At the taking of Bether, Bar-cochba's grandson Romulus is also said to have perished. We must therefore place the death of his father Rufus somewhat earlier, in case there is any truth in the tradition of this dynasty of three successive Jewish princes. Rabbi Akiba was taken prisoner, together with his son Pappas, and executed; and with him vanished, as it is said in the Mishna, the glory of the Law. He was, when he perished, an aged man of a hundred and twenty years. That he then lost his life is probable, although R. David Ganz in Zemach David asserts that he died in the year of Rome 880, A.D. 120. But the manner of his death, namely, that his flesh was torn off with an iron comb, and that he was roasted by a slow fire, is a story of later date. Such tortures were unknown to the Romans. His grave was afterwards shown, together with the graves of many of his pupils, in a mountain cave near Tiberias.

Many Rabbins had taken part in the war; and several of them perished at or after the taking of Bether. Basnaghe has collected from the Jewish writings the names of the most remarkable.1

---

1 In Danielem cap. 9, "Tres autem anni et sex mensae sub Hordianno supputantur, quando Jerusalem omnino subversa est, et Judaeorum gens catervati cessa, ut Judaeo quoque finibus pelleretur."

2 Sambdrin, Tract Kelek, in Martini Pug. Fid. p. 326, "Tribus annis et dimidio obedit Hadriannus Bitter." According to this author, Bar-cochba reigned during the whole time in Bether.

3 See Appendix to Sect. XX, at the end of this article, p. 455.


5 In Sota 515, p. 303; in Basnaghe XI. p. 365.

6 It is also said of another Rabbi, Johanan ben Zechai, that he attained the age of 120. Walch Hist. Patriarch. p. 256.


8 In the Talmud, Tract Erubbin, and in Berakoth, cited by Bayle in his Dictionary.


10 Basnaghe Histoire des Juifs XI. p. 566.
are regarded as martyrs. Isshab the scripturist (scribe) was slain in the hour of prayer, and his corpse remained long unburied, a prey to the dogs and wild beasts. Ananias, or Chanina, the son of Thardion, was condemned to the flames, and was burnt along with the book of the Law, which he is said to have read and expounded, contrary to the Emperor’s commands. Judah, the son of Bava, the restorer of the Sanhedrin, was thrust through with lances,—according to the tradition, with three hundred of them. Whether the son of Suma perished then or later is uncertain; because some regard him as the teacher of Rabbi Judah the Holy—that sun which rose as the other set. He is said to have been born on the day of Akiba’s death. R. Jose Setham, a name celebrated in the Mishna, had taken no part in the insurrection; but, it is said, because he was silent when the Romans were extolled, he was sent into exile to Sepphoris.

XXII. The number of the Jews that perished in the battles, is given by Dion Cassius at five hundred and eighty thousand; while those who were carried off by hunger, pestilence, and all the miseries of war, were innumerable.1 Jewish accounts give the number of those whom Hadrian destroyed at four millions;2 and in Alexandria he is said to have killed twice as many as came out of Egypt under Moses, viz. six millions. These exaggerations are evident. But the loss that the Roman empire suffered through this war, may easily have amounted to over two millions. Not only was it for the Jews, the Cyrenians, Egyptians, and Cyprians, an exceedingly bloody war; but the Romans also lost men in great numbers. Dion even thinks that it was in consequence of the loss sustained, that Hadrian did not employ, in a letter to the Senate, the customary formula: Si vos liberique vestri valetis, bene est; ego quidem et exercitus valeramus. But this conjecture is groundless. The Emperor must in that case have been with the army; and that he was so, is also the opinion of the Jewish writers. He was however in Italy: a sufficient reason for not mentioning the army in his letter.

A single inscription commemorative of this war has been pre-

2 In the book Gitthin it is said: "Traddit R. Eliezer Magnus . . . ." in Martini Pugio Fidei p. 327.
served. It is said to exist in the stone pavement of St. Peter's at Rome:1

SEX. ATTIVS. SENECIO.
PRAEF. ALAE. P. FL. GAETVLORVM.
TRIB. LEG. X. GEMINA. EMIS
SVS. A. DIVO. HADRIANO. IN. EXPE
DITIONE. IVDAICA. AD. VEXILLA.

Thus, then, auxiliaries were sent even from distant Mauritania to the Jewish war! This S. Attius Senecio was a tribune of the tenth legion, and probably headed a squadron of light Getulian cavalry which marched to Judea as a corps of reserve, cohortes vexillares.

Hadrian's coins in all the metals with the inscription TELLVS STABILITA accompanied by different types, undeniably have reference to the tranquillizing of the provinces and the suppression of the insurrections;2 and hence also to the conclusion of the Jewish war, the most dangerous of all. But as nothing occurs on them that has special reference to Judea, we cannot consider them as monuments properly belonging to the history of this war. They have also no precise dates. On some, the Emperor's third consulate is given. This indeed was in the year 872, A. D. 119; but as he did not take another consulate, we find the COS. III. on several of his later coins. The Alexandrine coins from the eighteenth to the twentieth year of his reign seem indeed sometimes to allude to victories; but in too indefinite a manner for us to draw any conclusion from them.3

XXIII. At length all was reduced to subjection. But Palestine had also become a desert.4 The prisoners were sold for slaves in countless multitudes; at first at the annual market by the Terebinth, or as Jerome says, in Abraham's tent near Hebron,5 where the

1 Syntagma Inscript. p. 513.
3 In Mionnet VI. E. g. of the 18th year, No. 1187, 1188 with the Αθηναίη Νικηφόρου; of the 19th year, No. 1245, a goddess of victory; of the 20th, No. 1283, the figure of Providence; No. 1292, the Emperor in a triumphal car and crowned by Victory.
4 Justin says to Tryphon, Dial. c. 52, ἂλλα καὶ τὸ ἄνευ χάρας ὑπὸ ὕδωρ βασιλεία ἐπικέιστο, καὶ προσέτα ἕν ἡμῶν ἡμών ἡμών ἡμών ἡμών, καὶ ὡς ὀπωροφορίαν καταλιθίστων.
5 In Zachariam c. il. "Legamus veteres historias et traditiones plan- geminum Judæorum, quod in tabernaculo Abrasha, ubi nunc per annos singulos merceatus celeberrimus exeretur, post ultimum evisionem, quam sustinuerunt ab Adriano, multa hominum militia venundata sint; et
patriarch had dwelt, and where a great market was yearly held.¹ As much was paid for a slave as for a horse. Those not sold there were taken to Gaza to another market, which thence received the name of Hadrian’s mart.² The remainder were shipped off to Egypt. Many perished miserably on the way, by hunger and shipwreck; others were murdered by the heathen.

Thus was this unhappy people severely punished for their renewed bold but indiscreet attempt to recover their freedom. No wonder that even in the following centuries they continued to mourn over the capture of Bether, as they did over that of Jerusalem under Titus; and that in their lamentations Hadrian and Nebuchadnezzar are mentioned with equal abhorrence. Titus, on the contrary, was far from being detested by the Jews in a like degree.

That Hadrian caused the ears of the Jews to be cropped off, as Abulpharagius relates,³ is at any rate to be understood only of those prisoners who were condemned to slavery. Yet the whole affair seems improbable; at furthest they can only have been marked with the iron, as servants exposed for sale. The prohibition against reading the Bible in Hebrew except on paying tribute for the same, which has been ascribed to the Emperor, has been shown by Basmage to be a fable;⁴ although the above mentioned Rabbi Ananias is said to have suffered martyrdom for transgressing it. But that the Emperor, as Appian relates, imposed on the Jews a heavier tax than that which they formerly had to pay to the state, a poll-tax which must be distinguished from that to Jupiter Capitolinus;⁵—is not by any means unlikely. This, however, may have served as a partial indemnification for the expenses of the war.

XXIV. We have thus reached the nineteenth year of Hadrian’s reign, A. U. C. 889, in the course of the year A. D. 136; in which
the Emperor celebrated his Vicennalia. It was the custom on such festivals, which only Augustus and Trajan had lived to see, to build or consecrate new cities, or else to give new names to old ones. And it was then accordingly that Jerusalem, which was no longer a Jewish but a Roman city, received the name of Colonia Ælia Capitolina,—Ælia after the prænomen of its founder Ælius Hadrianus, and Capitolina in honour of the god to whom it was now dedicated, and whose temple was built on the site where that of the Jews had formerly stood. Thus too a temple to Jupiter in Neapolis, the ancient Sichem, occupied the place of the Samaritan sanctuary on Mount Gerizim; although perhaps at a somewhat later period. The Holy City no doubt had already been fortified by Romans and Jews. Hadrian added whatever was still wanting, and adorned his colony with magnificent buildings. The Chronicle Alexandrinum speaks of a theatre—for the old one built by Herod had long since been destroyed; and of two market-places, a Trizonium, and a building called Τετράγωνον, the purpose of which is unknown, as is also that of another named Κόμις. A building that was formerly called the Άρναθάνατον 4 received in its new shape the name Αναθεάνατον, which reminds one of the Πετράκλαυρ and Τήνακλαυρ in Syracuse, and may have formed part of the fortifications. Was this perhaps placed on the site of the fortress of Antonia? The materials for these structures were furnished in abundance by the ruins of the temple and of other great works. The city itself was divided into seven quarters, ἀρχαία, each of which had its own warden, called the ἀρχαὶ. With all this, Ælia Capitolina did not attain to the size of the former Jerusalem. Mount Zion, which now lay in ruins, and was used for gardens and tillage, was not included within the walls; and that the city was enlarged on the west, and that Calvary among other places was

1 Pag. Crica. Antibarconiana ad ann. Chr. 132. § 35.
2 Dümöse, apud Photium Cod. 242, τὰ Ἑ (Ælia) Ἀρκαντισατον τῆς Εκκ. Fischel D. N. III. p. 434.
3 Ασία δημού αὐτής δημού mean market-places (Fons) to that of prisons; although the word bears the latter signification also.
4 The Άρναθάνατον are mentioned Acts xxii. 40.
5 Galler de sit et origine Syracusarum: Procm. p. xix.
6 Euseb. Demonstr. Evang. VIII.
8 Pleising's Golgotha und Christi Grab p. 120. So the Mount was
brought within its circuit, is a fable of later date.\footnote{Plessing loc. cit. p. 113 sq. [See the article on this subject by the Editor, in the present volume.]} Hadrian’s Ælia is the Jerusalem of the crusaders and of the Turks; and its limits have been assigned by nature herself.\footnote{See Robinson’s Bibl. Researches in Palest. I., p. 467 sq. and the Plan of Jerusalem.}

Over the gate that led to Bethlehem, Hadrian caused a swine to be sculptured in relief on the wall;\footnote{Hieron. Chron. ad ann. Hadr. 20, Chr. 137, “In fronte ejus Portæ qua Bethlehem egreditur, sus sculptus in marmore prominens, significationi Romano potestati subjacere Judæis.” Sestini adduces, in his Descr. Numor. Vet. p. 545, a coin of the emperor Antonine, which on account of the inscription K. A. C. he attributes to Ælia Capitoline, and on the reverse of which stands a swine. A similar one is found in Pellerin’s Supplem. Tab. II. 12.} perhaps with the view of rendering the new city still more odious to the Jews; since their refraining from the flesh of that animal was a subject of derision among the Romans. The swine however belonged also to the signa militaria of the Roman army, and was the fifth in rank, in honour of the sow that Æneas found at the place where Lavinium was to be built.\footnote{Virgil. Æneid. VIII. v. 43.} We see it on one of Hadrian’s coins.\footnote{In Lorn Historia Fisci Jud. on the frontispiece to p. 393. But I do not find the coin cited by Echhel. Did he perhaps regard it as apocryphal?}

It was an object of importance with the Emperor, to attract a large number of inhabitants to his new city. Accordingly, he provided also for their religious worship. That great honour was shown to Jupiter Capitolinus, is a matter of course. He was indeed regarded as the guardian deity of the city. His temple, on the site where that of Solomon formerly stood, is mentioned by Dion Cassius.\footnote{Dion Cass. LXIX. 12, p. 1611, Ἐκ τοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τόπου, καὶ τοῦ Ἀφροδίτας ἄεις ἐνευρηκαίριος. The Jerusalem Itinerary says, that two statues of Hadrian stood in the temple; ed. Wesseling, p. 591. Jerome, in his Comment in Esaiam ii. 8, says the same: “Ubi quondam erat templum et religio Dei, ibi Hadriani statua et Jovis idolum colloquenti est?” and in Comment, in Matth. xxiv. 15, he relates that there was a “statua equestris” of the Emperor standing “in ipso sancto sanctorum loco usque in presentem diem.”}

But the sepulchre of Christ must certainly have been destroyed in the siege under Titus.\footnote{Ad Paulinum de Institut. Monachor. c. 2.} Golgotha also, according to Sozomen,\footnote{Plessing’s Golgotha, p. 79.} was surrounded by the pagans with a
wall, filled up with stones, and on it placed a temple to Venus, whose image in marble is mentioned by Jerome. This was probably an Astarte, for the Phenicians; and if there stood also in this temple, as Paulinus de Nola reports, an image of Jupiter, it was doubtless a Phenician Baal, who indeed was not unfrequently adored as the solar deity in the same temple with the queen of heaven. A temple to Serapis appears to have been erected by Hadrian for the Egyptians. But excepting the adoration of Jupiter, the Phenician worship must have been the predominating one in the city and in the country round about; and hence it was that the cave in Bethlehem, in which, according to tradition, Christ was born, was dedicated to Adonis. Yet Hadrian can hardly have conceived the idea of a dying God, and have represented to himself Adonis as a mystical being having any reference to Christ. He was moreover no enemy or persecutor of the Christians; and it may well be supposed that the Apologies which Quadratus and Aristides presented to the Emperor, perhaps during his stay in Athens in the year 135, were immediately occasioned by the Jewish war, and were at the same time designed to convince him that Jews and Christians differed essentially from each other. Had

---

1 Ep. 13, "In crucis rupe status Veneris a gentibus posita celebatur."
2 Ibid. "Ab Hadriani temporibus usque ad imperium Constantini, simulacrum Jovis."
4 This conjecture rests on a coin with the head of this god, Vaillant Numism. Colon. I. p. 166. Also in Eckhel III. p. 443.
6 Paulini Epist. II. ad Severum: "Hadrianus . . . . in loco passionis simulacrum Jovis consecravit, et Bethlehem Adonis fane profanatus est." We learn from the sequel of this letter that the festival of Adonis was there celebrated: "Ubi natum Salvatorem . . . . salutaverunt pastores, ibi Veneris Amasium mixtus semiviris planxere meretricis," etc.
8 See Euseb. H. E. IV. 3. The Alexandrine Chronicle speaks also of an Apology, which it appears Apelles and Aristio presented to the Emperor in the eighteenth year of his reign; and thereupon refers to Eusebius, who however says not a word about it. The Apology of Aristides is mentioned by Ado Vienensis in his Martyrologium, as a production still extant in his time in Athens, and highly thought of; ad d. 3 Octobr. According to De la Guilliére (Athènes anciennes et nouvelles, Paris, 1676, p. 146.) it was still in existence in the seventeenth century, in the library of the Medelli convent near Athens.
he not possessed this conviction, he would have prohibited the Christians as strictly as the Jews from approaching Jerusalem. This however was not done; and he seems even to have observed with satisfaction, that they took up their abode in his new city, together with the Romans and Phenicians. This result could not fail to ensue; for, drawn to Jerusalem by the recollections attached to it, the Nazarene community, who had retired to Pella as long ago as the first war with Vespasian, now came back to Ælia Capitolina and re-established themselves there. But as no Jews were any longer tolerated in Ælia, the succession of bishops of the race of David and of the kindred of Jesus, now ceased with Judas, the fifteenth bishop, who appears to have died in Pella; and the series of bishops from the Gentiles begins with Marcus. Epiphanius asserts that he became a Christian in consequence of his intercourse with Christians in Jerusalem; but that, as he was compelled to leave off the pursuit of astrology, he relapsed into Judaism. Very improbable, truly! The Alexandrinian Chronicle has copied Epiphanius, and adds the fable that he was father-in-law to Hadrian. In what Rabbi this may be found, I know not.

The period of the building of Ælia is given in this Chronicle, as follows: IN A. I. A. 15. TII. ATTÔTΠÎΝΩΤ ΚΑΙ ΣΕΠΡÎΛΝΩΤ. We find in the year 885, A. D. 132, Sentius Augurinus and Arius Severianus, and in the year 887, A. D. 134, C. Jul. Servianus III. and C. Vibius Varus. Neither of these consulates perfectly agrees with the statement. The Chronicle probably meant the first, as the number 15 indicates the year of Hadrian’s reign; and in that year he has TR. P. XV. and XVI. on coins and inscriptions. Both statements are incorrect, notwithstanding; for he did not celebrate his Vicennalia till the year 889, A. D. 136. Or, he must already have made use of Aquila at an earlier period, and before the breaking out of the war with Bar-cochba, when he began the building of the city, which was afterwards interrupted.

1 In Hadrian’s 20th year. See Eusebii Chron. p. 384. In Jerome’s Latin version, Marcus is made bishop of Jerusalem in Hadrian’s 19th year. The difference is unimportant.


The coins of Ælia Capitolina begin with Hadrian, and end with Hostilian. We still possess that which was struck at the establishment of the colony, with the symbol of founding, i.e. a husbandman ploughing, with the ensign of a legion near him, and the inscription, COL. AEL. CAPIT. CONDitor. The coins of this city, however, must not be confounded with the Grecian coins of the city Capito\lina in Cælesyria, although some of them also have Greek inscriptions. A catalogue of all the coins of Ælia is found in Rasche's Lexicon, and some additions in Sestini.

Those are particularly remarkable whose types have reference to religion. On coins of Hadrian and Diadumenus we see the Capitoline Jupiter in his temple between Pallas and the genius of the City. The queen of heaven, Astarte, is represented on the coins of Antonine and Marcus Aurelius; she stands sometimes alone, sometimes in a temple, holding in her right hand a human head, the head of Adonis, with her feet on a river-god, doubtless the conquered Jordan. A coin of the emperor Severus has a large conical stone in a temple between two ensigns of legions, and alludes to the local worship of the Baûthylia, or meteor-stones.

The later fortunes of Ælia are foreign to our purpose. We refer to the before mentioned treatises of Deyling and Witsius; and add only, that the ancient and venerable name Jerusalem gradually sank so entirely into oblivion, that under Diocletian, a governor of Palestine, Firmilianus, on a trial of Christian prisoners, asked what city it was. The name Ælia was retained long after in the Christian ages, together with the ancient one; which last was applied again to the city from Constantine's time onwards, and gradually supplanted the other.

XXV. Pagans and Christians were thus permitted to reside in Ælia. The Jews alone were excluded by the most stringent laws.

1 Mélanges de Pellerin I. p. 239. Eckhel III. p. 442. Coin of Cæsarea in the province of Samaritis is found in Eckhel p. 431.
2 As has been done by Harduin; Eckhel III. p. 328.
3 Rasche's Lexicon Tom. I.; and in the first supplementary volume.
4 Sestini Descripção numorum veterum p. 544.
5 Harduin Numi antiqui illustrati p. 8. Eckhel III. 442. A similar [See also in Robinson's Bibl. Researchea, II. p. 9 sq.]
6 Euseb. de Martyr. Palestine c. 11.
from the city of their fathers. Hadrian forbade them access to it under pain of death. This is testified to by Justin Martyr,\(^1\) Aristo of Pella in Eusebius,\(^2\) Tertullian,\(^3\) Eusebius himself,\(^4\) and Jerome.\(^5\) The prohibition was still in force in Tertullian’s time, in the beginning of the third century. Nay, the unhappy people dared not even to venture into the neighbourhood of Jerusalem; not even to look upon and lament over the ruins of their sanctuary from a distance! Guards too were stationed to prevent their entering.\(^6\) Such strong measures were of course intended to last only for a while. But they were certainly renewed, and perhaps increased in severity, as often as the Jews gave new cause for suspicion or raised new disturbances. In the age of Constantine, however, the Jews received permission to approach the city within a certain distance, so that they could see it from the surrounding mountains. But none ventured to enter it, or take up his abode there.\(^7\) At length they were allowed to come to Jerusalem once a year, on the anniversary of the day when Titus took the city, and to weep over the

---

\(^1\) Apol. I. 47, ὅσις, δὲ τιμαῖος τάξις (Ἰερουσαλήμ) ἐν ὑμῖν ὑπὸ ἕκτης ὕπειρος ἐκάθειρται, καὶ θάνατος τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου Ἰουδαίων εἴσοδος ἁμαρτάνει, ἀφαίρετος ἐπετώκει τι. Dial. c. Τρυψ. c. 15, Ὅτα ἄλλος ἄλλοι τῶν ἐθνῶν καὶ ἄλλοι ἀνθρώπους . . . καὶ ἕνοντες αἱ χώρας ἐξαιροῦσι, καὶ οἱ πόλεις πυρεύοντο . . . . καὶ μυθικὰς εἰς ὑμᾶς ἵπποις ἀποκριθῆ εἰς τὴν Ἰερουσαλήμ.\(^8\) Hist. Eccles. IV. 6.

\(^2\) Contr. Judaeos c. 15, "Et exinde, quod interdictum est, ne in conscientia ipsius regionis demoretur quisquam Judaeorum . . . quod vobis pro meritis vestris post expugnationem Hierusalem, prohibitis ingredi terram vestram, de longinquo tandem eam ossibus vestris videre permissum est." Apologet. c. 21, "Quibus (Judaeis) nec adversarum jurè terram patriam saltam vestigium salutare conceditur."\(^9\) Demonstr. Evang. VIII. 18, after the passage cited above relating to the destruction by Titus: μετ’ αὐτῶν τοῦ χρόνου κατὰ Λεβαντίων τὸν Ἀντωνιάνης καὶ ἐκ ναὸς Ἰουδαίων γεμοῦσι τε ἑκάτερο ἐναίων τῆς γενομένης, τὸ λαὸν τῆς πόλεως μείρος ἡμῶν πολιορκηθεὶς, αὕτης εἰσελαμότης, ὡς ἐς θάνατον καὶ ἐς διόρθωσιν πάλιν ἐρωτάν ὑπὸ τοῦ τόπον.\(^8\) In Essaiam c. 6, "Rursum ipsum religiones erant in depredationem, quando post annos ferme 50 Hadrianus venerit, et terram Judaeos non fuerit depredans, in tantum ut terrebintho et quercui quae glandes amiserit, compararet."\(^7\) So too in Dan. c. 9.

ruins of the temple. Men and women, often feeble and aged persons, flocked there together in rent garments of mourning, and were forced to purchase permission from the Roman guards to weep undisturbed. At a later period, when the Jews were more equitably treated, they obtained leave either expressed or understood to reside in Jerusalem. Twice however they were driven forth, by Constantine and by Heraclius; and it was not till under the dominion of the Saracens, to whom the city was no less holy, that its gates were again opened to the posterity of its former inhabitants.

XXVI. But with the taking of Bether, all disturbances among the Jews do not yet appear to have been suppressed. A few words of Capitolinus allude to a new attempt in the first years of the reign of Antoninus Pius. By means of his governors and lieutenants, says this biographer, he quelled the rebellious Jews. This is all we know. According to Capitolinus, disturbances had broken out in several provinces, for instance also in Achaia and Egypt. The tranquilizing of Egypt is probably referred to on a couple of Alexandrian coins of Antonine's second year. Perhaps a passage in Fronto's letters also belongs to this period. This rhetorician had been appointed to the command of a province as proconsul; but he excuses himself on account of his feeble health, and speaks of his friend Julius Senex, whom he had summoned to him from Mauritania; having desired the support of his activity and fidelity, as well as of his military abilities in hunting out the highway robbers (latrones) and keeping them in check. That the province allotted to Fronto lay in Greece or in Asia, has been rendered very prob-

---

1 Hieron. in Zephan. i. 15. "Quin quondam emerant sanctorum Christi, emant lacrymas suas, et ne fle tas quidem eis gratuus sit. Videm in die quo capta est a Romanis et diruta Jerusalem, venire populum lugubrem, confuere decerpit mullerulam, et aegres pannis annique obsidit, et in habitu suo iram Domi nii demonstrante, plangere ruinas templi sui. Miles mercedem postula lat, ut illiis flere plus licent." Also in Gregorii Nazianzeni Orat. XII.

2 Basnage XI. p. 149. XII. p. 387.

3 Cap. 5. "Atque Judaeos rebellantes contulit per prassides ac le-gatos." It is singular that the Jews try to make out the emperor Antonine to have been a Jew, and to have even circumcised himself in order that he might eat the Paschal lamb. He is said to have been a disciple of R. Judah the Holy. Zemach David, in Basnage XII. p. 3.

4 In Mionnet VI. No. 1406, 1427. On the first is a Victory in a quadriga; on the second, the eagle on a globe with the wreath of victory in his beak.

ble by Mauis; and the expression *latrones* may with good reason be applied to the Jews, inasmuch as they had made themselves especially formidable in skirmishes and onslaughts. In Egypt also they may have participated in the disturbances that there broke out. But nothing can be said with certainty on the subject; as the seventieth book of Dion Cassius, which must have contained the history of these years, was already lost in the time of Xiphilin. After this, the Jews kept themselves quiet. At their solicitation, Antonine softened the rigour of Hadrian's laws, and permitted the circumcision of their own children; but he forbade them to incorporate strangers in this way among their own people. Their Sanhedrin they had established anew; and history names several of their patriarchs who lived under Antonine and his successors.

Marcus Aurelius and Verus also at first gave them proofs of favour, and according to Ulpian again granted them access to posts of honour. But when a new Parthian war broke out, the Jews living in the East, and hence probably those in Mesopotamia under the Parthian rule, united themselves to the hereditary enemies of the Roman empire; and when Mesopotamia and Osroene became in time of peace (A. U. C. 918, A. D. 165) subject to the Romans, they were compelled to bow again beneath the hated yoke. The Emperor, who, though otherwise so mild, on his journey through Syria to Egypt likened them to the Marcomanni and Sarmatians, renewed Hadrian's laws against them; although in the remote oriental provinces they were never enforced. Probably the dis-

---

1 Commentar. praevious, ibid. I. p. 19.
2 Modestinus L. II. D. ad legem Cornel. de sicaris: "Iudaei ipsi ut possent circumcidi, indulset is Divus Pius." Schulting Jurisprud. Antejustinianap. 405. There too it is said: "Cives Romani, qui se Judaico ritu vel servos suos circumcidae patientur, bonis adeupta, in insulam perpetuo relegantur. Medici capite puniuntur." Again: "Iudaei si alienis nationibus comparatos servos circumcluderint, aut deportantur, aut capite puniuntur." Taken from Jul. Pauli Sententiar. receptuar. libr. V. Tit. 22, de Sedi-
tiosis. That the Jews alone had the right of circumcision, is affirmed by Origen, c. Celsum II. 13. p. 399. ed. Ruseii.
3 Basnage XI. p. 366.
6 Stauti Sylv. III. v. 170:
"Quem modo Marcomannos post horrida bellis, vagusque Sarromantis, Latii non est dignata Triumpha."
pleasure with which Marcus Aurelius visited them, arose from their participation in the rebellion of Avidius Cassius; which however was very pardonable, as almost the whole of the East had declared itself for him, and the Jews as well as the rest may have been deceived by the reports which Avidius spread of the Emperor’s death.

In the early part of the reign of Severus nothing was heard of them. Although Pescennius Niger seems not to have been their friend, as he gave them, or at least the inhabitants of Palestine, a harsh reply in answer to their request that he would exempt them from taxation; and was at the same time master of the country, as we have coins of Ælia bearing his name; still the Jews appear not to have been involved in the war with Severus. And when Spartan relates that Severus deprived the inhabitants of Neapolis of their rights of citizenship for siding with Niger, but afterwards remitted to the inhabitants of Palestine the punishment they had deserved on Niger’s account, he seems to refer to the Syrians and Greeks dwelling in the country, and not to the Jews and Samaritans. Perhaps these latter were then sufficiently occupied with one another. For Abulpharagius informs us that a civil war broke out among them; and that during it a bloody battle took place, which cost many menon both sides. This may well have been the case and may be explained by the bitter national and sectarian hatred which animated each of these people against the other.

Perhaps this account is connected with the story of the highwayman Claudius, who had a large body of the people under his command, and who carried his audacity to such a pitch, that he once even appeared in the Emperor’s presence, in the guise of one of his tribunes. If his bands consisted partly of Jews, they may have made use of this opportunity to attack the Samaritans; and thus the battle may have ensued. That the Jews were really involved in the affair of Claudius,—or that he himself belonged to this people, and conducted his operations on a pretty extensive scale,

1 Bannage XII. p. 20.  
2 Spartanus in Pescennio c. 7.  
3 Echel VI. p. 157.  
4 In Severo c. 9. et 14.  
5 Pag. 79, "Anno imperii ejus primo obtorta est contentio magna inter Judæos et Samaritanos, et commissum proelium, quo ex utroque exercitu occiderunt multi."  
6 Dion Cass. LXXV. 2. p. 1257.
is probable from the fact that Jerome's Chronicle, at the fifth year of Severus, (A. D. 198, A. U. C. 951,) speaks of a Jewish and Samaritan war; and that Spartanus gives an account of a triumph over the Jews decreed by the Senate to Caracalla, but which Severus changed into a triumph over the Parthians. An Alexandrian coin of the same year also gives intimation of victorious rejoicings. But to triumph over Jewish highwaymen was beneath the imperial dignity. In connexion with these disturbances stands also the account, that Severus in his journey through Palestine prohibited accession to Judaism under severe penalties. Consequently the Jews must have gone on making proselytes, in spite of all former laws. The same prohibition was issued by command of the Emperor respecting the Christians; and thus he gave rise to a persecution, which was particularly vehement in Alexandria and in Africa; and in which, besides Leonidas the father of Origen, and the celebrated Potamiena, there perished also the Scyllitanian martyrs, and somewhat later Felicitas and Perpetua, together with their companions in misfortune.

In the sequel, Severus became again more favourable to the Jews. Their money opened his heart to them; but at the same time he did not spare their purses, and they were obliged afterwards as before to pay the taxes imposed on them. They were, however, regarded as Roman citizens; were capable of holding office, and of being employed in public business; and possessed even the right of declining such offices as were attended with too great expense, e.g. municipal magistracies. They consequently felt deep gratitude to the Emperor; and applied to him, as they had previously done to Marcus Aurelius, the words of Scripture: "Now when they fall, they shall be holpen with a little help."

---

1 Hieronymi Chron. ad h. ann. "Judaeicum et Samariticum bellum motum." Eusebius's Chronicle has nothing relative to it.
3 A coin of Caracalla of the fifth year, No. 2482, bearing a caduceus sprouting out into a palm; in Zoëga p. 252. No. 28.
4 Spartanus in Severo c. 17. "Judæos sierit sub gravi pena vetuit. Idem etiam de Christianis sanxit."
6 Basnage, XII. p. 48.
7 Dan. xi. 34.
Accordingly there now ensued quieter and more prosperous times for the Jewish people; and these constitute the boundary which our recital of their calamities must not transcend.

APPENDIX to Sect. XX. Page 438, where the capture of Bethera is treated of.


"Artasis (regis Armeniaci) mortem praecclare tradit Aristo Pellaus. Si quidem per ea tempora Judaei ab Adriano rege Romano dexterant et cum Rufio Hipparcho confiderunt, ductu viri eumusdam latronis, cui nomen erat Barcohiebas, id est stellae filius, qui quidem erat hicinoramus et homicida, sed nomine suo glorians, afflictos illis et captivos servatorem se de ccelo delapeum esse praedicabat. Is bellum adeo accendit, ut Syria ac Mesopotamia incite, Persaeque omnes, id respicientes, tributa solvere desisterent. Namque audìverat etiam leprae morbum in Adrianum invasisse. Noster autem Artasis super ea re nil moveretur. Accidit autem, ut per id tempus Adrianus in Palæstinam veniret, rebellesque in parvo oppido propie Hierosolyma obsessos dereret, quiideo omnes Judæorum gentem a patrio solo jussit pellere; quæne procul quidem Hierosolyma esse set spectatima; atque ipse Hierosolymam a Vespasiano, Tito, et ab eo devastatam instauravit, et ab nomine suo Ἀλίαμ appellavit, cum ipse Adrianus Sol esse appellatus, (he confounds the Greek word Ἡρως with Hadrian's prenomen Ἀλίας, atque ibi ethnicos locavit, et Christianos, quorum Epistopos erat Marcus.)"

Even if this narration be taken in the main from Aristo, or, which seems more probable, from Eusebius, it still confirms what I have said of the great importance of the war, and clearly indicates the extent of the insurrection, which spread far beyond Palestine. That Hadrian himself took part in the war in person, Eusebius nowhere says. This statement seems to rest wholly on Jewish traditions, with which perhaps Moses of Chorene was also acquainted.
The notices of Jewish writers respecting the city Bether (בר), or Beth-Tar (בר יִדָּר), are collected by Lightfoot, and less fully by Reland. 1 Eusebius writes the name Bεθηγα, Lat. Bitter. 2 This mysterious city seems destined to baffle the efforts of historians and archaeologists to determine its position; for all the data extant are too few and too indefinite to afford ground for more than some degree of probability.

The name accords sufficiently well with the Betarum of the Itinerary of Antonine; which notes this place as eighteen Roman miles from Caesarea towards Lydda. 3 The Jerusalem Itinerary has the name Bethor at sixteen of the like miles from Caesarea towards Antipatris, from which it was distant ten miles. 4 These names doubtless both refer to the same place; which thus far might well be the Bether in question. This too would nearly agree with the testimony of the Rabbins, that Bether was situated four Roman miles from the sea. 5 But on the other hand, this last specification is contradicted by Eusebius, who says that Bether was not far from Jerusalem. 6 Further, Betarum would seem to have been merely a village or station between Caesarea and the towns further south; and no traces of its existence are found, except in those two Itineraries of a later age. There are also other circumstances to which we shall again recur, which render it probable that Bether lay not in the plain, but upon the mountains.

Cellarius and others find Bether in the upper Beth-horon, which lies twelve Roman miles north-west of Jerusalem, on the brow of the steep pass leading down to the plain below. 7 This would accord sufficiently well with the testimony of Eusebius; and it would certainly be a position of great strength. But the two names are

2 H. E. IV. 6.
3 Itin. Anton. ed. Wesseling, p. 150. The same name occurs again on p. 198, where it is mentioned as thirty-one miles from Caesarea in the same direction.
5 Reland Palest. p. 639.
6 H. E. IV. 6, Βεθηγα ἡ κατ’ Ἱερουσαλήμ ἡ πόλις πρὸς τὴν Ἰερουσαλήμ ἐν δύο διπλάδα.
7 Cellarii Notitia Orb. Tom. II. p. 450.
very far from being identical or even similar; and besides, the Mishnah exhibits the name Beth-horon without change, while it also speaks of a city Bether; thus implying that the two were distinct. Further, the position of Beth-horon, upon a narrow, rocky ridge on the lofty brow of a mountain-pass, in the midst of a Rocky and desolate region, shows decisively to one who has ever visited the spot, that nothing larger than a very moderate village could ever have existed there.

The Betaris of Josephus, in the midst of Idumea, has also been held to be Bether. But most probably, as Reland has shown, this form of the name is merely a corruption from Begabris, as read by Rufinus. At any rate the position of this place in Idumea, (which then included the south of Judea,) accords neither with the testimony of the Rabbins nor with that of Eusebius.

Baronius boldly attempted to cut the knot, by assuming Bethle-hem as the Bether of Jewish writers. But for this hypothesis there is no foundation, either in the name or in the circumstances.

In all the preceding conjectures there is then nothing which amounts even to a slight degree of probability. In searching, therefore, for some other data on which to found a further suggestion and inquiry, two or three preliminary circumstances suggest themselves as worthy to be taken into the account.

First, the name Bether or Beth-Tar appears not to have been ancient; but to have become known only after the destruction of Jerusalem. It is rendered domus inquisitionis, or domus explorationis; and, as Münter has related, is said to have been given because of a watch stationed there after the destruction of the Holy City, in order to spy out those going up to visit the ruins.

Secondly, the testimony of the Rabbins as to the position of Bether at four miles from the sea, is utterly irreconcilable with that of Eusebius, who places it near Jerusalem. If the one be adopted, the other must be rejected. And that the evidence of the Christian Father is here to be preferred, is manifest from the following considerations.
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1. Eusebius resided at Caesarea, and must often have passed by way of the Betarum above mentioned, in journeys to Jerusalem and elsewhere. Had this been the Bether so renowned in history and mentioned by himself, he could not but have known it; yet he places Bether near Jerusalem.

2. The origin of the name Bether or Beth-Tar, as above described, implies that it was near Jerusalem, and probably on the north of that city; since the greater number of Jewish visitors would naturally come from that quarter, where a very large population of Jews continued to reside undisturbed in Galilee and the adjacent region. ¹

3. The many captives taken at Bether are said to have been first exposed for sale at the Terebinth, or Abraham's Tent, near Hebron; afterwards at Gaza; and then those remaining were transported in ships as slaves to Egypt. ² Now if Bether was situated near Jerusalem, it would be a natural and obvious course thus to remove the captives for sale first to the mart near Hebron, then to Gaza, and so to Egypt. But if Bether were in the plain and near the coast, then to have marched them first away from the coast into the mountains, and afterwards back again to Gaza, in order to send them to Egypt, would have been unnatural and is improbable; especially as the large marts and sea-ports of Caesarea, Joppa, and Askelon were much nearer at hand.

It seems therefore in the highest degree probable, as asserted by Eusebius, that Bether lay upon the mountains, and not far from Jerusalem.

The question as to its particular site, and as to its possible identity with some known place, has been for years before the mind of the writer; and the idea has repeatedly suggested itself, whether after all Bether may not have been the same with Bethel. The change from l to r, is a very common one in all languages; although I would not insist upon it here. But the position of the latter place accords well with all the circumstances known respecting Bether. It lay twelve Roman miles north of Jerusalem, on the east side of the great road leading northwards to Neapolis.

¹ See a passage from the Talm. Hieroa. implying the same thing, in Lightfoot Opp. T. II. p. 143.
² See above, p. 443. For an account of the place here mentioned near Hebron, and the extensive remains now found there, see p. 44 sq. of the present volume.
and Galilee; by which indeed all visitors from that quarter would necessarily approach the Holy City; and it would therefore be an appropriate station for such a watch as has been above alluded to. Bethel was re-inhabited after the exile; was fortified in the time of the Maccabees by the Syrian general Bacchides; and, although not mentioned in the New Testament, yet we know from Josephus that it existed and was captured by Vespasian. Eusebius and Jerome mention it as a small village in their day; and this is the last notice of it as an inhabited place. Later writers speak of it only as of a place known in Scripture history, and not then in existence. Yet the present ruins cover a large extent of ground, and are larger and more important than those of any village. The remains of churches and of other edifices upon the site and in the vicinity, betoken a town of importance probably before, and certainly after, the time of Jerome; and it is matter of surprise that no further allusion to the place occurs on the pages of history. The ground on which it lay, viz. the long point of a low hill between the heads of two shallow Wadys which unite and form a valley below running S. S. E., is capable of being strongly fortified—far more so indeed than the site of Eleutheropolis, though less so than the rocky precipices of Jerusalem.

It may be said, that there is no good nor probable reason, why the Jews should thus adopt the change of form from Bethel to Bether; and we therefore have no right to assume the identity of the two names on mere hypothesis. To a certain extent this is true; and I therefore would here lay no weight upon the circumstance, that such a change is often nothing more than a mere popular corruption. But we know that the Jews were fond of by-names, formed by a slight change of letters, so as to bring out a name of like sound, but of different and sometimes opposite signification. A striking instance occurs in connexion with this very place; where the leader of the war, in the days of his success, bore the honoured appellation of Bar-cochba, Son of a Star; but was afterwards (and is still) stigmatized as Bar-cozba, Son of a lie. Now if we may

---

1 Ezra ii. 28. Neh. vii. 32. xi. 31. Bethel, now called Betin, in the

2 Onomast. arts. Bethel and Agai. 4 See too the names Sichem and
3 See the account of the ruins of Sychar in the New Testament; also
suppose in the case of Bethel, that the like-sounding by-name Bether (softened from Beth-Tar) had arisen from some such cause as has been above described, it is easy to conceive how Jewish writers, when speaking of the catastrophe and utter subversion of their own nation, should prefer to connect it with this form, rather than with the ancient and venerated name imposed upon the spot by the immediate ancestor of their race.

It may be further asked, why then do Eusebius and Jerome, when treating expressly of Bethel, make no allusion to the important circumstance of its identity with Bether? To this it may be replied, that these writers in the Onomasticon were treating simply of places, as mentioned in Scripture; their object being mainly to mark their topographical position, for the most part without any allusion to historical facts. In like manner, in respect to Sichem and Sychar, Jerome in the Onomasticon contents himself with making them distinct places, merely translating Eusebius; though he elsewhere declares the latter name to be nothing more than a false reading.¹

So in the present instance, if the preceding considerations go to establish any degree of probability in favour of the identity in question, this is greatly strengthened by a remark of Jerome in another of his works. In a passage referring directly to the capture of Bether under Hadrian, and founded on Jewish accounts, he writes the name Bethel;² thus showing that he himself regarded the two names as designating the same place; unless, indeed, we suppose the form Bethel to have crept in here by a corruption of the text; of which however there is no evidence.

On the contrary, there exists another witness to show, that in the days of Eusebius, in the fourth century, the ancient site of Bethel was actually known among the people as Bether. The Bourdeaux

---

¹ See Bibl. Researches in Palest. III. p. 120.
² Comment. in Zach. viii. 13.
³ Capta urba Bethel, ad quam multa millia congerentur Judaeorum: aratum Templum in ignominiam gentis oppressae, a Tito Annio Rufo." Jerome here evidently confounds the destruction of the Temple with that of Bether; but the mention of Titus Annus (Turannus) Rufus shows clearly that he is speaking of events which took place under Hadrian; see the notes on p. 418 above. Deyling de Ælius Capit. Hist. et. orig. in S. Deyling Observat. Sac. Pars V. p. 450.
pilgrim, who visited the Holy City in A. D. 333, writes that in going from Neapolis to Jerusalem, on the left hand, at the distance of twelve Roman miles from the latter city, there is a “villa” called by this name.¹

Taking all these circumstances together, although they certainly do not amount to any positive demonstration, yet they seem to me to afford a much higher degree of probability in respect to the site of Bether, than is presented by any previous hypothesis.

II.

THE WHITE STONE OF THE APOCALYPSE.

EXEGESIS OF REV. II. 17.

By M. STUART, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary, Andover.

"Ο λέγει οὖς, ἀκοῦσάτω τι τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις: τῷ νικῶτα, δόσοι αὐτῷ τὸ μάννα τοῦ κεκρυμμένου, καὶ δόσοι αὐτῷ ψέφον λευκόν, καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ψέφῳ ὅσοι καὶ νόθοι γεγραμμένοι, ὃ οὐδεὶς οἴδει εἰ μὴ ὁ λαμβάνων.

"He who hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches: To him that overcometh will I give of the hidden manna; I will also give him a white stone, and on the stone a new name inscribed, which no one understandeth save he who receiveth."

Some attention may be regarded as due to the grammatical construction of this passage. The phrase, τῷ νικῶτα, δόσοι αὐτῷ, apparently contains a pleonastic or redundant pronoun. The like to this may be found elsewhere in the Apocalypse; e.g. Rev. 7, 2 ὃς ἐδώθη αὐτοῖς ἐδώθησα, and Rev. 20, 8 ὃν ὁ ἀνθρώπος αὐτῶν ὃς ἦ

¹ Itin. Hieros. ed. Wesseling, p. 588, "Inde [a Neapole] millia xxvili, icta est villa, quam dicitur, Bethar."
THE WHITE STONE OF THE APOCALYPSE.

ἀμμος. So in 3, 8, 6, 4, 8, 7, 9, 17, 9. Even adverbs are sometimes repeated in a similar way; as ἐν τῇ ζῷᾳ ἰεριν. Rev. 12, 14, and the like in 12, 6, and in some other cases. Indeed the instances in which the demonstrative pronoun is inserted after the noun to which it refers, as in the phrase above which gives occasion to these remarks, are by no means unfrequent in the Apocalypse. It is matter of particular interest, moreover, to the inquisitive reader, to know that this idiom has not only been charged upon the writer of the Apocalypse as a peculiarity, but also as a barbarism, or even a solecism. Yet the New Testament is full of the same idiom. And not only so, the Septuagint exhibits it even still more frequently; yea, the Greek Classics themselves—I mean such writers as Xenophon, Plato, Sophocles, Ælian, Diodorus Siculus, and others—exhibit it, especially when a participle precedes the demonstrative pronoun, as in the case before us. We need not resort to the Hebrew, therefore, as most have done, for the sake of explaining and defending the idiom of John; for it is no unusual thing even in the best Greek. But the frequency of it in John, I suppose, may be Hebraistic. The ὁ... ἔστε and the ὅσο... ἡμέρ (to whom, where) of the Hebrew must be very familiar, even to a mere beginner in the study of it. The apparently pleonastic pronoun, in such a case as ἐπεξεργασθησάτας; she saw him—the child Ex. 2, 6, is so common, not only in Hebrew, but in all its sister-dialects, that there can scarcely be a doubt, that the New Testament writers were influenced by this, as to the frequency with which they have resorted to the idiom in question.

The reader, who may have any special interest in inquiries that respect the particular idiom of the New Testament, may find abundant evidence in regard to the subject now presented, in Winer's New Testament Grammar, § 22. 4. § 23. 3; to which he may add Gesenius's Lehrgeb. § 192. 2 sq. The simple truth in regard to this idiom seems to be, that either emphatic intensity, or else designed and peculiar specification, is in all cases the object of it. If now John had simply said in Rev. 2, 17, τῷ ἰδόντι δόσω τοῦ μάννα x. τ. λ. the Greek would have been perfectly classic, and the meaning altogether plain. But when John says: τῷ ἰδόντι, δόσω αὐτῷ τοῦ μάννα, i. e. 'to the conqueror—to the very same, will I give of the manna;' he makes his expression specifically
emphatic. We may well illustrate this by our own English idiom. Should I say: 'To Andrew M. to that very man, or to this same individual, will I make application, or give reward,' every one would understand me as increasing the intensity of my promise, and minutely and certainly designating the particular individual to whom the promise was made. So too when we say: 'That very man,' 'That man there,' etc. In common parlance, the latter mode of expression is frequent to a degree that can hardly be estimated. For substance, it illustrates at once, to the considerate reader, what is achieved in Greek when the pronoun demonstrative is inserted after the noun to which it belongs, and in cases where, strictly speaking, it might be dispensed with. It is not grammar, but rhetoric, which demands the employment of it in any case.

I should not have dwelt thus on so minute a particular as the idiom in question, had it not been the fact, that every thing which could be brought to bear upon the Apocalypse, either as to idiom, style, object, or design, has of late been adduced, in order to overthrow the credit of the book, or at least, among one class of writers, to show that John the Apostle and Evangelist could not have been the writer of it. It turns out in this case, however, as it does in respect to nearly all other anomalies which have been charged on the Apocalypse, that John had exemplars, as we have seen above, among the classic Greek writers; and although he might have read, and probably had read, but little of the heathen Greek when he wrote the Apocalypse, he had still so learned it as rarely indeed to make a misstep in the use of it. He has, we may readily conceede, written it as a Hebrew would and must write it, viz. he has often exhibited Hebrew modes of thought and expression. Often, and indeed almost everywhere, in the pictures which he presents, the person is Hebrew while the costume is Greek. It has been a charge against the Apocalypse, made so long ago as the days of Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, (f. A. D. 250,) that the Apocalypse is full of barbarisms and solecisms, and therefore cannot belong to John the Evangelist. Among these anomalies were doubtless reckoned the modes of expression which we have just now examined. It turns out, however, after these charges have been hundreds of times repeated, and all the changes rung upon them that were possible, that there is very little, if any, substantial ground
on which one can rest them. Winer was the first, I believe, in recent times, who has, with any good degree of success, vindicated the character of the Apocalypse in regard to its grammatical style, and especially in regard to its alleged anomalies and barbarisms. This he has done in his Programm, De Solacismis, qui in Apocalypsi Joannea inesse dicuntur, Exeg. Studien, Heft I. S. 144 sq. The writer of these remarks has had occasion still more minutely to examine this subject. He has found, (and to his great surprise after all that has been said about the anomalous Greek of the Apocalypse,) that there are not more than two or three expressions in the whole book, which have not their exemplars in the Greek classics, so far as the principles of grammar are concerned. Such a Greek syntax as Kühner has exhibited, although it was composed without any reference to the New Testament, will enable any man of diligence and accurate observation to verify all which I have now said. It is easy to see, therefore, how much of mere empty and groundless declamation there has been among a certain class of critics, respecting the style of the New Testament writers, and particularly of the writer of the Apocalypse. Indeed, the time seems to be near, in which the alleged rudeness and unskilfulness of the New Testament writers in Greek, will cease to be descanted upon; for such writers as Kühner and Winer must speedily put questions of this kind to their final rest.

I must beg the reader to indulge me in one more remark, kindred to what has already been said. Another allegation against the Apocalypse has been, that 'the writer does not appear to have understood the nice and more exquisite use of the oblique cases (Genitive and Dative) in Greek, and consequently that he very rarely, or almost never, employs them.' Yet a minute examination of the Apocalypse will go far towards rebutting the force of this allegation. For example, in the case before us, we have δῶσω τῷ τοῦ μαννᾶ, i.e. I will give him of the manna. Here is one of the very nicest of the Greek idioms. If a Greek writer or speaker meant to convey the idea that the whole of any thing was given or imparted to any one, he would put the noun designating that thing in the Accusative case, and the person to whom it was given in the Dative. But if he meant (as in the present case) to speak partitively, i.e. to designate the idea that a person was merely made partaker
of a part or portion of any thing, then be would put that thing in the Genitive case, and the person in the Dative. This belongs to Attic writers of the nicest idiom. Yet here in the verse before us, we find this very idiom, and find it most properly and appropriately employed. It is only a portion of the heavenly manna, that any one conqueror receives. There are other conquerors, and very many of them too, who are also to have their portion. We may easily express the like idea in English by saying, 'I will give him of the manna,' or 'I will give him some of the manna.' The first phraseology is quite good English, and perfectly intelligible; and it corresponds, moreover, very exactly in all respects to the Greek of the Apocalypse.

The reader, who feels an interest in refuting such allegations as those just mentioned against the style of the Apocalypse, may easily find material for refutation in the book itself. Thus, in respect to that use of the Genitive which is nicer and more idiomatic, we find the Genitive of price or value twice in Rev. 6, 6, the Genitive of time taken, in 7, 15, 12, 10, 14, 14, 20, 10. Even where length of time is designated by the Genitive, as in Rev. 2, 10, we may vindicate this on classical ground; for which I would refer to examples in my New Testament Grammar §107. 7; comp. §106. 4. Other examples of a nice classical use of the Genitive, may be seen in c. 4, 6, 8, 5, 8, 15, 7. 8. 17, 4, 21, 9; the Genitive even after the verb dèxòm is frequent, notwithstanding Ewald and others have asserted that this idiom is not employed in the Apocalypse, e. g. 6, 1, 3, 5, 14, 13, 16, 1, 5, 7, 21, 3. And the like of the Dative case. 'John,' it has been said, 'was not acquainted with the proper and idiomatic use of the Dative, viz. to designate manner, means, material, time, etc. without prefixing any preposition before it.' Yet it is easy to refute this, by a reference to c. 5, 1, 12, 6, 10, 7, 2, 10, 8, 3, 4, 8, 13, 10, 3, 14, 18, 15, 2, 8, 17, 4, 18, 10, 16 (bis), 19, 21, 19, 17, 21, 8, 16, 19, 22, 14. So after all verbs signifying to show, tell, declare, impart, give, belong to, etc. i.e. all verbs which require an indirect complement as well as a direct one, the Dative is employed in the Apocalypse times almost without number. No one in carefully reading it feels, in respect to this idiom, that he is in a different element from that of common Greek. So too we find the Dative, after such verbs as on other grounds require, or rather very commonly admit, the Dative; e. g.
The subjects thus introduced by the modes of expression in our text, evidently possess more interest than what belongs to a simple grammatical inquiry. The discussion of matters like those before us, takes deep hold on the higher criticism of the Apocalypse, and may help to remove some of the obstructions that have industriously been thrown in the way, against the fair and proper claims of this deeply interesting book.

But I must not delay for a moment longer upon mere topics of style, lest I should lose sight of my main object, or weary the patience of the reader, before I come to that part of my exegesis where I must make the strongest appeal to it.

The verse before us consists of two clauses, which exhibit two promises that are in some respects quite distinct, while at the same time there is a general bond of connexion between them. The first promise runs thus:

To the conqueror, to him will I give of the manna which is laid up.

The word conqueror (σινών), in this case, has a relative meaning. From the commencement of the Apocalypse down to the passage before us, the writer everywhere exhibits manifest tokens, that a violent persecution or war against Christians was going on at that period. Hence the idea of a struggle, a combat, and in the sequel, that of a victory. The great object of the writer of the Revelation, is to confirm and encourage the professors of Christianity to continue steadfast in their profession, although it might be at the sacrifice of liberty, property, and even life. He who should persevere in the course of fidelity to his Lord and Master, come what might or could, is the one whom John calls σινών conqueror. He has fought against the world, the flesh, and the devil, " against the rulers of the darkness of this world and spiritual wickedness in
high places," and has overcome them all. This is the conqueror—this the very man—to whom is made the promise of the manna which is laid up.

But what is this? The literal sense of the words in question, we may presume, no one will contend for; but what is the source of the imagery or symbol which the writer here employs? It may doubtless be found in Ex. 16, 32-34. The children of Israel had murmured against Moses and Aaron, because they lacked bread in the wilderness, and the Lord had promised to Moses that he would "rain bread from heaven" for them. This promise was accomplished by sending down the manna; which fell upon the ground like the dew of evening. On this the people fed; and in commemoration of this signal event, the Lord directed Moses to "fill an omer of it to be kept for their generations, that they might see the bread wherewith they had been fed in the wilderness," v. 32. Moses then directed Aaron to "take a pot, and put an omer full of manna therein, and lay it up before the Lord, to be kept for their generations," v. 33. Accordingly Aaron "laid it up before the Testimony, to be kept." In accordance with what was done on this occasion, we find the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews expressing himself in 9, 4; where he says, when speaking of the inner sanctuary, or most holy place, that it contained "the ark of the covenant overlaid with gold, wherein was the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant."

Whether the apostle speaks, in this passage, of the condition of the ark as it was known to be while in the second temple, and during the time in which he lived, or merely of its condition in the original first tabernacle, has been thought a matter of difficulty to decide. In 1 K. 8, 9 it is said, when the ark was deposited in the temple built by Solomon, that "there was nothing in it save the two tables of stone which Moses put there at Horeb;" and the very same words are repeated in 2 Chron. 5, 10. Paul then, as it would seem, is rather speaking of what belonged originally to the ark of the covenant, than of what was actually in it at the time when he wrote. Yet the Rabbins seem to have held, that the ark of the covenant was with all its contents transferred to the first temple, and even the tabernacle also along with it; for they tell us
that Jeremiah, being divinely warned, commanded the tabernacle and the ark and the altar of incense to follow him to Mount Sinai, when the army of Nebuchadnezzar were about to destroy the temple. Thither, according to the same authority, they did follow him, and there he found a subterranean depository for them, and hid them, so that no man knows the place of them, even unto this day. There too, as they go on to teach us, they will remain, until the days of the Messiah, when Jeremiah, who will re-appear with him, will bring them out and deposite them in the new Messianic temple at Jerusalem. This story, moreover, is not of recent invention. It may be found for substance in 2 Maco. 2, 4–7.¹

But, dismissing the conceits of the Rabbis, let us return to our interpretation. In Ps. 78, 24. 25, manna is called the corn of heaven, and the bread of the mighty or of the mighty ones, αἰδεία ἅγγιστος, or, as our English Bible has it, angels’ food. Obviously these appellations are given to the manna, in order to show forth or enhance the excellence of the gift, or of the nourishment. And we are now brought near to the final illustration of the matter before us. The happiness of a future world, or the joys of the blessed, are often represented in Scripture under the imagery of a feast. Thus Lazarus, in a world of blessedness, is exhibited as reclining in Abraham’s bosom, i. e. reclining at the table of heavenly repast, Luke 16, 23; and our Lord represents his followers as coming from the east and the west, from the north and the south, and sitting down (reclining ἀναληθευτικῶς) at the divine feast in the kingdom of God, Luke 13, 29. So in Revelation 3, 20, the Saviour represents himself as supping with the true and faithful believer; and in Revelation 19, 9, we are told of those “who are invited to the marriage-supper (δείπνου τοῦ γαμοῦ) of the Lamb.”

All these modes of speech were familiar to the minds of John’s readers. Hence the idea suggested in our text, of manna in reserve for the feast of the blessed. At that feast, the bread is not to be like that which sustains us here on earth, but to be like the corn of heaven, the bread of the mighty ones, or angels’ food. In fact, our

THE HIDDEN MANNA.

Lord has said, that "in the resurrection we shall be made like to the angels." Of course angels' food, so to speak, will be appropriate for all true believers. And so the declaration of John is, that he who overcometh shall sit at the table of heavenly refection, and there eat the bread of the mighty ones. In other words, he shall have full admittance to the joys of paradise, and partake of its splendid and precious entertainments; he shall eat the bread of heaven, and eating live forever. The manna rained down from heaven upon the Israelites, was but a type and shadow of the true and heavenly manna reserved for believers.

But this last word, reserved or hidden, (νεκρομετέρω in our text,) needs a passing notice. We have seen how the manna of the desert was laid up (νεκρομετέρω) in the inner sanctuary. This was an image of that which was in reserve, in the eternal sanctuary of the heavens, in reserve for all who are permitted to enter there. As to the earthly tabernacle, none was permitted to enter the most holy place, except the high priest once in a year, in order to make atonement for the people. Under the new dispensation, on the contrary, all are to be made kings and priests; yea, as we shall soon see, to have the dignity of high-priests bestowed upon them. This of course will entitle them to enter the inner sanctuary. In fact, the death of Jesus rent the vail which concealed the inner sanctuary on the earth, and Jesus showed to the world, that all men who will accept them, are without distinction to be admitted to the privileges and honours which the gospel proffers. The white stone and the new name designate them as of a rank equal to the high-priest of old, and as possessing a right to enter the innermost sanctuary of the heavenly world, and feed on the manna which is laid up for all who overcome, in the great contest between Christ's kingdom and the powers of darkness.

In a word, the true heavenly bread, kept in reserve for the faithful, and sustaining life without end, shall be given to them, when the contest and the sorrows of life are past, and they enter upon their final reward.

This brings us to the second promise, differing, as has been said, specifically from the first, but still connected with it by the bonds of a general relation:

I will also give him a white stone, and on the stone a new name
inscribed, which no one understandeth excepting him who receiveth.

This passage has long been a *crux interpretum*, and a great variety of solutions have been proposed. It is not my intention to examine them in detail, for this would occupy much time, and be little to my present purpose, or to that of my readers. The principal ones, however, which have been proposed by interpreters of note, ought to receive our respectful, although brief attention. Greek and Roman sources of explanation have been sought out here, and a solution of the difficulty by means of them often attempted. It is somewhat improbable, however, that John, who almost never appeals to Grecian objects and modes of representation, should have made such an appeal in the present instance. The more respectable attempts of this nature may be divided into two classes.

I. Vitringa, Lange, and many others, have referred here to the usage among the Greeks of absolving those who were tried on the ground of any accusation, by the use of *white* balls or stones, and condemning them by *black* ones. The balls, which symbolized the sentence of acquittal or condemnation, were thrown together into one common urn, whence they were drawn and counted. A majority of the white balls acquitted the party accused. There was no inscription on them. The mere colour indicated the nature of the sentence. But in the case before us, there are no corresponding resemblances. The *white stone*, whatever it is, is given to the party himself who is conqueror. It is the new name inscribed upon it, which imparts to it its principal value and influence. The individual who receives it, is not represented here as being under trial, or as having any accusation preferred against him. And indeed we may ask, with Paul, "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect?" It is not the object of John to present the victor, in this case, as tried and absolved merely, but as crowned with a diadem of glory. The illustration from this source, then, is altogether inapposite and unsatisfactory.

II. Grotius, Eichhorn, and others refer to a different usage among the Greeks and Romans as a source of illustration. The victor in the Olympic games was presented with a *tessera*, on which was inscribed the reward to which his victory gave him a title, and
which was to be bestowed upon him usually by his native city. This reward might be a sum of money, public support, presents of value, special honours, and the like. Similar to this was a custom at Rome. The emperors there, on certain festive occasions, scattered tesserae among the mass of the people who were assembled, on which were inscribed pledges to bestow certain favours on those who obtained them. But in both these cases the white stone of our text is wanting. The inscription, moreover, contained nothing which any one was unable to read. No mention is made of mystical characters. It is not a name which is inscribed, but some honorary stipend is designated. And in the latter case, it was the mere successful scramble of an individual to obtain a tessera in spite of his competitors, which entitled him to receive his reward. How can we suppose John to have referred, in our text, to things so dissimilar as these? Still less can we suppose, with Vitringa, that John had in view both of the customs which have been mentioned above, and amalgamated both in his representation.

Greek and Roman sources of illustration, then, do not promise much. Let us see whether Hebrew sources will not afford us better satisfaction.

We have already seen, that the first promise contained in our text exhibits an indication that the conqueror will be admitted into the most holy place, to eat of the manna which is laid up there. It follows, of course, that there is here an indication of a dignity and privilege which is equivalent to high-priesthood. We must further remark, also, that there is frequent intimation in the Old Testament and in the New, that the people of God will eventually be made kings and priests. Let the reader compare, among other passages, in respect to their kingly dignity, Ps. 49, 14. Dan. 7, 22, 27. Matt. 19, 28. Luke 22, 29. 30. 1 Cor. 6, 2, 3. 2 Tim. 2, 12. Rev. 2, 26. 27. 3, 21. In regard to their priestly dignity, he may consult Is. 61, 6. 1 Pet. 2, 5. Rev. 5, 10. 20, 6; comp. Ex. 19, 5. 6. Literally, indeed, these texts are not to be interpreted; for if all are to be literally kings, who are to be the subjects? And if all are to be literally priests, who are to be those for whom they are to officiate? It is the honour, the dignity, the privileges of the saints, which are represented by such language figuratively employed. And when they are called priests, there is an intimation of something
more than what the word kings designates, viz. the idea of consecration to God, of devotedness to his service, as well as of personal holiness. Indeed the whole compass of language discloses to us no words of greater and more intense significance, than those now in question.

Our text may be regarded as indicating still more than the simple declaration, that the redeemed shall become priests unto God. It conveys the idea that they shall be high-priests; than which no situation can be more elevated as to dignity and honour, especially as it was regarded by the mind of a Hebrew.

Let us see how this can be made out. In Ex. 28, 36 sq. the mitre of the high-priest is described, and it is enjoined among other things, that a plate of pure gold shall be put upon the front of this mitre, and on this shall be engraven holiness to the Lord. In Hebrew, it is יְדַעְתָּ הָבוֹדֵשׁ i.e. holiness to Jehovah; which means, that he who wears the mitre is consecrated to the service of Jehovah, and is to be regarded and honoured as his consecrated or holy one. The mitre, made of sumptuous materials, decked with blue lace, and having the frontlet already described, was truly a magnificent piece of attire, and must have been regarded by every devoted Jew with feelings which it would be difficult adequately to describe.

What resemblance, now, is there between our text and this description of the most striking part of the high priest's attire? Both, I answer, are substantially of the same nature; with the exception, however, that when the passage in Exodus was written, the future construction of the high-priest's mitre was circumstantially prescribed. But in our text, all that pertains to the mere fashion of the mitre is regarded as being already familiar to the readers. Already had John declared, in Rev. 1, 6, that Christ would make his devoted followers kings and priests to God. In the first part of the verse under examination, a promise is made that the same followers should have access to the most holy place, and partake of the manna laid up there; which of course implies, that they should enjoy such a privilege of access to the holy of holies as belonged only to high-priests. And now, in the clause at present before us, the speaker adds a brief description of the splendid attire in which the faithful disciples of Christ shall enter the
ianer sanctuary. Instead of a mitre, with a gold frontispiece on which is the inscription Holiness to the Lord, he shall wear a mitre with a pellucid precious stone, on which shall be engraved the new name which belongs to the new Lord of the new kingdom; a name equivalent in value to that of Jehovah under the Old Testament, which no one but the high-priest knew how to utter.

It will be conceded, that if I am in the right, this is a splendid description. But it needs to be more fully illustrated and confirmed by the explanation of a few particulars.

The epithet λαυξός, which is rendered white, means much more than our simple word 'white.' Hesychius has hit nearly the exact sense which it usually has in the New Testament, when he defines it as equivalent to λαμπρός, i.e. splendid, shining or glistening. Thus, it is said of Jesus' raiment at his transfiguration, that it was λαυξός ἀνέκα τὸ φῶς, i.e. splendid as the sun-light, Matt. 17, 2; or, as Luke has it, his garment was λαυξός, ἡμικράντων, i.e. splendid, glittering or shooting forth lightnings. So says Virgil, of a glittering polished sword: ensis candens, Æn. XII. 91; and Pliny speaks of a comet as adorned argenteo crine, Hist. Nat. II. 25. In Daniel 7, 9 the Ancient of Days is said to be clothed in a vesture white as snow, i.e. of a perfectly pure brightness. In the book of Revelation the epithet λαυξός is frequently employed to denote the pure splendour of vestments worn by saints in glory, or by angels; once or twice it is spoken of pure vestments as the emblem of innocence and purity of character; see Rev. 3, 4, 5, 18, 6, 11, 7, 9, 13, 19, 14. Once it is spoken of a radiant cloud, Rev. 14, 14. In all such cases, I think we may trace the original conception to the white heat of metallic substances, when subjected to a glowing furnace, or to the appearance of the sun when not discoloured by the atmosphere. There is a perfect union of splendour or effulgence and purity of colour, which we name dazzling white. And like to this, is the reflection of many of the pellucid or diaphanous gems. The splendour of some of them, it would be difficult indeed to describe in an adequate manner. The word ψηφως means, when generically considered, any small smooth polished pebble or stone, and may well be employed to designate any of the precious stones.

Such a gem, then, constitutes the frontispiece to the mitre or diadem, given to the new order of priests under the new dispensa-
tion. Gold is not rich or splendid enough for the frontispiece. A precious stone is put in its place. And on this stone, as the case requires, is graven a new name, significant of a new order of things and of new relations.

Two particulars in respect to this engraved name deserve to be considered. The first is, that it is new. The name anciently graven on the high-priest's mitre was that of Jehovah. The great Mediator between God and man had not then made his appearance. The temple-services and all the Jewish ritual foreshadowed him, or were in some way emblematic of him, or of some part of his work. But the fulness of time for his manifestation had not yet arrived. The Jews, therefore, were placed under a law-dispensation; and to God as their immediate law-giver and judge they owed their homage and allegiance. Consequently his name was inscribed on the mitre of their high-priest. But when a new covenant was introduced, "established upon better promises than the old;" in a word, when "all things were created anew," then came in person a Mediator between God and man, who was placed at the head of this new order of things. God no longer communed or treated with his people directly and without any medium of access, but chose to be henceforth approached only through and by this new Director and Disposer of all things. Henceforth there was a Vicegerent, wielding the concerns of all creatures and worlds by the word of his power—a new Head over all things for the sake of the church—an Heir of his Father's throne and dominion—a newly constituted Lord of all. In his name, by his authority, by his power, and at his word, all the concerns of the universe are managed and directed. The elders around the throne of God fall at his feet and reverently worship; before him angels and archangels bow; and at his presence devils tremble.

This new and delegated dominion is to continue, so long as the work of redemption goes on. When it is completed, "then cometh the end." Then will his delegated power—delegated to the God-Man for the sake of completing the work of redeeming grace—be given up to God the Father, and God will again resume his immediate and universal dominion. So says the apostle, in 1 Cor. 15, 24-28; and the nature of the case would seem to indicate that it must be so.
Here then is a new power, a new office, a new personage, and of course a new name. That the Logos is specifically meant or supposed by John, as the name in question, I would not positively affirm. His writings, however, seem to favour the supposition. His Gospel introduces us, in its first sentence, to the Logos, as becoming the incarnate Redeemer; and when, in holy vision, he sees him at the head of his great army, he tells us that his name was called the Word of God, Rev. 19, 13.

Perfectly natural and congruous is it, therefore, that this new name should be inscribed on the mitre of his followers, when they are advanced to the dignity of the high-priesthood. Indeed, what less could be expected, than that the subjects of the Prince of Peace should wear his livery, and have his name upon their frontlets? Yet this is a new name. It is not holiness to Jehovah, but יְהֹוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל, or θεός τῶν ἀνθρώπων! Such will be the frontispiece of their mitres, so long as the mediatorial dominion shall continue.

One circumstance more, and I have done. What means the clause, δόεις οἴδατε εἰ μὴ ὁ λαμβάνων, which no one understandeth excepting him who receiveth? This can be explained only by a reference to a Jewish custom in regard to the word יְהֹוָה, i.e. as we pronounce it, Jehovah. But every Hebrew scholar well knows that the Jews have never pretended to give the true sound of this word. The vowel points attached to it belong to the word יְהֹוָה; and so the Jews have read it always, excepting that in some cases of duplicate appellations they read it as יְהֹוָה, and pointed it accordingly. Hence, among the more than fifteen hundred times in which the word Jehovah occurs in the Old Testament, we find no example of any attempt on the part of the Seventy ever to make out the sound of the word יְהֹוָה. Always do they translate it by θεός, when it is read as יְהֹוָה, or by δεός when it is read יְהֹוָה. Hence we know, that the custom of never attempting to sound the word יְהֹוָה in common parlance, preceded the date of the Christian era; how much older than this date it is, it would be difficult to say. But he this as it may, when the Apocalypse was written, the word יְהֹוָה was regarded by the Hebrews as something too sacred and awful to be uttered. None but the high-priest knew how it should be uttered, and he could utter it only in the most holy place. So says Philo, in his book De Vita Mosis, when speaking of the high-
priest’s mitre: “A golden plate was made like a crown, having four engraved characters of a name [i.e. נְאָשָׁא], which it was lawful only for those whose ears and tongue were purified by wisdom to hear and to utter in the sanctuary, but for no one at all in any other place.” To the same purpose Josephus speaks in Antiq. II. 12. 4. Thus run his words: “And God made known to him [Moses] his own name [יהוה], which before had not been disclosed to men; respecting which it is not lawful for me to speak.” Josephus, being himself a priest, might possibly have heard the name in the temple; and therefore he does not say that he had no knowledge of it, but only that he cannot lawfully utter any thing respecting it. Besides this, Theodoret, in his Greek commentary upon Exodus, Quest. XV, says: “This name [יהוה] is not uttered by the Hebrews, nor do they attempt to pronounce it with the tongue.” He speaks, of course, respecting common usage among them. And to the like purpose Eusebius speaks, in Prep. Evang. XI, when he says: “It [this name] is something which cannot be spoken or uttered by the multitude.” That he means the name Jehovah, is plain; because he says, that it was “an appellation which the Hebrews designated by four letters.” In the same chapter he says again: “The proper name of God is unutterable and not to be spoken, nor is it even to be ideally conceived by the mind.”

From all this it is very apparent, that none but the high-priest, or those on whom his functions might devolve, had knowledge respecting the true pronunciation of the word יהוה on his mitre. But he was himself an exception. In the sanctuary he might and did utter it. The privilege, therefore, was high and exclusive.

Twice does the writer of the Apocalypse refer to this distinctive privilege and peculiarity; once in the text under examination, and again in chap. 18, 12, where he represents the Logos as wearing a diadem, “on which was inscribed a name that none understood but himself,” viz. the wearer. We cannot doubt therefore to what source we are to apply, for an explanation of the phraseology before us.

The sum of the meaning is, that the conqueror in the Christian warfare will not only be admitted to partake of the manna in the most holy place, but that he will wear a diadem on which the unknown and unutterable name is inscribed. In other words: The conqueror shall be advanced to the dignity, honour, and privilege
of the high-priest of the sanctuary—not on earth, but in heaven. The new name which he shall bear in his mitre, shall designate him as the consecrated servant of the new Regent of the universe, the Lord of all; and be the token of admission to all the privileges and honours conferred upon those who held such a rank.

One thought more must not be omitted. The awful, adorable, unutterable name of the ancient יהוה should be commuted for one under the new dispensation, which was an equivalent. In other words, this new name should be equally significant, equally honourable, equally adorabe. This is the substance. The idea, that it was not to be known or ever uttered, is not the necessary essence of the matter. Awful silence is only a token of the profoundest reverence. The new dispensation is one of revelation and light, rather than one of concealment and mystical secrecy. But all which belonged to the unuttered and unutterable name of ancient days, is to belong to the new name in the latter day—the times of the Messiah.

Here, in an indirect way, but still in a very striking one, and which does not easily admit of a refutation, the claims of the Messiah to the full honours and dignity of the Godhead are plainly conceded and declared. The Apocalypse abounds in similar intimations with regard to this most important subject. This book deserves a fuller investigation, with respect to this matter, than it has yet received. Few readers are well acquainted with the variety of ways in which it recurs to the transcendent glory and excellency of the Redeemer; fewer still, with the overpowering arguments which it supplies, to prove that he is God over all and blessed for ever.
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can ever be drawn from the passage before us, to show that a light and ordinary state of mind at the Lord’s Supper does not deserve, and may not be followed by, severe chastisement from the great Head of the Church. I doubt not, that in the primitive age of Christianity there were some special developments of this nature, and for important purposes; but the same God and Saviour still reigns, and he does not love holiness, nor hate sin, less now than he did then. A profanation of the sacramental ordinance, in any respect whatever, now and evermore, must be peculiarly offensive in his sight.

V.

THE COMING OF CHRIST:

AS ANNOUNCED IN MATT. XXIV. 29-31.

BY THE EDITOR.

Our Lord had taken his final leave of the temple and its courts; and in departing had uttered over it the dread prediction, soon to be so fearfully accomplished: “Verily, I say unto you, there shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down.” Retiring with his disciples to the Mount of Olives, he seated himself upon the heights over against the temple, where its courts and edifices, as well as the whole city, were spread out as on a map before him. Here, four of the disciples, Peter and James, and John and Andrew, propose to him privately the following inquiry:

Matt. xxiv. 3.  

Tell us, when shall these things be? and what the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?  

Master, but when shall these things be? and what the sign when all these things shall be fulfilled, or come to pass?

As the manner in which this inquiry is to be understood, has some bearing upon the main question before us, a few words may here be necessary, in order to set the matter in a proper light. The point to be considered is: To what events was the inquiry of the disciples directed?

Had we only the accounts of Mark and Luke, no difficulty whatever could here arise. They both refer simply and solely to these things; that is, the things just spoken by our Lord in respect to the temple—his prophetic announcement of its total destruction. They ask: "When shall these things be? and what the sign when all these things shall be fulfilled, or come to pass?" This inquiry then, taken by itself, cannot possibly be referred to any thing but the destruction of the temple; an idea which would naturally connect itself in the minds of the disciples, as it was afterwards connected in fact, with the siege and overthrow of the Holy City.

But Matthew relates the question in a different form: "When shall these things be? and what the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" Here these things in the first clause are necessarily the same things as before in Mark and Luke, and can refer only to the destruction of the temple and city. But the "coming" of our Lord and "the end of the world" in the last clause,—do these have respect to the same events? or are they to be regarded as an additional inquiry, referring to that awful day, when the Lord will come to final judgment, and: "the earth and the works that are therein shall be burned up?" In other words, did the "coming" of our Lord here have respect, in the minds of the in-

1 Peter 3, 10.
inquiring disciples, to the destruction of the temple and Jerusalem, or to the judgment of the last great day?  
Perhaps a correct answer to this question would be, that the disciples in their own minds referred distinctly to neither of these events. They obviously had not, at the time, any definite and distinct notions of that terrible overthrow and subversion of the Jewish people, which was so soon to take place. They were also equally ignorant in respect to the awful events which are to be the accompaniments of the day of judgment and the end of the world. We cannot suppose nor admit, that the inquiry, as Matthew puts it, suggested to their minds the same ideas, nor events of the same character, as the same language, taken by itself, would now suggest to us under the full light of a completed revelation. The Holy Spirit had not yet been given, and even our Lord's most favoured disciples still groped in comparative darkness. A glance at their training and peculiar expectations, may perhaps enable us to perceive, with some degree of distinctness, what they did intend to express by the terms of their inquiry.  
The expectation of a Messiah to come, which had long been cherished by the Jewish people, had its foundation in the prophecies of the Old Testament; where the coming of the Messiah, his triumph and his reign, are foretold in the language of poesy and sublimity; especially in the writings of Isaiah and Daniel. His reign is there figuratively described as a golden age, "when the right religion, and with it the Jewish throne and theocracy, should be re-established in more than their pristine splendour and purity, and universal peace and happiness should consequently prevail. All this was doubtless to be understood in a spiritual sense. It was the Redeemer's spiritual kingdom that was thus foreshadowed, that "mystery" of God which had been kept "hid from ages," but was now to be revealed to the saints. And so indeed the devout Jews of our Saviour's time, such as Zacharias, Simeon, Anna, Joseph, appear to have received it. But the Jewish people at large gave to these prophecies a temporal meaning. They expected a Messiah

1 Dan. 2, 4, 7, 14, 27, 9, 25 sq. Is. 2, 1-4 (comp. Mic. 4, 1-4). 11, 1 sq. Jer. 23, 5 sq. 32, 37 sq. 33, 14 sq. Ez. 34, 23 sq. 37, 24 sq. Ps. 2 and 110, etc. etc.
2 Col. 1, 26.
who should come in the clouds of heaven; and, as king of the Jewish nation, should restore the ancient religion and worship, reform the corrupt morals of the people, make expiation for their sins, deliver them from the yoke of foreign dominion, exalt them to a pre-eminence over all other nations, and at length reign over the whole earth in peace and glory. A main idea in this mode of representation, was the ‘restitution’ of all things to the Hebrew nation, and their exaltation to privileges and a rank above the nations of the earth. Their then present condition of humiliation and sorrow was to cease, and be succeeded by a state of power and glory which should never end. The world (so to speak) was to be turned upside down; principalities and thrones were to be cast to the ground, and those who dwelt on dunghills were to be exalted. The coming of the expected Messiah in solemn pomp and glory was to be the signal for these revolutions,—the downfall of the present order of things, and the introduction of the new. The world, as it then was, and now is, was to come to an end; and then all things would become new.

That even our Lord’s twelve apostles were deeply imbued with these views and expectations of a temporal prince and Saviour, so long as Jesus lived, and for a time even after his resurrection,—until, indeed, the giving of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost,—is apparent from every part of the sacred narrative. They were still groping in ignorance and darkness; they received Jesus with sincere faith as the promised Messiah; but as to the true character of himself and of his kingdom they had but imperfect conceptions. Their Master often had occasion to rebuke them for their “little faith;” he unfolded to them only gradually the deeper mysteries pertaining to his Gospel; and it was only on the very last evening of his intercourse with them, and after the institution of the Holy Supper, that he spoke openly to them of his departure. Even then they were dull of apprehension; so that our Lord declares them still incapable of receiving the instruction which he would gladly communicate: “I have yet many things to say unto

you, but ye cannot bear them now.” No wonder, then, that they looked upon him as one who was about to become a glorious Prince, and reign over the whole earth. In the spirit of this temporal and national expectation, the two disciples, on their way to Emmaus, declared: “We trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel;” and in the same spirit, after his resurrection, the disciples, when they had come together, “asked of him, saying, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?”

Such then being the state of knowledge and of expectation in the minds of the disciples at the time of our Lord’s passion, it is easy to see, that the above inquiry made by them only a few days earlier, must be judged of and interpreted in accordance with this state of mind and feeling. They awaited a temporal exaltation of their Lord and Master, and a restitution of pre-eminency and glory to the Jewish people; the introduction of this new state would be his “coming,” and with this they now connected the overthrow of the temple and city which he had just predicted. His “coming” and the “end of the world” were therefore in their minds to be coeval and identical with the “end” of the then present state of humiliation and depression, and with the commencement of the new and glorious era of the Messiah’s temporal reign.

The question, therefore, as reported by Matthew, although it affords us a deeper insight into the views and feelings of the disciples, than as given by Mark and Luke, yet does not differ in its general import from the specifications of the two latter Evangelists. Does our Lord answer the inquiry of his disciples? Not directly. He first warns them of many deceivers who shall arise. He speaks of famine, pestilence, and earthquakes, as about to occur; which seem here as elsewhere to be emblems of great civil and social commotions. He warns his followers, that they will be exposed to dangers and persecutions on every side; from which, if they endure them with the patience of faith and hope, they shall be delivered. The particular time when these dangers shall break forth upon them, will be when they “shall see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place.”

Instead of this expression, and explanatory of it, Luke points to the time when "shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies." Then they may know, "that the desolation thereof is nigh." Then will be the time for every one to save himself by flight. Then will the eagles be gathered together over the carcasses; and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.

In close and direct connexion with this representation, follows in Matthew the passage now more immediately to be considered. I subjoin it here in full; and also the parallel verses of Mark and Luke, in which the connexion is equally close and direct, and which have an important bearing upon the right interpretation of the language of Matthew.


24. Καὶ ἠγονυστῆκεν διότι ἦσαν πατομένη ὑπὸ 69᾽ ὡς ἤρθεν ὁ πλεισ-

θείος καυρὶ 69᾽. 25. Καὶ ἦσαν σημαίαι ἐν ἡλίῳ καὶ στήθη καὶ ἀστρο"

σαί, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς χρῆς συνεχόμενον ὑδάτων ἐν ἀπορίας. 26. ἦν θαλάσσης καὶ σαλα-

ναοῦ ὑδραίωται. 27. Καὶ τότε ἠγονυστῆκεν ὁ σωμάτων τῶν ἱερα-

τικῶν σαλανθήσονται. 28. Καὶ τότε κύριον αὐτῷ πέτασαν ἡ φωνὴ τῆς εἰς τῆς

χεῖρας, καὶ ἤρθαν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῶν ἱερατῶν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ μετὰ ἰδιν

μετα καὶ πολλῆς καὶ ἱερᾶς καὶ ἐκκλησίας.

26. Καὶ τότε ὑστῆκεν ὁ σωμάτων τῶν ἱερατῶν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ μετὰ καὶ πολλῆς καὶ ἱερᾶς καὶ ἐκκλησίας. 27. Καὶ τότε ἠγονυστῆκεν ὁ σωμάτων τῶν ἱερατῶν καὶ ἐκκλησίας καὶ ἱερᾶς καὶ ἐκκλησίας. 28. Ἀρχιμαῖων καὶ ἐπισκοπῶν καὶ ἐπισκόπων τῶν ἱερατῶν καὶ ἐκκλησίας καὶ ἱερᾶς καὶ ἐκκλησίας.
THE PASSAGE CITED.

24. And Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled. (25) And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring; (26) men’s hearts failing them for fear and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth; for the powers of heaven shall be shaken. (27) And then shall they see the Son of man coming in the clouds with great power and great glory. (28) And when these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh.

After these passages our Lord goes on, as reported by all three of the Evangelists, to introduce the similitude of the fig-tree putting forth its buds and leaves as the harbinger of summer. In like manner the disciples, when they shall see all these things taking place, may “know that it (the coming?) is near, even at the door;” or, as Luke more definitely expresses it, they may “know that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand.” Then follows immediately a most important designation of time, in which the three Evangelists accord verbatim in the original: “VERILY I SAY UNTO YOU, THIS GENERATION SHALL NOT PASS AWAY, TILL ALL THESE THINGS BE FULFILLED.”

The subject is now before the reader; and the question to be considered is: Whether the language of Matthew in the passage above quoted, is to be referred to the judgment of the last great day; or, rather to the then impending destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish nation? It is a question on which good men have ever differed; and on which, perhaps, entire unity of opinion is not to be expected, until the night of darkness and ignorance in which we are here enveloped, shall be chased away by the morn of pure light and perfect knowledge.

It is conceded by all, I believe, that the representation as far as to the end of the 28th verse of Matthew, and in the parallel verses of the other Evangelists, applies solely to the overthrow of Jerusalem. Or, if there be still those who would refer any portion of these preceding verses to the judgment-day, it seems to me that they must first show, that the "abomination of desolation" spoken of by Matthew and Luke has nothing to do with the "compassing of Jerusalem with armies," mentioned in the same connexion by Luke; and then, further, that all these things could have no connexion with the "treading down" of Jerusalem by the Gentiles, which Luke goes on to speak of as the result of all these antecedent circumstances. This, however, cannot well be shown, without disregarding every rule of interpretation, and without violating the very first principles of language.

But with the 29th verse a new specification of time is introduced: "Immediately after the affliction of those days" shall appear the harbingers of our Lord's coming; and these are depicted in language which elsewhere, it is said, is employed only to describe his coming to the final judgment. The "coming" here meant, is then to be subsequent to the downfall of Jerusalem; and can therefore only mean the coming of the Messiah in his kingdom at the judgment day. This opinion is perhaps, at the present time, the most prevalent one among commentators, and even with those whose views in other respects have little in common; as in the case of Olshausen and De Wette.

But on the other hand, it is replied, that the phrase "immediately after" indicates a very close connexion of this "coming" of

1 See Matt. 25, 31 sq. Also the explanation of the parable of the wheat and the tares, Matt. 13, 40. 41.
our Lord with the preceding events; and the Saviour himself goes on to declare, that "this generation shall not pass away, till all these things be fulfilled." We must then assume, it is said, that the prediction had its fulfilment within a period not long subsequent to our Lord's ministry; or, if it is to be referred to the day of judgment, then we must admit that our Lord was in error, inasmuch as he here foretold that it would take place immediately after the downfall of Jerusalem. For these reasons many commentators have understood the language as applicable only to the destruction of the Holy City; forgetting, apparently, that the very expression which they urge against a remote future application, is equally stringent against an exclusive reference to the latter catastrophe.

It is very obvious that both of these different opinions cannot be true; while it is also very possible, that both of them may be more or less wrong. Before proceeding to develop the manner in which the subject has presented itself to my own mind, it will be necessary to examine the language of the prediction and the attendant circumstances, and to bring into view some other preliminary considerations. All this may be best done under a number of heads, as follows:

I. The destruction of Jerusalem was the topic of our Lord's discourse with his disciples, and the subject of his predictions at the temple and on the mount of Olives, as related by Matthew in c. 24, 1-28 inclusive; and also by Mark and Luke in the parallel verses. This point has been already sufficiently considered; and requires here no further elucidation.

II. The "coming" foretold in v. 29-31 of Matthew, was to be subsequent to the time of the "abomination of desolation," and the compassing of Jerusalem by armies, and also to the "treading down" of the city by the Gentiles. By this latter phrase is usually and rightly understood the capture and destruction of the city by Titus, as related by Josephus. This same event is doubtless shadowed forth in the language of Matthew: "For wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together;" not indeed through any verbal allusion to the Roman eagles, as some assume; but in the general application of a proverbial expression, viz. that where the guilty are, there punishment shall find them; or, in other words, the guilty are sure to be overtaken by the divine
punishment. When this catastrophe shall have taken place, then, immediately after (εὐθεῖαν μέτα) this affliction, there shall be distress and anxiety, and the shaking of the powers of heaven, all which are to accompany and introduce our Lord's coming. The word εὐθείασ means literally straightway, and implies a succession more or less direct and immediate; so that there can be no doubt, as De Wette justly remarks, that the coming of the Messiah, as here described by Matthew, was straightway to follow the destruction of Jerusalem. Indeed no meaning can possibly be assigned to εὐθείασ, which will admit of any great delay; much less of an interval so enormous as that between the destruction of the Holy City and the end of the world, as understood by us. From this it is manifest, that "the coming," of Christ here spoken of, as occurring after the downfall of Jerusalem, could not be meant to refer solely to that event.

III. Our Lord himself limits the interval within which Jerusalem shall be destroyed and his "coming" take place, to that same generation: Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled. The language is here plain, definite, and express; it cannot be misunderstood, nor perverted. It follows, in all the Evangelists, the announcement of our Lord's "coming," and applies to it in them all, just as much as it applies to the antecedent declarations respecting Jerusalem; and more directly, indeed, inasmuch as it stands here in a closer connexion.

But what is the meaning of the phrase "this generation"? and what the interval of time thus designated? The specification is, and must be, at any rate, indefinite; for the tide of human life flows on in an unbroken stream, and no man can mark or tell the point where one generation ends and another begins. Yet modern chronology, with some degree of definiteness, reckons three generations in a century; and thus allows to each an interval of thirty-three and a third years, or, more loosely, from thirty to forty years. The ancient Hebrews, on the other hand, appear to have counted a hundred years to each generation. God said to Abraham, that his seed should be afflicted in Egypt four hundred years; but that in the fourth generation they should return to the Promised Land.

---

In which of these senses is the above expression of our Lord to be understood? If in the former, then certainly the destruction of Jerusalem, which is usually held to have occurred in A.D. 70, took place within the time thus generally specified; that is, within an interval of less than forty years after our Lord’s passion. But of the events which were to follow that catastrophe, we know of none that can be referred to the same interval. The destruction of the city itself occurred at the very latest point of time that can be reckoned to that generation thus understood; and no events of importance in Jewish history took place for quite a number of years afterwards.

But our Lord was speaking in a popular manner, and would naturally employ expressions in their most popular sense. He did not mean to point out definitely the exact time when this or that event was to take place. He says himself, immediately afterwards: “Of that day and hour knoweth no one, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only.” It seems necessary, therefore, to understand the word “generation,” as thus used by our Lord, in its largest sense, and in accordance with popular Hebrew usage, as implying a hundred years. But this again must not be construed too definitely. It is rather a general expression, designating time by a reference to the duration of human life; and is apparently neither more nor less than equivalent to our mode of expression, when we say: ‘There are those now born, who will live to see all these things fulfilled.’ Our Lord himself, in another passage, relating to the same subject, presents the same idea in this very form: “Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.”

IV. The question now arises, Whether, under these limitations of time, a reference of our Lord’s language to the day of judgment and the end of the world, in our sense of these terms, is possible? Those who maintain this view attempt to dispose of the difficulties arising from these limitations in different ways. Some assign to the meaning suddenly, as it is employed by the Seventy in Job 5, 3, for the Heb. צמח. But even in this passage, the pur-

---

pose of the writer is simply to mark an immediate sequence — to intimate that another and consequent event happened forthwith. Nor would any thing be gained, even could the word εὐθείας be thus disposed of, so long as the subsequent limitation to "this generation" remained. And in this, again, others have tried to refer γενομένη to the race of the Jews or to the disciples of Christ; not only without the slightest ground, but contrary to all usage and all analogy. All these attempts to apply force to the meaning of the language, are in vain; and are now abandoned by most commentators of note. Two or three general views, however, are current on the subject, which demand some further remark.

One is that of De Wette and others, who do not hesitate to regard our Lord as here announcing, that the coming of the Messiah to the judgment of the last day would take place immediately after the fall of Jerusalem. This idea, according to De Wette, is clearly expressed by our Lord, both here and elsewhere; and was likewise held by Paul. But as the day of judgment has not yet come, it follows, either that our Lord, if correctly reported, was himself mistaken, and spoke here of things which he knew not; or else, that the sacred writers have not truly related his discourse. The latter horn of this dilemma is preferred by De Wette. According to him the disciples entertained the idea of their Lord’s return with such vividness of faith and hope, that they overlooked the relations of time, which Jesus himself had left indefinite; and they thus connected his final coming immediately with his coming to destroy Jerusalem. They give here, therefore, their own conception of our Lord’s language, rather than the language itself as it fell from his lips. They mistook his meaning; they acted upon this mistake in their own belief and preaching; and in their writings have perpetuated it to the world throughout all time.

This view is, of course, incompatible with any and every idea of inspiration on the part of the sacred writers; the very essence of which is, that they were commissioned and aided by the Spirit to impart truth to the world, and not error. To a believer in this fun-
damental doctrine, no argument can here be necessary, nor in place, to counteract the view above presented. To state it in its naked contrast with the divine authority of God's word, is enough.

But there may well be a further inquiry here raised, viz. Whether there was in fact, in the minds of Paul and other apostles and early Christians, so strong an expectation of the speedy coming of Christ to judgment, as is thus assumed? The main passage on which this assumption is made to rest, is the very one now under consideration; which in this way is first employed to demonstrate the existence of such an expectation; and then that expectation is assumed to sustain this interpretation of the passage. In respect to Paul, reference is made to his language in 1 Cor. 15, 51 sq. and 1 Thess. 4, 15; where, in speaking of our Lord's final coming, he uses the first person of the plural: "we shall not all sleep;" "we which are alive," etc. The inference drawn by some is, that Paul expected the coming of the judgment-day in his own life-time, so that he himself would be one of those who would then be alive and would be changed without seeing death. But nothing is more evident, than that the language of Paul here, as often elsewhere, may be understood merely as including himself and those to whom he was writing, as a portion of the great body of Christians of the church universal in all ages, the dead as well as those living at our Lord's coming. So Chrysostom and others; and even De Wette regards it as certain, that the phrase "we shall all be changed" refers both to the dead and the living.1 And further, it would seem that Paul's language addressed to the Thessalonians, had in fact been so understood by some, as to imply the near approach of the judgment-day; and therefore the apostle, in his second Epistle, takes occasion expressly to warn them against any such misapprehension of his words: "Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together with him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand."2 The very application of his language now (as then) made, the apostle here protests against. In the face of this protest, I do not see how we can well affirm, that Paul regarded

1 Exeget. Handb. in 1 Cor. 15, 51. 2 Thess. 2, 1, 2.
the final coming of our Lord as an event which was speedily to take place. That it was already so regarded by some, is evident from the apostle's teaching to the contrary; and that the idea continued in the church, and was occasionally current in the early centuries, is matter of history. Yet for this, not the teachings of our Lord and his apostles, but the suggestions of human fancy, are responsible.

Another form of the same general view is that presented by Olshausen. He too refers the verses of Matthew under consideration directly to the final coming of Christ; but seeks to avoid the difficulty above stated, by an explanation derived from the alleged nature of prophecy. He adopts the theory broached by Hengstenberg, that inasmuch as the vision of future things was presented solely to the mental or spiritual eye of the prophet, he thus saw them all at one glance as present realities, with equal vividness and without any distinction of order or time,—like the figures of a great painting without perspective or other marks of distance or relative position. "The facts and realities are distinctly perceived; but not their distance from the period, nor the intervals by which they are separated from each other." Hence our Lord, in submitting himself to the laws of prophetic vision, was led to speak of his last coming in immediate connexion with his coming for the destruction of Jerusalem; because in vision the two were presented together to his spiritual eye, without note of any interval of time.—Not to dwell here upon the fact, that this whole theory of prophecy is fanciful hypothesis, and appears to have been since abandoned by its author; it is enough to remark, that this explanation admits, after all, the same fundamental error, viz. that our Lord did mistakenly announce his final coming as immediately to follow the overthrow of the Holy City. Indeed, the difficulty is even greater here, if possible, than before; because, according to the former view, the error may be charged upon the report of the Evangelists, while here it can only be referred to our Lord himself.

It may, indeed, be further asked, whether the limitation to "this generation," in v. 34, may not be referred solely to the prediction

of the destruction of Jerusalem ending with v. 28; and then vv. 29–31 be understood of the general judgment without being affected by this limitation? The reply to this question has already been given under our third head above. The limitation has a clear and distinct reference to all the events foretold in the previous discourse; and therefore, as Lightfoot says, “it is hence evident enough, that the preceding verses are not to be understood of the last judgment, but of the destruction of Jerusalem.”

V. We come now to our last preliminary inquiry, viz. Whether the language of Matthew in vv. 29–31 is in fact applicable to merely civil and political commotions and revolutions? and whether the solemnity and strength of the language, and the grandeur and pomp of the mode of representation, do not necessarily imply a catastrophe more general and more awful, than the fall of a single city or the subversion of a feeble people? Can it be, then, that the language of these verses should refer merely to the destruction of Jerusalem or of the Jewish nation?

Not to dwell here upon the well known facts, that the language of the Orient, and especially that of the Hebrew prophets, is full of the boldest metaphors and the sublimest imagery, applied to events and things which the manner of the Occident would describe without figure and in far simpler terms; it will be sufficient to show, that similar language is employed both in the Old and New Testaments on various occasions arising out of changes and revolutions in the course of human events; and especially in respect to the judgments of God upon nations. We will take the verses in their order.

Verse 29. Here it is said, that after the preceding tribulation, the darkness of the sun and moon, the falling of the stars, and the shaking of the powers of heaven, are to be the harbingers of the Lord’s coming. The “powers (συνάρμοι) of heaven” are the sun, moon, and stars, the πανεπιφανής θεάν host of heaven of the Old Testament. Now that the very same language and the same natural phenomena are employed in other places to mark events in human affairs and to announce God’s judgments, is apparent from the following passages:

1 Page 540 above.
2 Is. 34, 4, where Sept. συνάρμοι are ὁ σωρός.
In Is. c. 13, woes and judgments are denounced against Babylon. In v. 9 it is said, “the day of the Lord cometh ... to lay the land desolate;” and in v. 10 the following signs and accompaniments are pointed out: “For the stars of heaven and the constellations thereof shall not give their light; the sun shall be darkened in his going forth, and the moon shall not cause her light to shine.”

In Is. c. 34 similar woes and judgments are proclaimed against Idumea; see vv. 5, 6. The prophet in v. 2 describes “the indignation of the Lord upon all nations, ... he hath utterly destroyed them;” and in v. 4 he continues: “And all the host of heaven (Sept. δεινὰς τῶν οὐρανῶν) shall be dissolved; and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll; and all their host shall fall down, as the leaf falleth off from the vine, and as the withered leaf from the fig-tree.”

In Ez. c. 32 the prophet takes up a lamentation for Pharaoh, v. 2; in the succeeding verses his destruction is foretold; and then the prophet proceeds in v. 7, as follows: “And when I shall put thee out, I will cover the heaven, 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 set darkness upon thy land, saith the Lord God.”

In Joel 2, 30. 31 [3, 3, 4, Heb.] the very same phenomena are described as appearing “before the great and the terrible day of the Lord come.” In Acts 2, 19. 20, this passage is quoted by the Apostle Peter, and applied directly to the great events which were to accompany the introduction of the new dispensation,—including obviously the signs and wonders attendant upon the death and resurrection of our Lord; the outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost and upon the churches afterwards; the spread and establishment of Christianity; and the final termination of the Mosaic dispensation in the subversion of the temple-worship and the irretrievable ruin of the Jewish nation.

These examples are enough to show, that the language of the verse under consideration may well be in like manner understood as symbolic of the commotions and revolutions of states and kingdoms. In respect to the other two Evangelists, the words of Mark are entirely parallel to those of Matthew; while Luke interweaves
a further allusion to terrestrial phenomena, and to the distress and faintness of heart among men "for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth."

Verse 30. After the phenomena described in the preceding verse, is to appear "the sign of the Son of man in heaven." This of course is not the Messiah himself, as some assume; but it would seem to be something immediately connected with his personal appearance, perhaps the dark clouds and tempest, the thunders and lightnings, which are ascribed as the usual accompaniment of a Theophania, and in which the Redeemer is at first shrouded. Then the Son of man himself is seen "coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." Can this magnificent and awful representation have reference merely to events in the world's past history?

Let this question also be answered by an appeal to the Old Testament. There Jehovah is represented as appearing in a similar manner, both for the judgment of the wicked and the protection of the righteous.

Thus in Ps. 97, 2 sq. "Clouds and darkness are round about him,—a fire goeth before him, and burneth up his enemies round about," etc.

Ps. 50, 3 sq. "Our God shall come, and shall not keep silence; a fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him. He shall call to the heavens from above, and to the earth, that he may judge his people."

So too in respect to particular nations. In Is. 19, 1, it is said: "Behold, the Lord rideth upon a swift cloud, and shall come into Egypt; and the idols of Egypt shall be moved at his presence," etc.

In like manner, Ps. 68 is the description of a continued Theophania, in behalf of the people of Israel; see vv. 1, 2; 7, 8; 17, 18; 33, 35.

The same sublime imagery is likewise employed in Ps. 18,* in describing God's appearance for the deliverance of an individual—his chosen servant David. A passage more full of poetic sublimity and overpowering grandeur can hardly be found in the sacred writings,

---

1 See Ps. 18, 11-14.  
2 See also 2 Sam. 22.
than is contained in vv. 7–15 of that Psalm. The application of it to David follows immediately in v. 16: "He sent from above, he took me, he drew me out of many waters," etc. The whole passage is too long to be inserted here; but the reader will not fail to turn to it and peruse it.

If then language of this kind relating to Jehovah is employed in the Old Testament, with reference both to nations and to individuals, we surely are authorized to apply the like representations of the New Testament to an event so important in the Divine economy as the overthrow of God's own peculiar people, and the chosen seat of their national worship.

The source of the particular form of representation in v. 30, is doubtless the seventh chapter of Daniel. There in vv. 13. 14, the prophet says: "I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away; and his kingdom, that which shall not be destroyed." Here then is the Messiah, coming not for the day of judgment, but to introduce his spiritual kingdom upon earth. Analogically, therefore, the like language of our Lord in the verse before us, must be understood in the same way, and not made to refer to the day of judgment.

Verse 31. Hosts of angels and the sound of the trumpet belong to the Christophania here and elsewhere, as also to the Theophasia. Here too it is said: "He shall send his angels . . . and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds;" and the same is said in the corresponding verse of Mark. This "gathering," it has been thought, can refer only to the assembling of all nations for the final judgment, as more fully depicted in Matt. 25, 31 sq. and also as implied in the explanation of the parable of the tares in Matt. 13, 40 sq. But on comparing the modes of expression in the two cases, they do not appear to be parallel. Here the angels simply "gather together the elect;" there (in 25, 32) all nations are gathered before him, and the wicked are then separated from the righteous. The representation is the same in Matt. 13, 41, 43.

1 Ex. 19, 16, 19. 1 Cor. 15, 52. 1 Thess. 4, 16; comp. Rev. 8, 2, etc.
The idea of such a separation before the judgment-seat, is indeed essentially connected with every representation of the day of judgment; and indeed cannot be separated from it. Why then are only the elect here said (in v. 31) to be gathered together? For judgment? Nothing of the kind is expressed or implied in the passage itself; nor is it elsewhere ever said of the elect, that they alone will be “gathered together” to the judgment of the great day.

But the idea of “gathering together” those widely dispersed, sometimes includes also the accessory notion of deliverance and protection, as the end and purpose of the act. Thus it is said of Jehovah, that “he gathereth together the outcasts of Israel;”1 he will gather them out of all lands whither they are scattered, will deliver them from all dangers, and secure to them his protection. So too our Lord, in his touching lament over Jerusalem, exclaims: “How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!” Here the idea of deliverance and protection is strongly prominent. Now this idea we may apply in the verse under consideration. In the conceptions and distress antecedent to our Lord’s coming for the destruction of the Jewish state, he will send his angels “to gather together his elect,” so that they may be delivered and protected from the dangers which threaten them. Indeed, precisely this idea is strongly expressed by Luke in the parallel verse: “And when these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh.”

We come then to the general result, that the language of these three verses under consideration does not necessarily in itself apply to the general judgment; while the nature of the context shows that such an application is inadmissible. On the other hand, there is nothing in the language itself to hinder our referring it to the downfall of Judaism and the Jewish people; but rather both the context and the attendant circumstances require it be understood of these events.

In further illustrating the language of our Lord as thus applied, I would remark, that “his coming,” as here foretold, includes as its object not only the overthrow of the Jewish nation, but also the

1 Ps. 147, 2. Deut 30, 3.
establishment and spread of his own spiritual kingdom upon earth. This is clearly indicated in the words of Daniel, as above cited; and also in those of Joel, as cited and applied by the apostle Peter. The latter prophecy began to have its fulfilment in the signs and wonders attendant upon our Lord's death and resurrection, and in the outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost; but it was fully accomplished only in the later catastrophe of Jerusalem and Judaism. The tenacity with which that people clung to the outward rites and ceremonies of the Mosaic dispensation, to the worship of the temple, and to their hopes of restoration and exaltation under a temporal Messiah; as also their fierce and unrelenting opposition to the claims of the lowly Jesus;—all this was the first great and prominent obstacle to the introduction and prevalence of his spiritual reign. This was at that moment the great enemy to be vanquished; and the downfall of this opposing power was to be the triumph and the establishment of the Messiah's kingdom. Both these great results, therefore, were to be accomplished by this his coming.

The destruction of Jerusalem and of the temple, although standing out as a prominent catastrophe in this great series of events, was yet not the only one, and perhaps not the most important. Through the minute and vivid description of Josephus, who was himself an actor and eye-witness in all those scenes of blood and desolation, the fall of the Holy City has been brought out before the world for all time with a distinctness and prominency, greater, perhaps, than any other like event of ancient history. Hence it has become the great central point in the later history of the Jews; and thus has overshadowed and shut out from view the slighter notics of other events, in themselves perhaps not of less moment, but which have not been recorded by the graphic pen of a native historian. In this way the overthrow of the Jewish capital and temple has come to be regarded as the final catastrophe of the nation; after which their existence and name, as a nation, were utterly blotted out. Hence the frequent application of our Lord's prediction to this event alone.

But such was not, in fact, the case. The destruction of Jerusa-

lem by Titus, although terrible, was nevertheless not total. The city slowly revived. The Jews in Palestine, though reduced completely to the condition of a Roman province, were not driven out from their own land. The chief men, indeed, were allured to Rome, or found employment elsewhere; but the merchant in his shop, and the husbandman at his plough, were not interrupted in their labours. Yet we cannot suppose that the national hatred towards the Roman yoke was laid aside. Under the reign of Trajan insurrections broke out among the Jews of Cyrenaica and Egypt, which soon were quelled. Fifty years after the ruin of Jerusalem, Adrian began to rebuild the city, in order to convert it into a heathen capital, and probably also with a view to render it a stronghold for keeping in check the national spirit of the Jewish people. This new attempt served as a spark to kindle the long smothered embers of hatred and discontent; and caused them to burst forth into a flame, which overran and consumed both the land and the people with terrible desolation. The leader was the celebrated Barcochba, "Son of a Star." His success at first was great; he soon obtained possession of Jerusalem, and of no less than fifty fortified places and one hundred and eighty-five important villages. Adrian at length awoke from his lethargy, and troops poured in upon Judea from the remotest quarters of the empire. The Jews were harassed and worn out by degrees; and the bloody tragedy was at length brought to a close at the unknown city of Bether, in the eighteenth year of Adrian, A. D. 135. Thousands and thousands of the captives were sold as slaves at the Terebinth near Hebron, at Gaza, and in Egypt. By a decree of Adrian the Jews were forbidden thenceforth even to approach the Holy City; and guards were stationed to prevent them from making the attempt. This severe decree probably included, or at least effected, the removal of the Jewish inhabitants from Judea. Two centuries later, we find Tertullian speaking of them as still deprived even of a stranger's right to set foot upon their paternal soil. It was not until the days of Constantine, in the fourth century, that they were first allowed again to approach the Holy City; and at length, to enter

Tertull. c. Jud. voe. c. 15. Apol. c. 21, "quibus [Judeis] nec adventi
rum jure terram patrin saltem vés-
tigio salutare conceditur."
it once a year, and buy the privilege of wailing over the ruins of their former sanctuary.¹

Such is an outline of the great final catastrophe of the Jewish people, as it can be collected from the few scattered notices found in ancient foreign writers. These few fragments have been collected and arranged by Munster, in a treatise translated and published in the present volume. To this the reader is referred.² Had there been a Josephus to give us a history of this war with equal completeness and graphic power,—who can say that the catastrophe, in its magnitude and its horrors, would seem to us in any degree to come short of that of Jerusalem?

After these illustrations I may sum up here in a few words the views suggested to my own mind in respect to the discourse of our Lord under consideration. In reply to the question of the four disciples: "When shall these things be?" Jesus first points out what was to happen after his departure,—the trials and dangers to which his followers would be exposed. Then comes the "abomination of desolation;" Jerusalem is "compassed by armies," and is "trodden down by the Gentiles;"—all this referring to its desolation by Titus in A.D. 70. Immediately afterwards the Lord would come and establish more fully his spiritual kingdom, by crushing in terrible destruction the last remnants of the power and name of Judaism; and this within the general limit of a generation of a hundred years from the time when he was speaking. There might, therefore, literally have been some then "standing there, who did not taste of death till they saw the Son of man [thus] coming in his kingdom." Then it was, when this first great foe of the Gospel dispensation should have been thus trampled down, that Christians were to look up. "Then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh!" The chains of religious despotism and the terrors of Jewish persecution would then be at an end forever; and the disciples of Christ, thus far disenthralled and triumphant, might rejoice in the prevalence of the Gospel of peace and love,—the coming of Christ's spiritual kingdom upon earth!

I add here a few remarks upon the remaining part of our Lord's discourse in the 24th and 25th chapters of Matthew. It is well known that commentators differ in respect to what portions of this discourse are to be referred to the destruction of Jerusalem, and what to the judgment-day; and also as to where the one topic ends and the other begins. Thus Doddridge finds the transition from the former to the latter event in Matt. 24, 36; 1 Flatt and Kuinoel place it at v. 43; 2 Eichhorn, in c. 25, 14; and others, as Wetstein, not until c. 25, 31.

All interpreters, of any name, I believe, are agreed that the vivid representation in Matt. 25, 31–46, has reference only to the day of final judgment. Perhaps an exception may be found among some in this country, who deny the doctrine of future punishment. But it cannot well be otherwise than evident to every candid mind, that if the doctrine of a future judgment-day be found at all in the New Testament, it is prominently and expressly asserted in this passage,—a day when all flesh shall rise from the dead and be gathered before the omniscient Judge; when the righteous shall be separated from the wicked; and every one be rewarded or punished, according as his works shall be. The same general view is taught also by our Lord in his exposition of the parable of the tares, and in his teaching as recorded by John. 3 It is found also in Daniel, 4 and is more fully developed in the writings of Paul and in the Apocalypse. Paul often dwells upon the mighty theme: "For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." 5 In the sublime visions of the Apocalypse, the writer "saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened; ... and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in those books, according to their works.” 6

With all these representations the language before us in c. 25, 31–46 is perfectly accordant; nor is there any thing either in the cir-
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1 Family Expos. in loc.
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cumstances or in the context, to lead us on any philological or histori
cal grounds to a different interpretation of the passage. The 46th verse of itself decides this point: "And these [the wicked] shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal." There is no possible way of evading the force of this antithetic declaration, which on the face of it relates to the eternal destiny of mortals as fixed by the judgment-day, except by denying the idea of endless duration ascribed to the word αἰώνιος, in respect both to future punishment and to future life. This is said to be done by some, who, denying the doctrine of a state of retribution in another world, refer this whole passage to the destruction of Jerusalem; and are thus ready to barter away the hope of a future life of glory, in order to get rid of the terrors of a future state of punishment. According to them, in this verse, both the condemnation and the promise have respect only to this life; and then it follows, that the life of man, or threescore years and ten, is life eternal! I am unable to see why this is not, in the strictest sense of the term, both philologically and theologically, a reductio ad absurdum.

This whole passage, then, I hold without doubt to refer to the general judgment.

Let us now go back to the preceding parable, that of the talents, in Matt. 25, 14–30. Here the awful scenes of the dread tribunal are not indeed depicted; yet the subject is the same as before, the great doctrine of final retribution. Here it is the Master who returns after a long absence; calls his servants to an account; invites those whom he finds worthy to the splendid banquet of rejoicing prepared to celebrate his return; while he casts out the unfaithful servant into outer darkness and woe. The whole description is entirely consonant to that of the judgment day which follows; and is not analogous to any representation of the New Testament having reference merely to matters of this life.

If we go back now still further to the parable of the ten virgins, Matt. 25, 1–13, we shall find, I think, that it is the great object of the parable to inculcate the same important truth, the acceptance or non-acceptance of those professing to be the followers of Christ,
according to their several characters and deserts,—their admission or non-admission to the state of future bliss in the kingdom of God, here depicted under the imagery of a marriage-festival. The same idea of future bliss to the righteous, is expressed by the same imagery in the Apocalypse: "Blessed are they which are called unto the marriage-supper of the Lamb." 

Along with this great idea, there is also strongly inculcated in this parable the necessity of a state of constant preparation, with reference to the future judgment and its dread account; since no man knoweth when the Lord will call him to enter upon this state of retribution.

Thus far, then, there seems to be no reason why the three different representations contained in c. 25 should be separated, or not all referred alike to the transactions of the last great day.

If now we look at the latter portion of the preceding chapter, c. 24, 43–51, we find it intimately connected with the parable of the ten virgins; so closely, indeed, that the idea of separating the two has apparently never occurred to any interpreter. We have here the same great lesson inculcated,—the necessity of continual watchfulness in the performance of duty, under the imagery of servants waiting for their master’s return; who then will reward the faithful, and punish the slothful and wicked. The punishment, it may here be noted, is expressed in terms similar to those employed in respect to him who hid his lord’s talent, in c. 25, 30. All this seems to furnish a sufficient ground, why we should regard this passage also as having been spoken with reference to the future judgment.

There now remains to be considered only the passage in Matt. 24, 36–42. Our Lord, after declaring that his coming to destroy the Jewish nation would take place before that generation should pass away, goes on here to say, that "of that day and hour knoweth no one, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only." This he illustrates by the example of the deluge; which, although long predicted by Noah, yet came suddenly and unexpectedly upon the men of that generation. Hence he urges upon his disciples the necessity of constant watchfulness, in order that, as Luke expresses it, "ye may be accounted worthy to escape all those

\[\text{Rev. 19, 7-9.}\]
things that shall come to pass, and to stand (i.e. be approved, not destroyed) before the Son of man."

On this passage two remarks present themselves, which go to show that it is to be connected with what precedes, rather than with what follows; and is therefore to be taken as referring to the overthrow of Jerusalem and the Jews.

First, both the grammatical and logical connexion of the language itself require it to be so referred. The very expression, "that (ἰσιερύ) day and hour," can mean nothing but the day and hour of which our Lord had been speaking, viz. that 'coming' of his which should take place before that generation should pass away. It is that coming which would be so sudden; for as yet he had here described no other, and therefore his words could apply to no other.

Secondly, it is somewhat remarkable, that throughout this whole discourse of our Lord thus far (to v. 42), from his departure out of the temple and through his whole prediction relative to his then immediate coming, the Evangelists Mark and Luke both give parallel reports, serving alike to confirm and to illustrate the language of Matthew; while at this very point (v. 42) their reports cease. All that follows in this and the next chapter is here given by Matthew alone. Mark nowhere has any thing corresponding. Luke indeed gives the subsequent charge to watch (vv. 43–51) in a different place and connexion; and also elsewhere the parable of the talents." But the parable of the ten virgins and the description of the last day, are found only in Matthew. All this goes to show, that Mark and Luke intended to report the language now under consideration as connected with what precedes; inasmuch as they give nothing further. It goes also to show, that they regarded the discourse of our Lord, up to this point, as a whole, having reference to his coming for the overthrow of Judaism; and also that the subject, which thus far was one, was here completed.

It follows, then, that our Lord, as further reported by Matthew, here takes up (with v. 43) a new topic; which thus apparently begins, as it evidently ends, with the enforcement of the duty
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of watchfulness upon all, in reference to the terms of their acceptance with God, and of their admission to the Messiah's kingdom, when he shall come to judge the world and reign in bliss and glory.

If these pages shall serve to afford light to any mind upon this difficult portion of the sacred volume, and thus aid in the exhibition and enforcement of divine truth, the aim and prayer of the writer will have been answered.

VI.

ANCIENT TEMPLE ON MOUNT LEBANON.

Described by the Rev. Eli Smith.

[The following communication was sent by the Rev. Mr. Smith, under date of Dec. 6th, 1842. In his accompanying letter he writes thus: “I have taken a little pains this summer to renew my acquaintance with the ruins of the ancient temple of Deir el-Kul‘ah, mentioned in the Biblical Researches, Vol. III. p. 441. The result of my investigations I have embodied in a paper, of which I enclose you a copy. The conjecture there hazarded has interested me a good deal; and were I sure that any form from the root قدص is to be found in any existing relics of the Phenician language, I should feel much confidence in the theory. Unfortunately, I have not access to the work of Gesenius; and cannot examine this point.” On examination, it appears that no such form is extant in connexion with the Phenician or Hebrew language.

About the same time, a description of the same ruins and a copy of the inscriptions were forwarded to Berlin by Mr. Wildenbruch, Prussian Consul General in Beirut, who made this and several other excursions in company with Mr. Smith. His description was communicated to the Geographical Society of Berlin; and afterwards printed in their Monthly Report for Jan. 1843, p. 144 sq. Slight variations are perceived in the inscriptions as there given; arising apparently from a want of distinctness in the manuscript. It is understood that they will be inserted and explained in one of the next numbers of Boeckh’s Corpus Inscriptionum.

—Ed.]