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[1]. **THE WOMAN AND THE DRAGON.**

**HEPTAD XVII:** xii.

**Introductory remarks.**

D. I: xii; 1-2. **A GREAT SIGN.**

A sign = a symbol: why stated.

- In the heaven: why. — A woman: emblematic and symbolical significations. Three examples: the matron, the whore, the bride: significations. — Hermas q. — Precedents. — The sun = the Messiah. — Clothed with: significations. — The moon, &c.: meanings. — A crown, &c.: not a diadem: significations. — 12 stars: indicates the mother-Church. — Being with child: period of gestation does not come in question: significations: era indicated: precedents. | 2 |

D. II: v. 8-14. **ANOTHER SIGN.**

A dragon. — The crocodile the prototype: precedents. Symbol of a rapacious heathen power: specially of the military power actuated by Satan. — Red = bloodthirsty: indicates Rome: ref. to Eusebius, Socrates, and Prudentius. — 7 heads = 7 Caesars. — 10 horns = 10 Caesars. — Allocation of the horns no part of the symbolization. — 7 diadems: an emblem of arbitrary power. — His tail, &c.: significations. — Application. | 6 |

D. III: v. 5-6. **BIRTH OF CHILD, ETC.**


'Son of man' and 'Son of woman.' — Enoch, Sib. Or., &c.: To tend, &c.: The nations = the heathen. Ps. lii: 7. — Test. XII. Patr.: To God. The ascension not symb.: Sentiment. — The woman escaped. This flight not identical with that of v. 14. — Into the desert: not a desert, as in xvii; 8: significations. — 1260 d. = 3½ yrs.: two significations. — Application. | 12 |

D. IV: v. 7-9. **THE WAR.**

In the heavens: which: not the air. — Michael = Jesus. Precedents. Hermas: Enoch: Nicodemus: &c.: Es. — The dragon = the Sammael of As. Es. and the Rabbins. — He was cast, &c.: significations. — Application to Christ's history. | 16 |

INTERLUDE.


D. V: v. 13-14. **SERPENT'S PURSUIT.**

The earth = the Holy land. — The two wings: significations. — Wordsworth refuted. — Fly: indications that this is not the flight of v. 6. — The 3½ times. — Application to A.D. 37 B.C., | 25 |

D. VI: v. 15-16. **THE WOMAN SAVED.**

Water, &c.: significations. — Application to A.D. 43 A.D., | 28 |

D. VII: v. 17. **WAR ON WOMAN'S SEED.**

To make war: a technical phrase. — Stuart's view. — Application to A.D. 64 A.D., | 38 |

Synoptical interpret. of H. XVII, | 39 |

Interpret. of Woman and Dragon, | 41 |

The seer's time present attained. Non-inspiration scheme thereof, | 42 |
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ii]. The Two Beasts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEPTAD XVIII: xiii.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introductory remarks.—Leading general reasons for believing pagan Rome to be had in view. —Hengstenberg's argument against the beast's heads meaning seven Caesars, 44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. I: xiii; 1–2. 1st BEAST'S DESCRIPTION. I or he stood? authorities, and other considerations.—The sea. Elliott refuted.—A wild beast: signification in the abstract: individualization. Precedent in Dan. vii. This not identical with Daniel's fourth. Antipathy to an autocracy accounts for stigmatising as a beast. —The sea = heathendom in general, the territory of the dominant power in particular.—Coming up indicates the epoch.—Horns, heads, and diadems, as the dragon's. —Names of enigma: the signification and application. Verying q.—Like a panther, &amp;c.: emblematic significations.—The dragon gave, &amp;c.: how. Succession of beast to dragon not implied.—Application to the Caesars, 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. II: v. 3. THE SLAIN HEAD. Ve. 2 parenthetical.—As it were &amp;c.: not merely wounded, but slain.—One of: which? Not the first, as Berthold says; nor the fifth, as Stuart; nor the sixth, as Hengstenberg; nor the seventh, as Elliott; but the fourth. Historical application, 56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. IV: v. 5–8. PERSECUTING HEAD. v. 5. There was given: by whom? —A mouth, &amp;c.: difficulties. Precedent in Dan. vii; 8, but no identity. By Newton refuted. Applicability to Nero.—To make: different views of the construction.—42 months: applicability to Nero's persecution. The five examples of the half-week of fatality shown to have different applications, 68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 6. To blaspheme. N. T. illustrations.—His tabernacle: applicability to Nero's history, 67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 7. It was given, &amp;c.: genuineness of clause: the construction. Distinct references.—The saints = the Jews. Stages of rejection of Jewish Church. Different relative views of the Jews, 69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 8. Will worship: the sense.—He whose name: new and difficult reading.—The roll of life: Stuart and Hengstenberg q.—Slain from: the ancient construction not to be rejected, 72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General purport of this Division, 75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 9–10. Regression: how to be accounted for.—Formula to call attention. —Allusions to Nero's history?—Purport of Interlude, 75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. V: v. 11–12. THE SECOND BEAST. v. 11. Another beast. Interpretations of Faber, Stuart, and Elliott; no evidence for. The dragon and the three beasts are generically identical, specifically diverse. This beast, in particular, does not symbolize an ecclesiastical power. The true signification. The two beasts of this heptad are consecutive.—Coming up: indicates the epoch.—Out of—The earth = the Holy land: additional proof: applicability.—Two horns = two Caesars: applicability.—Like a lamb.—Elliott's, Wordsworth's, and Bengel's interpretations refuted.—Spake as a dragon. Stuart's and Elliott's constructions refuted, 78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 12. The power of the first he exercised before [i.e. as overseen by] him: a blunder of Keith's.—Application and individualisation.—To worship: in a civil or a theological sense? 85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General purport of this Division, 87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. VI: v. 13–14. 2D BEAST'S SIGNS. v. 18. SIGNS: the signification. —Fire: symbolical. —Applicability to A.D. 67 as: Josephus and Tacitus q., 87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 14. He deceiveth, &amp;c.: Applicat-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Page</td>
</tr>
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<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bol of vie; 3? Hengstenberg refuted.—The name, &amp;c.: what:</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 2. A voice, &amp;c. of the 144000.—</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel passages.—Signification,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 8. As it were, V. R.—A new song: its purport: None could learn, &amp;c.: why.—Bought: the precise meaning,</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 4. Not defiled, &amp;c. Is the literal the true sense?—No ground here for accounting cullaby the highest state.—Who follow, &amp;c.: refers not to duty and to a past state, but to a privilege and a special honour.—Bought from the men = delivered from those, ‘who were destroying the earth’ (=Judea).—A first-fruits: with reference to those, who shall come after them: texts.—The result,</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 5. No lie = have not denied the truth,</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. I: xiv; 6-7. THE FIRST ANGEL.</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An esoteric = good news respecting the coming age.—Those seated, &amp;c. = enemies of Christianity in Judea.—Over,</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 7. Fear God, &amp;c.: antithetic.—The hour of His judging synchronizes with the marriage of the lamb.’—Worship, &amp;c.: perplexes antipapistis,</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical fulfilment,</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. II: v. 8. THE SECOND ANGEL.</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fallen, &amp;c.: Babylon: what meant,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—Rome, pagan, not papal. —Mysteries connected with Rome: Sib. Or. Bk. VIII. —From the wine: meaning. —Of her fornication. Stuart and Hengstenberg at issue,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General purport of this proclamation,</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. III: v. 9-11. THIRD ANGEL.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If any one, &amp;c.: solutions,</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General purport of proclamation,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlude: the time present.</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Labour = sufferings. — For their works, &c.: the purport, | Page | 144000 : only one song. — V. R.—Test. XII Par. q. — The tabernacle, &c.: the depository of the saints' testimony. — Crouched in a stone : the signification. — One of the creatures: why. — Seven libation-bowls: to appease the manes. — With smoke = God's presence. — None could enter, i.e., to make intercession: realization of seal-pretense: why; 2-6. Züllig q.—xvi. 1. Mandate from God.—Four out: so in precedents, | Page |
| Remarks on four last angels. | 155 | 160 | 67-70. | 196 |
| D. IV: v. 14. FOURTH ANGEL. On a white horse: — Thy name is the word of God, from the earth. | 160 | D. I: vii. 2. THE FIRST BOWL. The earth = the Holy land.—A bowl: Ex. xi: 10.—Application, 197 |
| D. VI: v. 17. THE SIXTH ANGEL. From the temple in heaven: why, 164 | | INTERLUDE. | |
| As far as the horses' bridles: those of xix: 14.—1800: number of xix: 14.—1800: different estimates of: a symbolical number, 166 | 174 | D. V: v. 10-11. THE FIFTH BOWL. On the throne of the beast: at Rome.—Application.—Virtual identity of 4th and 6th bowls, 205 |
| Results: a slaughter in Judea, 175 | | D. VI: v. 12-16. SIXTH BOWL. v. 12. The river = the chief source of prosperity, or the country itself. — Euphrates = the power of Rome.—Consummation at the hour, d., m., y., of ix: 16. — Its waters were dried up: this the plague: how: application. — The kings from the east: who = erroneousness of the many solutions.—Connection of vv. 12 and 16, 208 |
| Summary of the Prelude, | 177 | | |
| Synoptical interp. of H. XIX, | 178 | EPISODE. | |
| Interp. of the judgment-angels, | 180 | vv. 13-14. The false prophet: ap- | |
The three spirits: their procession from three hypotheses: application.

Prop: wrong designation by Elliott: point of the symbolism; ref.
to Horace, &c.: application.

Spirits of demons. The connection: three hypotheses.

Dying signs: their nature.

The kings: rulers in general. Identity with kings from the east, &c.:
of Stuart, Ewald, Bengal. Different designations of the Flavian
dynasty.—To gather: parallelism with xix; 11fs.—The war: the
duration denoted.—The great day: the significance. Relation
of xv. 13–14 to that context. 214

Interlude: the time present.

v. 15. General remarks.—Walk naked = the guilt; see his shame
= the punishment. Similarity to iii; 18. Nakedness is con-
ected with idolatry. A. Clarke and Stuart q., . 227

v. 16. Connexion with preceding context.—Table of the bowls,
and their effects.—Harmon
don: Meanings given to the
name. Why a mountain made
the scene. Views of Vitringa,
Bengal, and Hengstenberg. 230

D. VII: v. 17–21. SEVENTH BOWL.
On the air = Satan’s sphere of action.—From the temple = in
vindication of Christianity.—It is done: the no plus ultra of
donunciation.—Parallel points.

The Babylon city = not Babylon,
but Jerusalem. Three parts: makes up four theses; com-
plete dissolution.—The cup: parallelisms.—Hall: the cli-
max.—Bengal’s solution question-
able.—They blasphemed: an
ascending series in v. 9, 11, 21. This the finishing stroke.

—Perpetual of 7th bowl.—Fulfil-
ment.—Stuart, Hengstenberg,
and Browne q., . 237

Summary of the Prelude. 248

Synoptical interpretation of H. XX, 249

Interpretations of the plague-angels. 261

[v]. THE WHORE ON THE BEAST.
HEPTAD XXI; xvii.

Introductory remarks, . 258

D. I: v. 1–5. THE GREAT WHOSE.

One of the seven: marks a connec-
tion with the plague-angels.

Show: an explanation of,
rather than exhibition by sym-
bol.—The judgment, &c.: the
woman the principal symbol.

Pornotreus: implies lust, co-
vetsousness, and ambition. The
first denotes unlawful com-
merce with false gods.—Argument of Wordsworth and others
answered. — The argument
from the absence of the term
adulterous strong, though not
conclusive. —Who sitteth—ru-
leth.—Have fornicated: avarice
and ambition the salient ideas
here.—Intoxicated. Stuart’s in-
terpretation questioned. —Is
spirit.—Into a desert not the
desert.—To sit upon: different
views that may be taken. The
antipapistical interpretation of
Wordsworth and others incon-
gruous.—A beast. This not
identical with the one from the
sea.—No diadems: indicates
Rome in her civic and repub-
liean aspect: is inconsistent
with antipapistical theory.

Gilded, &c. Parallelisms with
the New Jerusalem. Words-
worth’s literalizing.—Cup: idolatry indicated. —Armis-
ing, &c.: the construction: a
political and a religious aspect.

—Mystery: the construction:
a secret meaning: how the
whore was a mystery.—Mother,
&c.: the meaning: application
to Rome. 254

D. II: v. 6. THE WOMAN’S ACTS.

Intoxicated.—With the blood, &c.: two classes, Jews and Chris-
tians.—I wondered, &c. The
argument, that pagan Rome
would have caused no wonder,
answered: turned on those who
use it. 273

D. III. THE BEAST AS A WHOLE.

The Mystery: the third: Heng-
stenberg’s erroneous inference.

—Woe, &c. A multum in
parvo history from the seer’s
present. The precise time,
that the work was written.
The interpretation. Stuart’s
explanation refuted. — Paral-
lelisms with xiii, 8, 8, . 275
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<th>Page</th>
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</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. II: v. 9-10. THE FIRST LAMENT.</td>
<td>D. II: v. 9-10. THE FIRST LAMENT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Her burning. Tacitus q.</td>
<td>Her burning. Tacitus q.</td>
</tr>
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<td>D. III: v. 11-18. SECOND LAMENT.</td>
<td>D. III: v. 11-18. SECOND LAMENT.</td>
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<td>Precedents; miscel. comments.</td>
<td>Precedents; miscel. comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous remarks.</td>
<td>Miscellaneous remarks.</td>
</tr>
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<td>D. V: v. 20. CALL TO GOD'S PEOPLE:</td>
<td>D. V: v. 20. CALL TO GOD'S PEOPLE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the time present. Mis. remarks.</td>
<td>the time present. Mis. remarks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECLARATION.</td>
<td>DECLARATION.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precedents and remarks.</td>
<td>Precedents and remarks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The speaker: who: seven</td>
<td>The speaker: who: seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>changes. Mt. xxiii; 29-39</td>
<td>changes. Mt. xxiii; 29-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q.: Antipapistical theory refuted.</td>
<td>q.: Antipapistical theory refuted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symptepical interp. of H. XXI.</td>
<td>Symptepical interp. of H. XXI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpret. of the whore's judgment.</td>
<td>Interpret. of the whore's judgment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[vii]. THE GREAT SORROW OF GOD.</td>
<td>[vii]. THE GREAT SORROW OF GOD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEPTAD XXIII: xix.</td>
<td>HEPTAD XXIII: xix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introductory remarks. Relation</td>
<td>Introductory remarks. Relation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of this to preceding heptads.</td>
<td>of this to preceding heptads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEPTADAL PRELUDE.</td>
<td>HEPTADAL PRELUDE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introductory remarks.</td>
<td>Introductory remarks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marriage of the lamb: = Christ's taking his new Church into</td>
<td>marriage of the lamb: = Christ's taking his new Church into</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>union with himself, in place</td>
<td>union with himself, in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the old. — His wife hath prepared herself: how: xxi; 2 cpd.</td>
<td>of the old. — His wife hath prepared herself: how: xxi; 2 cpd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— The distinction between the</td>
<td>— The distinction between the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| marriage and the marriage sup- | marriage and the marriage sup-
| per. — Hermes q. — It was given: | per. — Hermes q. — It was given: |
| by whom: who the speaker. | by whom: who the speaker. |
| — The righteousness: imparted, | — The righteousness: imparted, |
| not imputed. | not imputed. |
| HEPTAD XXIII: xviii. | HEPTAD XXIII: xviii. |
| Introductory remarks. Relation | Introductory remarks. Relation |
| of this to the preceding heptad, 320 | of this to the preceding heptad, 320 |
| HEPTADAL PRELUDE. | HEPTADAL PRELUDE. |
| v. 1-8. The angel: — Fallen is | v. 1-8. The angel: — Fallen is |
| Babylon: indicates synchronism | Babylon: indicates synchronism |
| with xvi; 19. — And it be- | with xvi; 19. — And it be-
| comes, q.: Notions about de- | comes, q.: Notions about de-
| mons. | mons. |
| THE HEPTAD-PROPER. | THE HEPTAD-PROPER. |
| Introductory remarks. | Introductory remarks. |
| D. I: v. 4-8. CALL TO GOD'S PEOPLE. | D. I: v. 4-8. CALL TO GOD'S PEOPLE. |
| Mantuanus q.: Miscellaneous | Mantuanus q.: Miscellaneous |
| remarks. | remarks. |
THE HEPTAD-PROPER.

The supper—war of Haremgodon: heathens the victims. 369

D. I: v. 11-13. CHRIST'S ADVENT.

The heaven opened—a new Dispensation.—A white horse, etc.—Christ: cp. vi; 2.—In righteousness, etc.: pregnant meaning.—Many diadems: cpn. with dragon and beast.—Clothed with, etc.: synchronism with xiv; 20.—The Word: looks forward to the war. 360

D. II: 14. CHRIST'S ATTENDANTS.
The armies: parallelsims. 364

D. III: 15-16. CHRIST'S TERRIBLENESS.
The sword, etc.: significations.—The nations: the heathen.—Will tread, etc.: identifies with the man-child.—Cpn. with vii; 17.—The time future.—His treadeth, etc.: parallel with xiv; 19.—A name, etc.: this the name.—On his thigh: the significations. Herodotus q.—King of kings: Diodorus Siculus q. 365

General Remarks on first three Divisions. The time and manner of the advent: began a.d. 70: in providence. 368

D. IV: v. 17-18. BIRDS SUMMONED.
Standing in the sun: the significations.—He cried. Ezo. xxix; 4 sq. q. Syn. Soher q. 370


D. V: v. 19. THE BEAST'S FORCES.
The beast: the first.—The kings, etc.: the beast from the earth. —His or their? 372

D. VI: v. 20. THE BEAST'S SEQUEL.
The false prophet = 'the kings of the earth.'—Cp. xiii; 18 sq. 373

Alive.—Dan. ii; 88 cpd., 375

General Remarks on last four Divisions. 376

Summary of Preludes and Interlude. 378

Synoptical interpr. of H. XXXIII, 379

Interpretations of the great supper. 381

Review of 1st Trumpet from xi; 15, 381

[iii] and [c]. THE MILLENNIUM.

HEPTAD XXIV: xx: 1-10.

Introductory remarks. Seven important points to be considered.

—The commencing epochs of the millennial period of the 7th Seal: must begin from terminal dates of 7th Trumpet. 388

D. I: v. 1. DESCENT OF AN ANGEL.
Angel on Jesus.—Cpm. an inscription of a progressive work.—A chain: part of the machinery only. 386

D. II: v. 2-3. BINDING OF DRAGON.
Parallelsim with xii: 9.—The dragon, etc.: significations of the four appellations.—And bound him. Nature of the binding must be appropriate to the thing signified, and correlative to the loosing in xii: 9: a withdrawal of Satan's liberty to possess men, and to stir up persecution. Wymys and Wordsworth q.—Satan's three downsfall.—1000 years: not symbolical: not indefinite.—Cast him, etc.: restraint put on Satan comparative, not complete.—Not deceive ANY MORE. Hence the meaning is to be learnt from the previous descriptions of his deceiving. These indicate deluding the heathen into enticing or convincing the Lord's people to swerve from their allegiance. —Loosed. 387

D. III: v. 4-5. 1ST RESURRECTION, &c.
V. 4, vv. 4-6 not an Interlude.
—Thrones implies kingly judges.—I behold: where? not on the earth, but in the heaven. Hence the millennial reign must be in heaven. They were seated. Who? The expression not indefinite. Not 'the 24 elders': nor 'the saints': nor 'angels': nor 'the presence-angels': but Jesus and 'his martyrs.' The construction. —Judgment was given: to, on, or by them? Ana. “Power of passing sentence was given.” Who receive the sentence? Not the martyrs, but the confessors. Hermas q.—The souls. Not "the murdered souls," but a symbol of martyrs. Stuart's arguments examined. Inferences.—Beheaded. An indication of martyrs under pagan Rome.—They who worshipped...
not, &c. No distinction can be made into classes. Refers to the 144000, &c. This an independent sentence. — Both lived. Not "lived again," but rose to a higher life. — And were admitted to the highest honours of the celestial state, 394

v. 5. The rest. Who? Not "the godless dead," but the righteous, who had not been confessors. — Until implies their resurrection at the end of the 1000 years. — This is the first resurrection. The meaning expressed fully. The doctrine: — a translation of confessors of Christ under the beast from hades to heaven 1000 years before the main body of the righteous. Proofs: I. from the Apoc. II. from the N. T. at large. III. An objection considered. — A paraphrase of this Division, 408

D. IV: v. 6. AN INTERLUDE. Blessed and holy; in a high sense. This shall be, &c. Congruity with Rev. 6: v. 10, 417

INTERPRETATIONS OF FIRST RESURRECTION AND MILLENNIAL REIGN. Six theories and their history briefly stated. — 1. Premillenarians' theory of a corporal resurrection, and reign with Christ on earth. Arguments in refutation: Stuart's and Hengstenberg's: 17 advanced by Brown and other Postmillenarians. — 2-4. Three theories based, more or less, on the figurative hypothesis. Postmillenarians' theory of a reign of principles. 24 arguments in refutation: 4 others advanced by Birk and other Premillenarians. Wordsworth's argument in support of his views refuted. — 5. Stuart's theory of a reign in heaven. — 6. Hengstenberg's theory of a first stage of bliss in heaven, the second and higher stage being on earth. This view refuted. — Summary interpretation of the millenial passage. Objections answered from Hengstenberg, 420

D. V: v. 7-8. RESULTS OF LOOSING. S. shall be loosed: correlatively to his binding. Stuart's and Hengstenberg's views. — Out of his prison: what place intended. — The four corners, &c. The notions of the Easterns respecting the country of Yahweh and Majoof. — Gog, &c. Their history sketched, 435


D. VII: v. 10. SATAN'S FINAL DOOM. Termination of attacks on Christendom, 443

Synoptical interprets of H. XXIV, 448

An objection to the chronological adjustments answered, 446

Historical application. 1. The unimpeded growth of the Church to A.D. 1070. 2. The invasions of Christendom by the Seljukian Turks circa A.D. 1070, and by the Ottomans circa A.D. 1476: applicability of the designation Gog and Magog: epoch and durations. Summary, 447
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EXPOSITION OF THE APOCALYPSE.

HEPTADS XVII-XXIII.

THE FINAL SEPTENARY OF SEPTENARY OF JUDGMENTS, being as seven blasts of the seventh trumpet of the seventh seal: Chs. xii-xix. A.D. 1 to 70.

General remarks. In my sketch of the symbolic system (Vol. I: p. 15), I have shown that the allies of Satan, who are league together in hostility to Christ and his Church, are these seven:—(1). The dragon: (2). The beast from the sea: (3). The beast from the earth: (4). The beast from the abyss: (5). The whore: (6). The false prophet: (7). Death and hades. These (in contrast with the glorious matron, who represents the Church of God) form the principal figures in the tableau, which will be brought before us in the seven lines of details, which we have now to consider, namely: (1). The woman and the dragon, xii: (2). The two beasts, xiii: (3). The seven angels of judgments, xiv: (4). The seven angels of the last plagues, xv-xvi: (5). The whore and the beast, xvii: (6). Dirge on Babylon, xviii: (7). The great supper of God, xix. These seven series will, as we proceed, be proved by their internal correspondencies, as well as by their general purport, to be more or less chronologically parallel. They occupy the space between A.D. 1 and 70, reckoning (as before) the former date to be the epoch of Christ's birth; and this in conformity with the original reckoning, which started from that event as its era.

These seven blasts (so to speak) of the seventh trumpet correspond to the seven perambulations of Jericho by the Israelites, just as the seven trumpets do to the seven days' encompassings. But the more immediate precedent is to be found in Daniel's prophecies, which (as I have shown in Vol. I: p. 305) are arranged in seven more or less parallel

VOL. II.
Visions or symbolizations. We may note too here, that, during the feast of Tabernacles the Jews, for seven days in succession, were accustomed to go in procession to the temple, bearing palm branches and blowing trumpets; and on the seventh day to encompass the altar seven times, blowing their trumpets and chanting Hosannas. And we may also observe, that there was a correspondence to the seals, trumpets, and seven blasts of the seventh trumpet (in respect of the numerals, and of the threefold progressive diminution) in the sabbatical period, in which each seventh year, seventh month, and seventh day was holy:—at least, so the Rabbins say in respect of the second, in accounting for the feast of Trumpets being kept on its first day. See also 4 Ezra (Vol. I. p. 233).

With regard to the extent of retrogression, which I recognize in making these seven series to be partially synchronous, it is not greater than is to be found in every history, nor than is unavoidable in cases, in which synchronizing events, relating to different parties or occurring in different localities, have to be traced connectedly, or in which it is desired to present the same events under different aspects. Hence, this systematic retrogression in a limited and defined period is a totally different thing to that assumed by those expositors, who arbitrarily select portions here and there, and attribute to them retrogressions to the extent of many centuries, just as may happen to suit the fancy or the scheme of each: nor can any comparison be fairly made between the two cases. Thus Hengstenberg, for example, denies that the Revelation gives a progressive disclosure of the future; and asserts, that on the contrary it consists of a number of separate groups, each complete in itself, and synchronizing with the rest throughout the ages of the Christian Dispensation.


Introductory remarks. The principle of individualization will be found to hold good here, as in the case of the two testifiers. The virgin Mary and the 'holy child Jesus' on the one hand, and Satan on the other, are personifications, types, or representatives respectively of the Church of the Law, the Church of the Gospel, and the military power of imperial Rome.


XII; 1, 2. 777–782. And there appeared a great sign in the heaven, a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and on her
head a crown of twelve stars: and, being with child, she crieth out, struggling in her labour-pains, and agonizing herself to bring forth.

777. Not a “wonder” merely (as the A.V. and Stuart have it) is meant. For in that case the word would have been ῥέσις, whereas it is σημεῖον, a sign; yet not ‘a sign’ in the ordinary sense of a miraculous attestation, but in that of a symbol: though to be a σημεῖον, it must be a ῥέσις. Yet, why (it may be asked), when we have been contemplating symbols all through the Vision, should this one in particular be prominently brought to view, as being such? I answer; To distinguish it as a “great” symbol, on account of the pre-eminent importance of the thing symbolized by it, and to indicate a parallelism with two other similarly designated symbols: see ve. 3 and 16; 1.—Why, again, is the scene laid in the heaven? I might answer; To indicate the heavenly origin of the thing signified, and consequently of that which is born of it; or otherwise to intimate, that that which is about to be born has not at this epoch come on earth: but I am more inclined to think, that in this instance the locality is only a part of the machinery (so to speak) of the scene, the heaven having been selected to allow of the subsequent exaltations and degradations being symbolized.

778. A woman, as being appropriately emblematical of reproduciveness, is a suitable symbol of a corporate body, and has accordingly been commonly used as such. As Eve was ‘the mother of all living,’ so a female figure, specialized by subordinate symbols, would be the most fitting representative of a society or family, of which she might be regarded as the parent.—In the Apocalypse we have three examples of such a use (see Vol. I. p. 16). 1. This, the gloriously adorned and holy matron represents generically the Church of God of all time,—‘the Jerusalem above, which is the mother of all,’ Jews and Christians alike, but is specialized to denote the Church of the Law. 2. The bedizened and “great whore,” called Babylon, as the ‘harlot-mother of fornicators’ (that is, idolaters), represents “Satan’s synagogue” of heathens, specially those of Rome. 3. “The bride” in white, called New Jerusalem, who has been ‘espoused to one husband,’ and is about to be presented ‘as a chaste virgin to Christ,’ is the Church of Christ. The first and second are in some respects contrasted, e.g., inasmuch as the matron is the mother of all ‘the children of God,’ but the whore of the ‘children of the wicked one.’ But the contrast is more especially drawn (as will be seen in the sequel) between the polluted harlot and the pure bride. The matron and the bride are companion pictures. The woman of this passage, as representing the Church of God of all time, includes the following divisions. 1. The antepatriarchal Church, which began at the Creation. 2. The patriarchal, from Abraham. 3. The Legal, from Moses. 4. The Evangelic, from
the birth of Christ. To describe her as being exclusively the Jewish Church is, therefore, scarcely correct; although it is true, that she appears here (as will presently be seen, and as the contrast of the matron with the bride shows), as being at the epoch of her appearance under that division.—The same view is taken in Hermas (A.D. 100–150). In Vis. I an aged woman appears to him, adorned with splendid vestments. He is told, that this is the Church, and that she appears old; because the Church was constituted before the beginning of the world. Again, in Vis. IV he sees a huge monster, like a whale (more probably a crocodile or dragon is meant). Passing the monster, a virgin, ‘adorned as if she had just come out of her bride-chamber,’ meets him. This is the Church of Christ. Similarly, in 4 Ezra 9; 27 ss., the Church, in its two divisions of the Law and the Gospel, is represented by a woman and her son (see Vol. I. p. 231). Victorinus too (303), and Augustine (410) substantially concur in the above interpretation of the woman.—As precedents for such a symbolization we may refer to Eze. 23; 4; ‘Aholah is Samaria, Aholibah Jerusalem;’ to the many places in which a country is described by such a periphrasis as ‘daughter of Zion,’ ‘of Judah,’ ‘of Jerusalem,’ ‘of Tyre,’ ‘of Babylon,’ ‘of Edom,’ ‘of Egypt,’ &c., or its people by that of ‘children of Jerusalem,’ ‘of Zion,’ &c. But the special prototypes are Is. 66; 8; ‘As soon as Zion travailed she brought forth children,’ and Mi. 4; 10; ‘Be in pain and labour to bring forth, O daughter of Zion, like a woman in travail.’—While to me it appears quite clear, that the woman here is a symbol of the Church of God in its Legal stage, the details that follow make it almost equally certain, that the virgin Mary and her history have been made a model for the symbolizations. This will appear as we proceed.—Clothed with the sun. The fundamental passage for the details is Ca. 6; 10; ‘Who is she, that looketh forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun,’ &c.? The Mediator of the covenants, the great head of the Church who is ‘the sun of righteousness’ (Mal. 4; 2), appeared at the first (1; 16: cp. Mt. 17; 2) with a ‘countenance, like the sun shining in his full strength.’ So, also, he appeared at the announcement of the new Covenant (10; 1). And at the last (19; 17) he will be seen again as an angel standing in the sun. “In the Jewish writings we often find this title applied to the Messiah. Thus in Rabbeth fol. 149; "They said unto him; No, unless when the sun shall come, i.e., the Messiah, as it is written; 'And to you who fear my name shall the sun of righteousness arise.'" And Raschi on Is. 24; 15, where he says; "Jonathan interprets it, when light shall come to the just,—this is said of the two lights of deliverance from Babylonish and Roman captivity, i.e., the Messiah, whom they feigned to themselves to be such a deliverer."—To be clothed with the sun, then, is tanta-
mount to having ‘put on Christ’ (Ro. 13; 14) and his righteousness, that is, ‘the righteousness of God which is by faith in him’ as it is ‘revealed in his Gospel,’ and ‘which is unto and upon all them that believe,’ and through being clothed in which, ‘the righteous,’ like their Saviour, ‘shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.’ More specifically, this item, in its connexion with the woman, must stand here for the Gospel.

779. And the moon under her feet. As contrasted with the Saviour and his imputed righteousness, the moon would represent the Spirit and his sanctifying grace, which may have been represented as being under the woman’s feet, because imparted righteousness is the consequence and reflection of imputed righteousness. But I rather incline to think, that the contrast is intended to lie between ‘the righteousness revealed in the gospel,’ and ‘the righteousness which is of the law,’ in which case the moon would represent the latter. However, both views are compatible, and may be held together. The Jewish Church, it may further be observed, stood in the same relation to the evangelic as the moon does to the sun, that is, all its light was derived and reflected from the sun of the latter. And inasmuch as henceforth the former would be as a thing ‘waxing old, and ready to vanish away,’ while the latter would from this epoch shine forth as in the full glory of the midday sun, this might well have for its emblem an encircling and irradiating sun, while that has a moon trampled under foot. Again, the Jewish system of types and shadows is the faint foreshowing of the realities brought to view by the Gospel. And inasmuch as, according to the view which the Jews took of their order, the night precedes the day, the moon would thus, as the feeble light and the first in point of time, aptly represent the Jewish system, and the sun, as the stronger and that which comes subsequently, the Evangelic. Thus, under different aspects, the Law and the Gospel may be symbolized. Some, however, think that the Church is represented as radiant with all the glory of God, and having all sublunar things put in subjection under her feet: or, that the Church will give light to the world as long as the sun and moon endure.

780. On her head a crown of twelve stars. Observe, that she wears not the regal diadem, but the victor’s crown, indicating that the real members of the Church are those who have come off victorious in the conflict with Satan.—Stars denote rulers, in which designation would be included patriarchs or heads of tribes.—The number twelve directs our thoughts at once to the twelve stars of Joseph’s dream; and in it we may doubtless see the precedent. I say ‘the twelve stars’ advisedly; for it is obvious, that Joseph was the twelfth, and strange is it, therefore, that Stuart should have objected, that there were ‘only eleven stars.’ Those twelve stars symbolized the twelve patriarchs:
and these are the representatives of 'the children of Israel' or of their national polity. Twenty-four, answering to the number of the patriarchs and apostles combined, would be required (as may be seen in the instance of the 24 elders) to symbolize the two divisions, of which the Church of God is composed.—I say two; for the two previous to the Law properly so called are included under its designation in a wider sense. Seeing then, that there are here only twelve stars, and having the precedent in view, we may surely conclude, that the object of this emblem is to specialize the symbol, so as to make it represent in particular the elder or mother Church.

XII.; 2. 781. Being with child. Some expositors have introduced the period of the woman's gestation into the symbolization. They have then converted it into years on the year-day theory; and next have devised an historical period to suit it, as might best accord with their schemes. But all this is purely gratuitous. Nothing more than the act of travelling comes into the symbolization; nor could have been intended to do so, for this act is the starting-point of the symbolic scene. It is quite unwarrantable (as I have more than once had occasion to notice) to introduce into the Vision anything, that the seer has not introduced, and the doing so has been prompted by the belief, that it might be made a strong point in the expositor's scheme. But so far is this from being the case, that a weighty argument may be drawn from such an instance against the system of interpretation which has produced it. If an historical realization can thus be found for a symbolization, which has no existence in the Vision, not only may anything be made out of anything, but anything may be made out of nothing, on this system of interpretation!

She crieth out. The strong emphasis laid on the woman's sufferings may be thought to point to the anguish, which the elder Church might poetically be supposed to feel in giving birth to a child, which was destined to supplant herself: but, on the contrary, some have supposed the earnest desire of the Jewish Church for the Messiah to be symbolized. The woman's sufferings form, also, an apt emblem of the difficulties and struggles, which would attend the bringing of the infant Church of Christ into the world. Ga. 4; 19 sanctions this signification; "My little children, of whom I travail in birth again, until Christ be formed in you." Cp. John 16; 21, 22; "A woman, when she is in travail, &c.;" and also Mt. 24; 8; 1 Th. 5; 3.

782. Travailing, &c. The circumstance of her giving birth to a child conclusively decides, that the woman is to be regarded as specially representative of the mother-church. And her being first seen in the very act of doing so fixes the era of this symbolization at the birth of Christ; for the Jewish division of the Church of God brought forth the Church of Christ in bringing forth its founder.—The prece-
The woman and dragon.

dents of the travelling have been cited on 778. To these others may be added, in which also the figure is used in respect of the Jewish Church: e.g., Je. 4: 31; "I have heard a voice as of a woman in travail, . . . the voice of the daughter of Sion:" Mi. 5: 2-3; "Thou Bethlehem . . . out of thee shall he come forth, that is to be a ruler in Israel, . . . until the time, that she which travaileth hath brought forth:" also Is. 26: 17; Je. 13: 21: 30; 6. How it is possible with these precedents in view, and taking into account the plain allusions to Christ's early history, to deny, that the woman in travail here symbolizes Judaism, as about to become the parent of Christianity, I cannot imagine. This truth might be learned even from the Rabbins, who in Sohar Ez., commenting on Ex. 21: 22, interpret the 'woman with child' to mean the Israelitish Church, and 'the woman's husband' to mean God.

DIV. 2. THE SIGN OF THE GREAT RED DRAGON: Satan acting by the military power of Rome.

XII.; 3-4. 783-791. And there appeared another sign in the heaven. And lo! a great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns; and upon his heads seven diadems. And his tail dreweth the third of the stars of the heaven, and did cast them unto the earth. And the dragon stood before the woman, who was about to bring forth, that, when she should bring forth, he might devour her offspring.

783. Another sign, but not a 'great' one, as the two others are; because this does not, like those, represent something preeminent for excellence. In the heaven Satan appeared in Job 1: 6: but this place has probably not been taken as a precedent here; because the dragon must necessarily be placed in the region where the woman was, in order to allow of the symbolization of his attempt to destroy her offspring at its birth.

784. A dragon. The crocodile is doubtless the original of this symbol. The precedents for making that creature a symbol of a cruel persecuting power are very numerous. I will first cite some passages, which show the character attributed to the animal itself. Job 7: 12: "Am I a crocodile, that thou settest a watch over me?" C. 3: 8: "Let them execrate it, who curse the (natal) day of those, who are about to rouse up the crocodile." In Job 41 the terrible character of this "leviathan" is described at length. Is. 13: 22; (speaking of Babylon) "the wild beasts shall cry in the desolate houses, and dragons in the pleasant palaces:" see also 34; 13: 35; 7. "Lucian, Philo, and Horapollo represent the crocodile to have been the emblem of craft, malice, and impudence: and Clemens Alexandrinus attributes to it the latter quality, especially in his Stromata, lib. 5."

"The crocodile was held by the Egyptians as the symbol of all mis-
chief. And therefore Typho, being in their belief the author of all evils, was supposed to have transformed himself into a crocodile or dragon. So that the principle of evil, or Typho, was in the symbolical character represented by a crocodile or dragon, and under this symbol was worshipped. Agreeably thereto in the Chaldean theology the principle of evil was called Arimanius, i.e., the crafty serpent." Hence Milton writes (Par. Lost, b. 12. l. 190.)

"Thus with ten wounds,

"The river-dragon tamed, at length submits," &c.

Let us notice next a few passages, in which the dragon or crocodile is made a symbol of a rapacious heathen power. Is. 51; 9; "Art thou not he that hath... wounded the dragon," or crocodile (Egypt)? Je. 9; 11; "I will make Jerusalem... a den of dragons" (Babylonians). Je. 51; 34; "Nebuchadrezzar, like a dragon... hath swallowed me up." Eze. 29; 3; "I am against thee, Pharaoh... the great crocodile." Eze. 32; 2; "Say unto Pharaoh... Thou art as a crocodile." Ps. 68; 30; "Rebuke the wild beast of the reed," i.e., the crocodile, meaning Egypt. And, according to the Oniocracies, the dragon is the symbol of a king, that is an enemy. It appears, however, from vv. 9, 15, that the symbol in question is to be conceived of as partaking of the serpent's form and character; and it will be convenient here to cite some texts, in which that reptile is mentioned. Is. 14; 29; "Out of the serpent's root (referring to "the king of Babylon," v. 4) shall come forth a cockatrice, and his fruit shall be a fiery flying serpent." Is. 27; 1; "Jehovah shall punish with his sword... leviathan the rigid serpent, leviathan the winding serpent, and shall slay the crocodile that is in the sea" (Assyria and Egypt are had in view). Is. 30; 6; "The burden of the beasts of the south (Egypt)... whence come the viper and fiery flying serpent." 2 Co. 11; 2; "I fear, lest as the serpent beguiled Eve, &c." In Hermas (as noticed on 388) we find a huge sea-monster (obviously the crocodile-dragon), black, red, yellow, and white, made a symbol of "oppression yet to come."—With these precedents before us we may see, first, with how great propriety a dragon, a compound of the crocodile and the serpent, is made a symbol of "that old serpent, the devil," who possesses all the rapacity of the crocodile with all the 'guile' of the serpent. But, as Hengstenberg says, II; 17; "the dragon is a name applied to Satan, only when the Old Testament description of the earthly world-power is transferred to him. The dragon is not Satan generally, but Satan in a particular relation, as the prince of this world;" and, I may add, as ruling it by the means by which the princes of this world rule, i.e., by the power of the sword. And we are led by the precedents to see, 2dly, the propriety of the dragon being taken as a symbol of the persecuting
heathen world-power of the day, and especially of the symbol, which of old represented the literal Babylon, being transferred to the mystical Babylon. Further, there is a manifest appropriateness in the crocodile, clothed in his scaly armour, being used to symbolize specially the military arm, which is the chief instrument wherewith Satan and the despotic world-power carry on their capacities, and deal their deadly blows. Utterly incongruous is it to interpret (as Stuart, e.g., does) the dragon to mean Satan only, and his allies,—the two beasts, the civil and ecclesiastical powers of Rome. With what propriety can Satan be associated in person with these? Congruity requires, that the dragon should represent, like these, a visible power (though it should be one, through which Satan may be supposed more especially to operate); just as, when it is said (2; 10); “The devil will cast you into prison,” every one understands, that a visible agent is implied.—Though this was not ‘a great sign,’ yet the dragon was a great one, that is, it was a huge monster of its species. The peculiar hatefulness of the thing signified is indicated by this epithet.—Red of a fiery colour is equivalent to blood-thirsty, fierce, cruel (see Vol. I: pp. 20, 248). There may even be in this colour, as connected with the symbol of which it is predicated, a special allusion to the military power of Rome. For a dragon of a red colour was a standard among the Romans. It ranked next to the eagle, as we read in Vegetius: “The first standard of the whole legion is the eagle, which the aquilifer carries. Dragons are also borne to battle by the draconarii.” As there would be ten draconarii for one aquilifer, from the much greater number of the former, signiferi, standard-bearers, came to apply only to the draconarii.—This allusion to the Roman ensigns leads me to notice, that at a later date Constantine spoke thus of his rival in the empire; ‘Liberty being now restored, and the dragon removed from the administration of public affairs,’ &c. “Moreover, a picture of Constantine was set up over the palace gate, with the Cross over his head, and under his feet the great enemy of mankind, (who persecuted the Church by means of impious tyrants), in the form of a dragon, transfixed with a dart through the midst of his body, and falling headlong into the depths of the sea.” See Eusebius de vita Constantini, lib. ii.; c. 46, and lib. iii. c. 3, and Socrates Hist. Eccles, lib. i.; c. 9. Constantine added to the other Roman ensigns the labarum, or standard of the Cross, and constituted it the principal standard of the Christian Roman empire. To this labarum Prudentius refers, when speaking of the Christian soldiers, in his first hymn Πέντε τριφάτων. The passage may be thus rendered; “They leave the ensigns of Caesar; they choose the standard of the Cross; and instead of the dragon-flags which they carried, moved about with the wind, they bring forward the illustrious wood that subdued the dragon.”
785. Having seven heads. And so in Kiddushin, fo. 29, 2, Rabbi Achæ is reported to have seen a demon, like a dragon, having seven heads. That the dragon here is, in respect of his terrestrial signification, substantially identical with the beast will clearly appear as we proceed. Hence we may gather from C. 17; 9 (as will be shown thereon), that his seven heads symbolize the “seven mountains” on which Rome stood, and also a dynasty of “seven kings” then in course of reigning (Guide, p. 22).—And ten horns. These also in C. 17; 12 are declared to mean “kings”; and in expounding C. 17 I shall show, that both the seven and the ten form parts of the dynasty of “the twelve Caesars.” See on 851, 889, 1129. These heads and horns will alone suffice to satisfy any candid inquirer, that the real reference of the symbol is to imperial Rome.—Besides their symbolic significations, the heads and horns may denote emblematically the plenitude of power. See Vol. I: pp. 18, 19.—Many expositors make it a point of knotty discussion (as indeed they well may, seeing it becomes a vital question to their schemes), how the horns were located on the heads. The natural inference from the omission of any statement on the point is, that this question was never intended to come into consideration in respect of the thing signified, much less to be made one of vital importance. And the inversion of the order of the horns and heads in C. 13 may be thought to indicate the same. At any rate we may say, that any scheme, which rests on a particular allocation of the horns on one or more of the heads (as, e.g., those of Elliott, Hengstenberg and many others, on the seventh head) is based on an unsound, or rather on no foundation; since the text contains nothing on the point. If any allocation were proper, I doubt not, that it should be as follows: one horn on each of the heads excepting the sixth, on which there would be three additional but diminutive horns for Galba, Otho, and Vitellius.

786. And on his heads. In 852 the diadems are said to be “on his (the beast’s) horns.” From comparing that place we may presume, that the intention here is to represent the supreme power as more immediately residing on the “seven mountains,” i.e., in the city of Rome, the Senatus populusque Romanus.—Seven diadems. Not the crown of the victor, as the woman had, but the eastern diadem, the emblem of arbitrary power. Hence, as being connected with the dragon, the fulness of tyrannical despotism is denoted.

XII; 4. 787. His tail. This member may denote an envenomed, but subordinate instrument of attack. Ex. 4; 1 ss. may be compared, where Moses casts his rod on the ground, and it becomes a serpent, which, on his seizing it by the tail, turns to a rod again. See also Is. 9; 15: 19; 15: and on 608–9, 644–6. This is a particular, which it does not seem possible to interpret in direct reference to
Satan; but it is capable of easy application to the Roman dragon. Herod, the vicegerent and puppet of the Caesars, would be appropriately styled the tail of the dragon.—Draws. The present tense (and not the past, according to the general rule in relating what was seen) is used here probably in order to intimate, that this occurrence took place at the very epoch at which this scene commences, that is, about the vulgar era.—The third, i.e., a certain part: whether considerable or inconsiderable I will not undertake to determine positively; but see on 547.—Of the stars of the heaven. The latter phrase has probably been inserted here, lest it should be supposed, that the stars in the woman’s crown were meant; in which case it might be thought, that “the holy Innocents” slain by Herod about the time of Christ’s birth were symbolized. But this clause, as well as the date of their murder, and the meaning of symbolic stars, are opposed to such an interpretation. The term stars requires, that rulers or princes be understood. And we may therefore conclude, that the reference is to the many chief men among the Jews, whom the ambition or cruelty of Herod led him to put to death or to degrade from their offices (op. Vol. I: p. 389). The precedent, which is in Da. 8; 10, tends to confirm this view. Therein it is said, that “the little horn,” meaning Antiochus Epiphanes, “cast down some of the stars”, meaning the chiefs of the Jews, “to the ground, and stamped upon them.” Nevertheless, as the Innocents may possibly be included, I would not absolutely exclude them from the interpretation.

788. And cast them unto the earth. As this clause can have nothing specifically answering to it, it tends to confirm what was said on 777, by showing, that the heaven and the earth are used here as part of the machinery of the drama. A great downfall or degradation is all that is meant.

789. The dragon stood, &c. An illustration of the design and consequence of his hostile attack may be seen in the slaughter of the Innocents.—About to. Here is another confirmation of the second remark on 669.

In this division Satan is brought to view as being prepared, through the instrumentality of his chief instrument, the military power of imperial Rome, and specifically of its vicegerent in Judea, Herod, to strangle the infant Church of Christ at its birth in the person of its founder. Herod’s depostions and slaughter of the Jewish rulers is noticed, perhaps with the view to indicate further the epoch of the scene. But, more probably, the allusion is mainly to the High Priests, whom Herod at his pleasure deposed. And this view would accord best with the connected symbols, as implying a preliminary blow struck at the woman herself, the mother of the child that is the chief object of the dragon’s hostility, I mean, the Jewish Church. Cer-
tainly, on the principle of the supreme authority being answerable for the acts of its subordinates, the Roman dragon is justly charged with the illegal and atrocious acts perpetrated by Herod (who was in reality neither more nor less than its officer and servant), whether it be thought, that his infringements on and abrogations of Legal institutions, or his degradations of God’s High Priest, or the havoc he made among the members of his own family and the chief men among the Jews, or his massacre of the Innocents, may most probably have been had in view. What were the sentiments of the Jews towards Herod, and how well the symbolization of the tail of the draconic beast drawing the stars would accord therewith, may be fully learnt from Josephus; and in particular from the address to Augustus, made by the fifty ambassadors, whom the Jews sent to remonstrate against Archelaus’ being appointed to succeed his father (Ant. XVII: xi; 2). Besides much more to the same effect, they stated, “that Herod had put such abuses upon them as a wild beast would not have put on them, if he had power given him to rule over them: and that, although their nation had passed through many changes of government, their history gave no account of any calamity they had ever been under, that could be compared with this, which Herod had brought upon their nation.” (cp. Vol. I: pp. 381, 390).

DIV. 3. THE BIRTH OF THE MALE-CHILD, AND FLIGHT OF THE WOMAN:

The nativity of Christ and the attendant circumstances.

XII; 5–6. 792–799. And she brought forth a son, a male, who is about to tread all the nations with an iron rod. And her offspring was caught up to God, even to his throne. And the woman escaped into the desert, where she hath there a place prepared by God, that they should nourish her there a thousand two hundred and sixty days.

792. A son, a male. The virtual repetition of the sex is not without an object, and ought by no means to be lost sight of in the translation, especially as it is brought forward again (in 833) as a salient feature. The use, too, of the general term, offspring, both previously and subsequently, tends to make the repetition still more emphatic. What, then, is the object of it? To the scheme of redemption, as shadowed forth under the older Dispensation, a son of a woman, a male child, is set forth as essential. “Thou shalt set apart unto the Lord all that openeth the matrix: the males shall be the Lord’s”: the beasts to be sacrificed, the children to be redeemed. In like manner, it was essential, that the lamb for the Passover-sacrifice should be “a male” (Ex. 12; 5). Cp.Is.9; 6–7; “Unto us a child is born: unto us a son is given”: C. 66; 7; “Before Zion travailed: she brought forth: before her pain came she was delivered of a man-child: cp. Je. 20; 15. This ‘man-child,’ the Targum interprets to
be a king, a deliverer. See also Mt. 1; 23, 25: Lu. 1; 31: Jo. 16; 21; ‘a woman, . . . when she is delivered, remembereth no more the anguish, for joy that a man is born into the world.’ Bede has remarked on the clause before us; ‘Semper ecclesia, draconem licet adversante, Christum parit; masculum autem dicit, victorem diaboli qui feminam vicerat.’ In point of fact it may be said, that the covenant with Abram was made exclusively with the males of his seed; since ‘the covenant of circumcision’ was necessarily limited to such. The exclusion of females, too, from the genealogies confirms this.—And here we may notice, that, while ‘son of man’ was the title commonly taken to himself by Christ, and while ‘son of God’ was that commonly given to him by his disciples, and ‘son of the Highest’ by the angel who announced his birth, ‘son of woman’ is the designation by which he is described in some of the earliest Christian writings; e.g., Enoch, 61; 9. He was regarded as being emphatically the son, inasmuch as he was the promised ‘seed of the woman’. And hence he is called in the Sibyl. Or. Bk. VI. (A.D. 100) ‘μυρσις υιος, the great son, to whom the Most High has given a throne:’ and in 4 Ezra, repeatedly ‘my son’ only.—We may notice too, that God’s people are sometimes called his son, as in Ex. 4; 22: Ho. 11; 1: Eze. 21; 10. So that the term son may well be comprehensive of ‘the church of the first-born’.

793. Who is about. See on 669, 789.—To tend. In C. 7; 17 the lamb is said to tend as a shepherd his people. Here he is said in like manner to tend the nations, that is, the heathen. But as it is added with a rod of iron, we perceive, that a very different kind of tending is meant, even a tending of stern correction and restraint. The same expression occurs in C. 2; 27 and 19; 15. If proof could be wanting to show, that the reference here is to Christ, the former text would furnish it. He is there represented as saying; ‘He who conquereth, to him will I give power over the nations (and he shall tend them with an iron rod: as a potter’s vessels are broken in pieces, he shall break them) as I also received from my Father.’—The precedent of the passage before us is in Ps. 2; 7 ss.; ‘Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter’s vessel.’ Who, again, on comparing the two can doubt, that Christ is had in view?—A somewhat similar symbolization may be found in Test. XII Patr. XI (A.D. 70). Joseph has a dream, in which he sees twelve deer (the twelve stars of the woman’s crown), nine of them (the ten tribes, excepting Levi) were scattered, afterwards the other three. He saw, that from Judah was produced a virgin, having a robe of fine linen; and from her
came a spotless lamb; and on his left hand was the similitude of a lion, and all the beasts rushed with violence against the lamb, and the lamb overcame them, and trode them down.'—And here we may bring forward C. 17; 14; 'The lamb . . . and they that are with him, shall overcome them '; and hence we may infer, that what is predicated of ' the son ' may be said also of his followers, that is, of his Church.

794. And her offspring. In its being said ' her child,' and not simply ' the child,' we may perhaps see an allusion to the virgin Mary.
—Was caught up. The word expresses the most hasty rapture (ct. 11; 12), the better to denote the need there was for instant intervention, in order to save the child from the jaws of the draconic serpent.

795. To God. It is added, and to His throne, with the view either to express, even more strongly still, the security of the place of refuge, or to signify an exaltation to copartnership in Deity and dominion. But, as two distinct things cannot be meant, it seems better to render even to his throne.—Inasmuch as it is a common mistake to explain this rapture as symbolizing the ascension of Christ, it will not be out of place to call attention to the fact, that the child was not caught up to the heaven; but, being in the heaven, was caught up to the throne of Deity to be beyond the reach of the old serpent. The place of this rapture, namely, before the war which symbolizes Christ's ministry, shows, that the ascension cannot be signified.—The sentiment is, that a special Providence watched over the infant Church from the advent of its Founder. We may also call to mind the promise of Christ to victors in C. 3; 21, that they shall be συνάδεσμον with him and with his Father.

XII; 6. 796. And the woman escaped. It is common (see, e.g., Stuart's Com.) to represent this flight as being identical with that mentioned in vv. 14 ss. But there is no other reason for this, than that the erroneous schemes of expositors can give no account of two flights. There being, however, nothing to indicate retrogression, it is contrary to the right rule of interpretation to assume it gratuitously; and I shall be able to show, that there is no occasion for doing so.—Into the desert or wilderness: in contrast to the child's rapture to heaven. The Church of the Gospel, in the person of its founder, is temporarily taken under the special protection of the Almighty, and exalted to the place of highest honour; while the Church of the Law is allotted indeed a temporary place of refuge, but is compelled to flee from the heaven, and content herself with an abode exposed to all the sorrows and sufferings of earth.—Observe, that the glorious woman of C. 12 escapes to ' the wilderness,' while the vile woman of C. 17; 3 is beheld in ' a wilderness.' Now, in the former place no wilderness had been mentioned previously, but in the latter there had been. It
results, that this is the wilderness par excellence, and that the other is not identical with it. Wemyss says (p. 129); "A wilderness may be a symbol of good, when it denotes a hiding-place from enemies, as David and Elijah found it" (1 Sa. 23; 14: 1 Kgs. 19; 4 sq.). Such is the case here; for this wilderness symbolizes a place of refuge and of safety. On the other hand, it may be "the symbol of temptation, solitude, persecution, desolation, and destitution of all spiritual things." And such is the case in C. 17; 3; where the wilderness denotes a place of degradation and desolation.—Doubtless, in the clause before us an eye has been had to the flight of Joseph and Mary into Egypt; and the place of refuge they found in that 'house of bondage.' Arethas and others have even interpreted it exclusively of their flight. But this event has merely been taken as in part, and only in part, a type of the state of the Jewish Church (the 'son called out of Egypt': Ho. 11; 1: Mt. 2; 15) during a portion of its conjoint existence with the rising Church of Christ (the 'son' out of the spiritual Egypt: C. 11; 8).—Note, that the representative of the older Dispensation begins to be 'removed out of God's sight' from the time, that the true 'first-born' comes into existence, while 'the son' (the Church of Christ) is nurtured for a time in his Father's bosom.—It is a singular coincidence, that, when John the Baptist was sent to preach to the Jewish Church, he announced himself in Isaiah's words (40; 3), as 'a voice crying in the wilderness:' as though he recognized, that the Church of which he was the personification was then in its wilderness-state.

797. Where she hath there. This is a Hebraistic pleonasm; but I have thought it best to exhibit the original as it is.—A place prepared by God. Note, that it is a Divine provision; and this accords well both with the command; "Flee into Egypt, and be thou there until I bring thee word," and with the appointment of a depressed state of the Jewish Church during the conjoint testifying of the two witnesses.

798. That they should nourish her = that she should be nourished: see on 697.

799. 1260 days, i.e., 3½ years. "The old fathers had a tradition, that the flight into Egypt occupied the space of 3½ years" (Palmori, p. 463).—This, the half-week period of fatality, may have been used in this instance as emblematical of the first half (containing 3½ decades of years) of the period of the contemporaneous testifying of the two Churches. During this half the Jewish Church suffered much adversity, especially from the unlawful depositions and appointments of High Priests by Herod and other Roman Governors; though at the same time she was tolerated and protected: she was as it were in the wilderness, yet not subjected to those 'wars,' which were subsequently made upon her by the military power of Rome at the instigation of
Satan.—Observe, that the half-week period is expressed in days in the two instances, in which mention is made of the Church’s testifying during her Lord’s sojourn on earth: see on 709.

In this division the circumstances attending the birth of the Christian Church, in the person of its founder, are symbolized. Christ by his Church will obtain supreme dominion over the heathen. This is announced here by anticipation: in C. 19; 15 its realization is exhibited. Next, the providential preservation of Christ during his early years, the exaltation of his Church to the place of honour, the corresponding degradation of the elder Church, but yet its special preservation for an appointed time, are represented.


XII; 7–9. 800–12. And there arose a war in the heaven. Michael and his angels [began] to war with the dragon. And the dragon warred and his angels. And he had no strength, neither was their place found any longer in the heaven. And he was cast,—that great dragon,—that old serpent,—he who is called the Devil and Satan,—he who deceiveth the whole civilized-[world], he was cast unto the earth, and his angels were cast with him.

800. A war ordinarily, but not always, in the Apocalypse means a battle or single fight; but I have thought proper to retain in every instance the term, which, with its cognate terms (admitting of being used invariably), would allow of the most exact conformity to the original.—In the heaven. Stuart, like many other commentators, raises the question here, What heaven is meant? And he decides in favour of the air; because the Jews were accustomed to conceive of evil spirits as inhabiting the air. He represents Satan as endeavouring to follow the man-child, when his progress is arrested by Michael, who (he must intend) meets him in the air. In this representation he forgets, that Satan was already in the heaven; and consequently, in following the man-child to God’s throne, would not have been met in the air. This may suffice to show, that the air cannot be meant. Generally speaking, such a question must be decided by the context. If there be nothing in it to decide, the general use would require, that the heaven of God’s presence be understood. And it would be only in such a case as that in ve. 4, where ‘the stars of the heaven’ are spoken of, that the firmamental heaven must be conceived of. When, as here, the phrase is simply ‘in the heaven,’ there can be no doubt, that the heaven into which the seer was admitted in C. 4; 1 is intended. After all, the question is in this instance, I am fully convinced, altogether out of place; since the scene of the war is laid in the heaven merely for congruity, and to admit of the degradation of
Satan being symbolized. As I remarked on 777, 'the heaven is here merely a part of the necessary machinery.'

801. Michael is 'the guardian-angel of God's people or the Church,' says Stuart: and as such he is made a symbol of the Mediator. Thus, in Dan. 10; 13, 21: 12; 1, he is described as "Michael, the first of the chief princes," "your prince," and "the great prince, who standeth up for the people of God." In Jude 9, as the defender of God's people, he is said to contend with Satan. See also Zec. 1; 8; 3; 1. In Hermas, Sim. VIII., he is called "the guardian-angel of God's people." In Enoch 20; 5 he is fifth in the list of the seven presence-angels, and is described as "Michael, one of the holy angels, who, presiding over human virtue, commands the nations," and in C. 24 he interprets to Enoch concerning the tree of life. In the Gospel of Nicodemus he is evidently contemplated under the same character, when it is said in C. 20; 1 ss.; "The Lord, holding Adam by the hand, delivered him to Michael the archangel." "The archangel Michael commanded us, &c." The Uriel of 4 Ezra is substantially the same (see Vol. I.: p. 228 ss.). No doubt this archangel is here a symbol of him, who 'rules the nations with a rod of iron.' He who was caught up to God's throne as the man-child representative of the Church, now re-appears in a character suited to the champion who fights the Church's battles, that is, as 'the captain of the host of the Lord,' and 'the captain of salvation.' Michael means, Who is like unto God? which may be taken as a challenge in answer to the demand of the worshippers of the beast (13; 4); "Who is like to the beast? who can fight with him?" Cp. Ps. 113; 5; "Who is like unto the Lord our God?"—And his angels. It was quite in accordance with Jewish notions, that two hosts of good and evil angels should be represented as being arrayed against one another under their respective leaders. Thus, in Asc. Esaias 'Sammael and his powers are seen in the heaven, engaged in fierce conflict, doing deeds such as are done on earth.'

802. Began to war. The genuine reading gives the second verb in the infinitive, with an ellipsis of the first. Heinrichs, Lucke, and Stuart have proposed three different ways of supplying the omission. Suffice it to say, that the most natural way is to reinsert the verb which immediately precedes the clause.

803. The dragon worred and his angels. The same, that R. ben David calls; "Sammael and his troops." So also in Sohar Gen.; "God cast out Sammael and his troops from the place of their holiness." In the Asc. Esaias, Ch. 4, it is said; "Berial and his powers shall be dragged into Gehenna." 'Berial' is here equivalent to Belial, and 'Berial and his powers' to the dragon (or Satan) and his angels. But in the Ascensio Nero and his abettors are being spoken
of under this phrase. Hence it affords an illustration, showing that
the reigning Cæsar and his emissaries, as well as the devil and evil
spirits, may be included under 'the dragon and his angels.'

XII; 8. 804. And he had no strength. The word is not that which
is used, when the meaning is to overcome. Much more than 'pre-
vailed not' (as in the A. V.) is meant. It is signified, that Satan was
rendered utterly powerless, destitute of all strength to offer resistance.
Very possibly, from the Greek name for Rome meaning strength, there
may be here a covert allusion to Rome.

805–6. Neither was their place found, &c. This is a phrase expres-
sive of the most complete removal or exclusion, as may be seen by
comparing C. 20; 11, where it is used in reference to the heavens and
the earth. Cp. also Ps. 37; 10; ‘I sought him, but his place could
nowhere be found.’

XII; 9. 807 sq. He was cast, &c. Satan's character is here described
in four clauses; and thus, on the whole, a universality of evil qualities
is indicated.—A repetition of this description occurs in C. 20; 2, on
the occasion of Satan's second 'casting-down,' viz., to the abyss. The
final one is to the lake of fire: see 20; 10. The description has per-
haps been dwelt upon to indicate, that in this act Satan himself, the
actuator of the dragon, and not the draconic visible instrument, is
primarily had in view.

808. That old serpent, viz., of Ge. 3: cp. 2 Co. 11; 3. This designation stigmatizes Satan as wily, deceitful, supplanting, tempting.

809. The devil, that is, the traducer or calumniator.—Satan, i.e.,
the adversary.

810. He who deceiveth the whole civilized world. The oicoumenē
would ordinarily be used of the Roman empire; and this would corre-
spond at that time to what we should call the civilized world. Hence
Josephus writes (Wars III: 2; 4); 'Antioch was the third city in the
habitable world, that was under the Roman empire.' Cp. C. 3; 12:
16; 14.—The best illustration of the extent to which Satan deceived
it may be found in the statement, that he is 'the prince of this
world.'

811–12. He was cast unto the earth: of course, the symbolic, which
represents Judea. This will furnish an important guide to the mean-
ing.—Observe the force and appropriateness of the two terms in 810
and 811, as they stand contrasted with one another.—Note also, that
the devil is not now Apollyon, the destroyer, as in C. 9; 11: he is
rather the destroyed.

Although a battle is unquestionably portrayed in this division, it
by no means follows, that anything corresponding to a battle, that is,
a single engagement, is intended. Probably it would not be possible
to depict symbolically a war, that is, a series of engagements extend-
ing over an indefinite, and perhaps a protracted period. There can, therefore, be no objection to supposing, that such may be represented by or included under a symbolization of this kind. And this I take to be the case in the present instance, though I doubt not, that reference may have been made to one spiritual conflict in particular. I suppose, then, that the symbolization before us depicts that war between the Lord Jesus (on behalf of his Church and people) and the powers of darkness, which may be considered to have lasted from the incarnation to the ascension. We may suppose the first conflict to have taken place at the mission of Gabriel to announce the conception of the Christ in the virgin's womb. Another assault of Satan was made, when, through the instrumentality of his tool Herod,—the agent of the Roman dragon, he caused the Innocents to be massacred in the hope of destroying the infant Saviour. But it was chiefly during the ministry of Christ, and especially at its commencement and close, that the war between him and Satan was waged. The latter then had a preternatural liberty allowed him, which he had not possessed before, with the view of showing, that, though he was 'a strong one, yet a stronger than he had come upon him,'—of showing also, that 'stronger is he that is with us than he that is against us,' even though the latter be 'the prince' and 'the god of this world.' With respect to this period it might well be said, that 'the devil was come down among both Jews and heathens, having great wrath; because he knew that the time appointed him was short.' He opened the campaign by the temptation in the wilderness, in which, after being repulsed in a series of assaults, 'he departed,' it is said, 'from him (Jesus) until a convenient season,'—probably referring to the agony in the garden and the crucifixion, when he again assailed Jesus with sore personal temptations. Meanwhile, the ministry of Christ was one continual conflict with Beelzebub and his legions. Besides Christ's spiritual assaults on Satan's kingdom, he was constantly coming in personal contact with him and his. And, not only by himself, but also by his emissaries, Christ put 'Sammael and his troops' to flight. So that, on one occasion, 'the seventy returned with joy, saying; Lord, even the devils are subject to us through thy name. And he said unto them; I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven. Behold, I give unto you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy; and nothing shall by any means hurt you.' Yet all the previous conflicts were but as trivial skirmishes, compared with the grand and final encounter, which attended the offering a propitiatory atonement for the sins of the whole world. Then Satan again, through the instrumentality of the Roman dragon, vented his fiercest 'wrath.' And sore indeed must have been the 'agony' which he caused, when it could make the Lord Jesus 'sweat as it were great
drops of blood,' and utter that exceeding bitter cry; 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' Nevertheless, the old serpent did but 'bruise the heel of the woman's seed,' while his own 'head was bruised with a deadly bruise.' So deadly indeed, that its result, more truly than anything else, might be described as being as it were a hurling from heaven to earth. In reference to this 'war,' from its commencement at the incarnation to its termination at the ascension, it was said; 'Of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together, for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done.'—The same conflict which the Redeemer sustained on behalf of his Church, his people have had to sustain more or less in all ages, but specially in the first age, and while Satan retained his extraordinary powers. How the obdurate Jews persecuted the disciples from city to city, and how the Roman beast devoured them, is well known; and will be brought to view in the sequel. But the apostle reminds the Christians of his day, that they had even more terrible foes than these, saying; "Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the authorities, against the world-powers of darkness, against the spiritualities of wickedness (or wicked spirits) in heavenly places." And he directs them to look to 'the captain of their salvation,' as 'having by his cross spoiled the principalities and the powers, and made a show of them openly, triumphing over them by himself;' and who (as he himself intimated, that he would do) had 'overcome the strong one, and taken from him all his armour wherein he trusted, and divided his spoils:' yea, and had 'judged the prince of this world.' On the whole, whether this symbolization be regarded in its corporate reference, as applying to Christ's Church, or in its individualization to Christ himself, it is seen to accord accurately with the facts of history.

INTERLUDE.

(XII; 10–12. 813–29. And I heard a loud voice in the heaven, saying; 'Now hath come the deliverance, and the might, and the kingship of our God, and the authority of his Christ; because the accuser of our brethren hath been cast down, who accuseth them before our God day and night. And they conquered him through the blood of the lamb, and through the word of their testifying: and they loved not their soul even unto death. Wherefore exult, O ye heavens, and ye who tabernacle in them! Woe to the earth and to the sea; because the devil hath come down to you, having great wrath, knowing that he hath a short [appointed] time.')
813. *A loud voice.* This proceeded (as appears from the speakers saying our brethren) from saints, who had previously been admitted into the heavenly Paradise. And when we call to mind, that the martyrs of the fifth seal, who had perished before the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem, were told (6; 11), that they must remain in their state of rest (that is, of incomplete bliss: see on 427), 'until the number of their brethren, who were about to be slain, should be made up,' we cannot, I think, doubt that these are the doxologists here, and that they are led to praise God, not only on account of their brethren's deliverance, but also because their brethren's victory will prove the prelude to their own complete glorification.—*In the heaven.* As the heaven does not appear to be used here as part of the machinery of the drama, it may perhaps be meant to intimate, that this thanksgiving is in celebration of the triumph of the Christian Church.

814. *Now.* Probably we ought to lay much emphasis on this word, as forming a contrast to the "How long?" and the delay of C. 6; 10–11.—*The deliverance.* Not salvation, but deliverance from the assaults and persecutions caused by the old serpent, is meant, as on the parallel occasion: see on 490.—It is called God's deliverance; because He effected it.—The article is prefixed to each term to indicate, that each is preeminent in kind and degree: see on 318, 375.

815–6. *The kingship of... Christ.* This is parallel to and almost identical with the opening of the prelude, 11; 15; 'The kingship of the world hath become, &c.' So also are the might and the deliverance to 'thy wrath hath come,' and 'the time to give the reward, &c.' There is also a parallelism with C. 7; 10 and C. 19; 1 severally. What was said in one degree at the Saviour's birth, could be repeated in a still higher at his ascension, but in the highest of all at the full substitution of the Christian for the Jewish economy.

817. *Because the accuser, &c.* A sixth accusation against Satan is herein implied, suggested probably by Job 1; 2.—The Rabbins constantly designate Satan as 'the accuser,' using the very same word in Hebrew letters as the one here in Greek; e.g.; "Every day, except the day of expiation (see on 8; 3), Satan is the accuser of men." "God said to the seventy princes of the world; Have ye seen him, who always accuses my children?"

818. *Day and night=unceasingly.* It was unquestionably the opinion of the Jews, that Satan had free access to the Divine presence.

XII; 11. 819. *They.* The pronoun is inserted in the Greek to intimate an emphasis on it. The speakers being those who had themselves been confessors in old times, they may be regarded as meaning to say; 'They (the confessors in the Roman beast's persecution), even as we ourselves, conquered, &c.'—I will just notice, that
possibly this and the next verse, or this only, may be introduced parenthetically by the seer, and not form part of the celestial doxology. In that case, they might be meant to refer to the confessors, who conquered before the Babylonian destruction. However, as in my own mind I feel satisfied, that this was not the construction intended, I merely suggest the possibility of it.—Conquered. The past tense might be supposed to be used anticipatively, as it sometimes is, when the event is regarded as being close at hand, and absolutely certain. Cp. 1 Jo. 2; 13, 14; "Ye have conquered the Wicked one:" and 4: 4; 5; 4, 5; "Ye have conquered the antichrists:" and "the world through faith in Jesus." See also C.15; 2. But in this instance it is scarcely necessary to have recourse to this hypothesis. The immediate reference unquestionably is to Michael and his angels, who symbolize Christ and his people, and whose victory had just been described. And the reference to them places beyond doubt the correctness of the interpretation, that, not Christ alone, but his Church also, is included in the symbolization; and in this place the latter only is had in view. But, if both Christ and his Church be included, then, from the nature of the case, two distinct conflicts must be comprehended under the one symbolization, one being a spiritual and figurative conflict between Christ and Satan, consisting in the redemption of the slaves of the latter by the former, and the other an earthly war of persecution, waged by the servants of Satan against the followers of the lamb.

820. Through the blood of the lamb. In the parallel case under the fifth seal the corresponding expression (6; 9) is 'through the word of God.' This well accords with the circumstance, that the lamb was not known to those ancient martyrs. Not but that the same might be said in respect of them; inasmuch as it would be true of all, who shall enter heaven. And so in fact we find it virtually said of them, when we read in C. 7; 14; "These made their robes white in the blood of the lamb."

821. And through the word of their testifying. The 'blood' was the efficient cause: their 'testifying' the practical means of their conquering. Giving a general testimony to the truths of the Gospel is not meant; but testifying under persecution, as in the precedent (6; 9). See also C. 1; 2, 9: 12; 17: 17; 6: 20; 4.

822. They loved not their soul. The Babylonian martyrs had been symbolically described as 'souls.' Perhaps to carry out the parallelism more completely the same term was brought in here. Because it is, and because there is another word which is translated 'life,' I have kept to the term 'soul.' No doubt 'life' is meant; but the Jews did not distinguish between 'life' and 'soul,' as we do. The meaning of the word translated soul might either be limited to the present life, or
extended to include a future one; whereas we understand by the soul, the immortal spirit.

823. Even unto death. This clause shows, that martyrs are had in view. These ‘brethren’ had obeyed the precept; “Be faithful unto death;” and in consequence they had obtained an interest in the promise; “I will give thee a crown of life” (2; 10).

XII; 12. 824. Exult, O ye heavens! This is the only instance out of 54 in this book, in which the Greek word for heaven is put in the plural. Even in the parallel phrase in C. 18; 20; “Rejoice over her, thou heaven,” it is in the singular.—The Jews unquestionably held the doctrine both of three heavens (2 Co. 12; 2) and of seven heavens (Asc. Es.: Test. XII Patr.): cp. Vol. I: pp. 10, 12, 26. The two views may be thus reconciled. The third or highest heaven was held to be the abode of God. The first and second were each divided into three subdivisions, of which the lowest, extending from the earth to the starry firmament, was the sphere of action of evil angels, and the remaining five were the abodes of the angelic ‘principalities and powers in heavenly places,’ according to their several ranks and degrees in an ascending order. The third and seventh heavens would then be coincident. In the doxology before us the symbolic heavens in general are poetically called upon (for the greater exaltation of the idea) to join in exulting on the occasion of Satan’s expulsion from them.—It must be observed, however, that the heavens here stand contrasted with the earth and the sea. And hence it is most probable, that the three are to have their appropriate symbolical significations assigned to them in this instance. In that case, Christianity and Christians will be called on to exult over Judaism and heathenism, on account of the assurance of the final triumph of their cause, which is given in the victory of their great Captain over Satan.

825. And ye who tabernacle in them. I have shown on 571, that this phrase designates the true servants of Christ. It may include all, who are saved through him. But possibly, since in the present instance heavens, as the more generic term, would include all the saved, this phrase may point specially to those, who had previously entered into their rest in the separate state.

826. Woe to the earth and to the sea:—or, as the received text reads, ‘Woe to those who dwell on the earth and the sea.’ The difference is not material; for we must necessarily understand the inhabitants to be included in the more correct reading. So that, ‘Woe to Judea and heathendom and the inhabitants thereof,’ will be the literal equivalent for this clause.—We must not read woe be, but woe will be. This is a prophetic announcement, not a denunciation. The subsequent symbolizations are devoted to the exhibition of these woes.

827. Because the devil hath come down to you. In contrast with
the cause of joy to the heaven, because the devil is cast down from it, is placed the cause of woe to the earth, because he is come down to it.—This is that loosing of Satan on the earth, to which his binding in C. 20; 1 is correlative.

828. Having great wrath. In the syllabus in 769, 'The nations' of the heathen, Satan's children, 'were made angry.' There the instruments and the visible effect are adverted to: here the invisible prime mover.

829. He hath a short time, that is, only a short time, as C. 9; 4: 17; 10: 21; 27: 22; 9 may suffice to show (see on 229).—The Greek word signifies a convenient season, or the right point of time, and hence an appointed time: cp. C. 1; 3: 11; 18: Mt. 26; 18: Acts 17; 26: Ro. 5: 6.—Once again, see C. 20; 3, Satan is 'loosed for a little time.'

The foregoing doxological interlude has been introduced most appropriately in this place. With the greatest propriety is the Saviour's conquest of the powers of darkness thus celebrated at the close of his career on earth, and at the epoch of his triumphal ascent to heaven. Of course this song of praise or psan of victory is not a symbolization; and consequently we are not to look for anything corresponding to it as a whole in the real world. At the same time, the realization of its separate statements must be illustrated, and to this I proceed.—The coming of the kingdom of God and of Christ, which was announced (in C. 11; 15) as entering on its first stage from Christ's nativity, received a new development in consequence of the resurrection and ascension of Jesus. The gates of Christ's Church (which is as it were the porch of the kingdom, or the kingdom itself in a lower sense) were now first opened, and multitudes entered therein. But, besides this visible stage of progress on earth, there was also an unseen development in heaven, at least such was the belief in Apostolic times, as may be gathered from the passage quoted under No. 482 from the Asc. Esaiæ. It is therein declared, that 'after the Beloved's incarnation, crucifixion, and resurrection, and when the conquest of all the powers of darkness has been achieved, he will ascend to glory, taking many saints with him; and then will thrones and crowns be given to them all,'—'thrones' to denote, that they are to reign as kings with him,—victors' 'crowns' to signify, that they suffered as martyrs on earth. It is, however, to the state of the Church on earth between the ministry of Christ and the final rejection of the Jewish Church, that this doxology has respect chiefly: and of this it speaks by anticipation. The duration of this period may be considered to have been in round numbers 40 years,—the ἐγγοργασμος, which occurs so often in Scripture as a period of fatality: see Eze. 20: 11-13; Acts 7; 23, 30, 36, 38, 42: 13; 18, 21: Heb. 3; 9, 17: Ordo Seccl. pass. This was truly a time of oppression and ca-
lamity to Judea and the Jews, if ever there was one. A succession of cruel, oppressive, and tyrannical rulers, native and foreign, plundered and persecuted the people, until they were goaded into that hopeless rebellion, which entailed the utter destruction of their nation. Nor was the condition of heathen Rome much better. To mention only the names of Tiberius, Caligula, Nero, Otho, Vitellius, may suffice without entering into particulars. Well might ‘woe’ be announced to both ‘the earth’ and ‘the sea,’ Judea and Rome. For truly in both there was an unprecedented manifestation of ‘diabolical wrath.’ And many were the martyrs, who, sustained by the principles and motives which are derived from the blood of the Lamb, ‘got the victory over the beast’ by persevering in their testimony, undismayed by the terrors of his wrath.—But, besides this view of the statements, in which Satan is regarded in his character of the dragon, another may also be taken, in which he is looked upon in the form which he more commonly assumes, that of the old serpent or the devil, ‘who deceiveth the whole world.’ For allusion may also be made to those extra-ordinary powers, which Satan was allowed to retain as late as to the destruction of Jerusalem; and by which he brought much woe upon men. I might, also, quote here most appositely our Lord’s words in speaking of this period; ‘Take heed that none, man or devil, ‘deceive you, &c.’ (see Mt. 24; 4–11). But, the whole passage being too long for quotation, I must content myself with citing one verse, which I give on account of its bearing on the clause, ‘knowing that he hath but a short time allowed him.’ It is this; ‘Except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved; but for the elect’s sake those days shall be shortened.’


XII; 13–14. 830–39. And when the dragon perceived, that he was cast unto the earth, he pursued the woman that brought forth the male [child]. And to the woman were given the two wings of the great eagle, that she might fly into the desert unto her place, where she is nourished there a time, and times, and half a time from the face of the serpent.

830. When the dragon perceived. Observe, that the diabolical character is now again kept in the background, and the agent is put forward as operating as a persecutor by force of arms.

831. That he was cast unto the earth. From his being on the earth at the time, that he begins the persecution, it may be inferred that the persecution was carried on in Judea. Yet this inference cannot be fully relied on; because the earth, standing as it does in close connexion with a casting down from the heaven to the earth, may be introduced here again only as a part of the necessary machinery.
832. He pursued. To pursue may be thought to be the symbolical equivalent for to persecute. But, as the mystical expression for religious persecution in every place but this is to make war, it may be supposed, that there is some difference in the persecution here contemplated, most probably consisting in this being of a milder character, or not carried to extremities, so as to entail bloodshed.

833. Who brought forth the male child. This clause not being necessary for identification of the person intended, we may reasonably suppose, that it has been inserted with some other object in view. And the most probable hypothesis seems to be, that it was designed to keep in mind the contrast between the woman and her child; and thus to intimate, that the woman still represents the Jewish division of the Church of God.

XII ; 14. 834–5. The two wings of the great eagle. When the object is to symbolize the swiftest motion possible, the wings of an eagle are introduced: see on 312, 569. They are also emblematic of protecting care: see on 310. "To bear on eagles' wings," says Lowman, "expresses the readiness and power with which God often delivers his Church out of its dangers." In this instance the epithet great is emphatically added to give more force to these significations. Wordsworth, however, asserts that "the two wings of the great eagle are the two Testaments:" and he remarks, "the two wings, i.e., the well-known wings; another striking use of the article." Now, I would first observe in reference to this remark, that it assumes the genuineness of a very doubtful reading. Tregelles, indeed, has adopted it; but Griesbach and Scholz do not appear to have been even aware of its existence, for neither of them makes any allusion to it; while Stuart says: "Not the two wings, but two wings." But further, granting the genuineness of the article, Wordsworth's remark will not, even then, be justified; for the article may be used merely because two are all the wings that an eagle has, and certainly not to distinguish these (as his remark implies) from others not so well known. Moreover, the wings manifestly represent the woman's means of escape from a great impending danger: and how can the two Testaments be considered to have served this purpose in reference to the Church? Wordsworth's interpretation, therefore, is wholly chimerical.—We may observe, that the insertion of a means of escape in this instance, which was not considered necessary on the former occasion, argues a much more imminent peril to the Church at this epoch. Or, possibly, there may be an emblematical allusion to the instrument to which the escape was due. The eagle being the emblem of Rome, the wings of an eagle might fitly be used to symbolize an instrument or agent of Rome.

836. That she might fly. The expression differs from that used on
the previous occasion: see 796. Then she is said to flee as a man flees from his enemy; but now to fly as a bird flies. I have indicated this by using different words. Greater urgency seems to be denoted here.—Into the desert. Of course that, into which she had formerly escaped: though it does not follow, that the thing signified by it should be the same; nor indeed that any place should be symbolized, escape and preservation without reference to the means being the point of the symbolization. Stuart says; “The simple idea divested of trope is, that the Church found a refuge, which God had provided for her.”—Unto her place. This phrase, especially as compared with the corresponding one on the previous occasion, might alone suffice to show, that different flights were contemplated by the writer. For this indicates an accustomed or previously known place, as plainly as the other does a place then first ‘prepared by God.’ And, in addition to what was said on 796, it may be observed, that the different circumstances show, that two flights were intended. On the occasion of the first, the dragon’s wrath was directed against the child: he pursued the child: neither before nor after its birth is it said, that he directly persecuted the woman: her flight was then from the heaven: and was immediately consequent on the child’s birth. On the occasion of the second flight, the dragon’s wrath was necessarily directed wholly against the woman, the child having been removed beyond his reach: he pursued and persecuted her: her flight must have been from the earth; since to it the dragon had been cast: and it was consequent on the war, and on the dragon’s being cast down from the heaven. Let any one read vv. 6, 13, and 14 in close connexion; and he will find it, I think, impossible to doubt, that two different flights are spoken of. The repetition in ve. 14 is quite unnatural on the supposition of only one flight being had in view.

837. Where she is nourished. Cp. 798: that they should nourish her. In both places it is indicated (as Stuart observes) by no agent being mentioned, that ‘it is God who provides the requisite nourishment,’ or means of preserving life.—Elijah’s flight into the desert (1 Kgs. 17; 3–6) has doubtless been had in view as a precedent.

838. 3⅓ times. Cp. and see on 707, 709, and 799. In the last (ve. 6) the same duration is stated in days, perhaps for the purpose of further intimating, that this flight is a different one from that before mentioned. Referring to what was there said, I would now add, that, as the former 3⅓ times may be emblematic of the first 3⅓ decades of the Christian era, so may this be of the second 3⅓, the two thus making up the septuagintal period lying between the vulgar era and the subversion of the Jewish polity. It must be quite unnecessary to show, that the last half of this period was on the whole a time of great adversity to the Jewish Church.
839. From the face of the serpent. Perhaps by the introduction of the hostile power here as the serpent, it may be intimated, that in the persecution the wiles and deceitfulness of the serpent were combined with the force and ferocity of the dragon: or the change of designation may be adopted only for the sake of aesthetic variety.

In the last division the symbolizations brought down the history of the Church to the epoch of Christ's triumph over the old serpent by his death and resurrection. About this time the Romans began to harass the Jews by attacks on their religion. Pilate, who held the governorship till A.D. 38, set the example. Josephus states (Antiq. XVIII: iii, and Wars, II: ix), that "he removed the army from Caesarea to Jerusalem in order to abolish the Jewish laws. Secretly and under cover of night, he introduced into Jerusalem those images of Caesar, which are called effigies: whereas our law forbids us the very making of images, on which account the former Procurators were wont to make their entry into the city with such ensigns as had not those ornaments. This proceeding, when the day broke, excited a dreadful tumult among the people: for those near them were struck with consternation at the sight, their laws being, as it were, trampled under foot. And in addition to the indignant crowds in the town, a vast concourse poured in from the country. Hastening to Pilate, who was then at Caesarea, they besought him to remove the effigies from Jerusalem, and preserve their ancestral laws. Pilate rejecting their suit, they fell prostrate, and during five days and as many nights remained immovable. On the ensuing day Pilate, having seated himself upon a tribunal in the great circus, and summoned the people, as with a view to return them an answer, gave a preconcerted signal to a body of troops under arms to surround the Jews. The soldiers having accordingly encircled them three deep, the Jews were struck dumb at the unexpected sight. Pilate, declaring that he would cut them down, should they refuse to admit the effigies of Caesar, nodded to the soldiers to draw their swords. The Jews, as if by concert, falling prostrate in a mass and offering their necks, cried out, that they would rather die than transgress their law. Pilate, astonished at the strength of their attachment to their religion, ordered the immediate removal of the effigies from Jerusalem.—He subsequently occasioned another tumult by expending the sacred treasure, called Corban, in the construction of an aqueduct. Indignant at this profanation, the populace, on his return to Jerusalem, collected with loud clamours about his tribunal. Having foreseen the tumult, he interspersed among the crowd his troops armed, and disguised in plain clothes; forbidding them to use their swords, but directing them to chastise the rioters with staves. He then gave the preconcerted signal from the tribunal; on which they beat the Jews so severely that many
perished from the blows, while numbers were trodden to death by their own party in the flight. Terrified at the fate of their friends, the multitude were silent." Pilate continued to oppress the Jews to such an extent, that at length, on their representations, Vitellius, then President of Syria, ordered him to Rome to answer for his conduct to the emperor.

We are now brought down to the reign of Caius Caligula, who was the first emperor that assailed the religion of the Jews. The following is an abstract of the account which Josephus gives of him and his proceedings. "To such an excess did Caius Cæsar abuse the favours of fortune, that he thought himself a god—willed to be called such—cut off from his country those of noblest blood—and extended his impiety even to the Jews. He accordingly despatched Petronius with an army to Jerusalem, to place his statues in the sanctuary, with orders, should the Jews refuse to admit them, to put all that opposed him to the sword, and enslave the rest of the nation. God, however, was not regardless of these commands. Petronius marched from Antioch towards Judea at the head of three legions, and a large body of Syrian auxiliaries. Among the Jews, meantime, one party could not credit the rumours of war; whilst another that believed them despaired of making any defence. But the terror quickly became universal, for the army was already at Ptolemais. The Jews now assembled in crowds, with their wives and children, in the plain near Ptolemais, and supplicated Petronius, primarily on behalf of their country's laws, and afterwards of themselves. 'If,' said they, 'thou art entirely resolved to bring this statue and erect it, do thou first kill us, and then do what thou hast resolved on; for, while we are alive, we cannot permit such things as are forbidden us to be done by the authority of our legislator, and by our forefathers' determination that such prohibitions are instances of virtue. We dare not by any means suffer ourselves to be so timorous as to transgress those laws, out of the fear of death, which God hath determined are for our advantage; and, if we fall into misfortunes we will bear them, in order to preserve our laws, as knowing that those who expose themselves to dangers, have good hope of escaping them; because God will stand on our side when, out of regard to him, we undergo afflictions, and sustain the uncertain turns of fortune. But, if we should submit to thee, we should be greatly reproached for our cowardice, as thereby showing ourselves ready to transgress our law; and we should incur the great anger of God also, who, even thyself being judge, is superior to Caius.' Yielding to their numbers, as well as to their entreaties, Petronius left his army and the statues in Ptolemais; and, proceeding into Galilee, and convening at Tiberias the mass of the people, with all those of distinction, he represented to them the power
of the Romans, the menaces of Cæsar, and further, the unreasonableness of their request; for when all the subject nations had, in every city, placed among their gods the effigies of Cæsar, that they alone should oppose such a proceeding, was little less than rebellion, and that aggravated by insult. They, on the other hand, alleged their law and national usages; and that it was not permitted them to set up any representation of God, much less of man, not only in the Temple, but even in any ordinary place throughout the country. To this Petronius replied; 'But is not the law of my master to be observed also by me? For, if I disobey him, and spare you, I shall perish justly. He who sent me, and not I, will levy war against you; for I myself, like you, am under his authority.' On this, the multitude with one voice cried out, that 'they were prepared to suffer, rather than that their law should be infringed.' Petronius, having allayed the clamour, rejoined—'Will you then war with Cæsar?' they answered—'For Cæsar, and the Roman people, twice a day do we sacrifice. But if he wishes to erect these effigies, he must first sacrifice the whole Jewish nation; and we now present ourselves, with our children and wives, ready for slaughter.' Astonishment and pity here seized the mind of Petronius at their exceeding sense of religion, and their unflinching readiness to die. He then dismissed them, leaving matters as they were. During the following days, collecting the nobles in private, and publicly convening the people, he now entreated, now advised, but more frequently threatened, enlarging on the power of the Romans, and the wrathful temper of Caius, and the necessity under which he himself lay. As they yielded, however, to no effort of his, and as he saw the country in danger of remaining unsown—for it was seed-time, and the people had continued fifty days idle—he at length called them together, and said: 'Better were it that I should endanger myself, than slay so many myriads only on account of their religious disposition towards God; for I shall either, God aiding me, prevail with Cæsar, and thus gladly save myself and you, or, should he be exasperated, I shall, for the lives of so many, cheerfully surrender my own.' He then dismissed the multitude, who invoked many blessings on him. And now did God show his presence to Petronius, and signify to him, that he would afford him his assistance in his whole designs; for he had no sooner finished the speech that he made to the Jews, than God sent down great showers of rain, contrary to human expectation; for that day was a clear day, and gave no sign by the appearance of the sky of any rain. Petronius immediately wrote to Cæsar, acquainting him with his expedition into Judea, and with the entreaties of the nation; adding, 'that unless he was prepared to destroy both the country and its inhabitants, it behoved him to forego his orders, and allow them to observe their
law; and that God who was their governor, had shown His power most evidently on their account, and that such a power of His as left no room for doubt about it. To this communication Caius returned an answer, couched in no very moderate terms, threatening Petronius with death, for being so tardy in executing his commands. It so happened, however, that those who carried these despatches were detained by tempestuous weather three months at sea, whilst others, announcing the demise of Caius, had a favourable voyage. Petronius accordingly received the letters on that subject seven-and-twenty days prior to those against himself. Whereupon he rejoiced at this coincidence as to the death of Caius, and admired God’s providence, who, without the least delay had given him a reward for the regard he had to the temple, and the assistance he afforded the Jews for escaping the dangers they were in.’

Tacitus alludes to Caligula’s attempt to place his statue in the temple in the following terms:—“In Tiberius’ reign the Jews were quiet; but afterwards they chose to take up arms rather than obey Caius Caesar, and set up his statue in the temple. This disturbance was terminated by the death of Caesar.” (Hist. v. 9.)

Josephus twice states, that Caligula reigned three years and eight months. This period at 365 days to a year, and 30 days to each of the odd months, gives 1335 days, which is one of the numbers connected with the half-week of fatality (Dan. 12; 12), and especially remarkable as being the measure of Daniel’s prophecies (see Vol. I: p. 332). This coincidence, together with the wish to bring each of the persecutions of the Church under the number of calamity, has probably led to the assignation of the mystical period of ‘3½ times,’ as the duration of this sojournings of the woman in the wilderness. Indeed, Josephus, speaking generally of Caligula’s reign, says, that ‘during it the Jews were greatly oppressed.’ But, it may also be observed, that, as some time must have elapsed before Claudius, on the intercession of Agrippa, issued his decree (Ant. XIV. v: 3) commanding, that ‘the Jews in all the world should be permitted to keep their ancient customs,’ it is probable, that, from Caligula’s first requiring to have Divine honours paid to him till the receipt of the decree of Claudius, there may have elapsed a period, sufficiently near to the demi-hebdomad, to allow of the latter being assigned as the duration of Caligula’s persecution. And it is observable, that this is the only instance, in which the least definite form of this mystical period is introduced, as though the object was to allow the greatest latitude here.

The suspension by Petronius of the emperor’s order, which proved under Providence the deliverance of the testifying Jews, may perhaps
have been had in view in the wings of the eagle, which bore the
woman to a place of safety.

DIV. 6. THE SERPENT'S RENEWED ATTEMPT FRUSTRATED BY THE EARTH:
the ruin of the Jewish polity temporarily averted by the long-suffering
of the Jews: A.D. 42 ss.

XII; 15–16. 840–45. And the serpent cast out of his mouth behind
the woman water as it were a river, that he might cause her to be swept
away by the river. And the earth helped the woman. And the earth
opened her mouth, and drank down the river, which the dragon cast out
of his mouth.

840. The serpent cast out of his mouth. This is merely a part of the
necessary machinery of symbolization, designed only to connect the
assailant with the assailed, and having nothing answering to it in the
real world. Means of annoyance or destruction are frequently repre-
sented as proceeding out of the mouth: see 1; 16: 2; 16: 9; 17:

841. Water as a river. “The overflowing of a river is generally a
symbol of the invasion of an army, as in Is. 8; 7 (“The Lord bringeth
up upon them the waters of the river, even the king of Assyria, &c.”):
28; 2 (“as a flood of mighty waters overflowing”): 59; 19: Je. 46
7, 8: 47; 2: Am. 9; 5: Na. 1; 8. And in Dan. 9; 26 flood is
immediately explained by war.” (Cla. Sym.) This may be true as
far as it goes; but such a symbol cannot rightly be limited to war.
Its signification must obviously be much more comprehensive, though
modified by the concomitant circumstances in each case. In this
instance it seems to be intended, that Satan, having been thwarted in
the bloodthirsty purposes of destruction, which he had planned as the
great dragon, has recourse as the serpent to other more subtle means,
less terrible in their immediate aspect, but not less calculated to effect
his object in the end. Sending a host of rapacious and cruel govern-
ors into a country, to grind down and tyrannize over the people,
would accord well this symbolization.

842. That he might cause her to be swept away by the river. In
accordance with the view just taken of the preceding clause, we may
interpret this as follows:—that he might drive the people into a
rebellion, which would end in their Church and nation being swept
from the face of the earth.

XII; 16. 843. The earth helped the woman. The earth, standing
symbolically for Judea, may represent the nation viewed civilly or
politically, while the woman symbolizes the same regarded ecclesiastic-
ally. Hence the generical purport of this clause will be, that the
state of political affairs in Judea favoured the escape of the Jewish
Church from immediate extinction. Stuart supposes, that ‘the power
The woman and dragon.

of the Romans, bearing with great force upon the Jews, and obliging them to seek their own safety, instead of pursuing schemes of vengeance upon Christians, is symbolized by the earth's helping the woman.' This interpretation makes the earth represent the Romans, the serpent the Jews, and the woman the Christian Church, in opposition in each instance to the plainest indications, and to Stuart's own interpretations elsewhere. In particular, it does not seem quite consistent with congruity, to make the woman represent the Christian Church here, after having at the outset taken her for the Jewish: though Stuart's view (which is as follows) may perhaps be deemed admissible. 'The woman is the church; not simply as Jewish, but in a more generic and theocratic sense—the people of God. This church, Jewish indeed (at the time of Christ's birth) in respect to rites and forms, but to become Christian after he had exercised his ministry in the midst of it, might well be represented here by the woman.'—Wherein the help given by the earth consisted is shown in the following clauses; and consequently from them the meaning may best be gathered.

844-5. And the earth opened her mouth, &c. If the flood represents a series of rapacious and tyrannical Governors sent forth by the Roman dragon, then the endurance for a time by the earth [Judea] of their cruelties and extortions would aptly answer to the earth's swallowing the flood. Satan's machinations would thus be thwarted for a season.

Historical application.—From the time of Caligula a succession of Procurators governed Judea, each of whom might be supposed to have tried to surpass those who preceded him in tyrannizing over the Jews, and labouring to drive them into rebellion. Claudius, indeed, at the commencement of his reign published an edict commanding, that the Jews should be permitted to follow their own customs unmolested; and in consequence, on the people of Doris carrying his statue into the Jewish synagogue, Petronius issued an injunction to the contrary, in which he required the magistrates 'to take care, that no handle be given for raising a sedition among the Jews; since the first object both of himself and of King Agrippa was, that the Jews should have no occasion given them of getting together under the plea of avenging themselves.' But the sentiments of Claudius towards Agrippa and the Jews seem to have soon undergone a change, probably in consequence of Agrippa's taking in hand to build very strong and high walls round Jerusalem. Being suspicious of his designs, Claudius commanded him to leave off building. He also 'commanded all Jews to depart from Rome,'—a clear indication of hostile feelings towards them. On Agrippa's death the soldiers, who formed the Roman garrison at Cesarea, grossly abused his daughters; and these, says Joe-
phasis,' being allowed to remain in Judea still, were the very men that became the source of great calamities to the Jews in after-times, and sowed the seeds of that war, which began under Florus.'

Fadus was appointed Procurator of Judea in place of Herod. He entered on the government with prepossessions against the Jews, and the first act of his administration manifested the hostile sentiments entertained by the emperor. 'In consequence of the orders he had received, he required the chief-priests to deposit the sacred vestments, in which the High Priest officiated, in the tower of Antonia, that they might be in the power of the Romans. The Jews did not dare to refuse compliance. But they petitioned Fadus, and Longinus (who had come to Jerusalem with a large army, in expectation that the demand of Fadus would drive the Jews to rebel), to allow them first to petition Claudius to be allowed to retain the sacred garments.' Claudius granted their petition; and thus for a time the spirit of rebellion, which was being excited, was allayed. About this time, too, severe and protracted famines tended to keep down the spirit of the Jewish nation: and thus proved one means by which the earth swallowed up the flood out of the dragon's mouth.

'Under Cumanus however,' says the historian, 'fresh disturbances broke out. The occasion was this. At the feast of unleavened bread, while the services were going on at the temple, a soldier of the Roman cohort on guard indecently exposed his person towards the assembled multitude, addressing them in language corresponding to the gesture. Fired with indignation at this insult, the people began to cry out, that this impious action was not done to reproach them, but God himself. A tumult ensued, in which more than 10,000 of the Jews perished. Continual commotions followed, occasioned more or less by the harshness or remissness of the Roman Governor. On one occasion, a tumult arose in consequence of a soldier having burnt a copy of the Law, with every indignity he could offer to it. On another the magistrates of Jerusalem, clothed in sackcloth, and scattering ashes on their heads, ran out of the town, and implored the people to return home, and not incense the Romans against Jerusalem; to pity their country and the temple, their own children and wives. Prevailed on by their remonstrances, the people were induced to disperse. Representations were then made to Quadratus, the President, that Cumanus was responsible for all that had occurred, having allowed himself to be induced by bribes to suffer the most atrocious crimes to go unpunished. Nevertheless, Quadratus marched to Cæsarea, and ordered all Cumanus's prisoners to be crucified. He also put others to death, and sent many of the chief men among the Jews, together with Cumanus, to Rome to answer for their conduct to Claudius.'
Cumanus was banished,—a clear proof how iniquitous had been his administration.

Felix was sent to supply his place. But the change was not for the better. "Felix," says Tacitus (Ann. xii ; 54), "added fuel to the Jews' disaffection by unseasonable remedies." And Josephus states, that 'the affairs of the Jews grew worse and worse continually.' Now sprang up the band of assassins called Sicarii, one of whose first crimes was the assassination, at the instigation of Felix, of the High Priest Jonathan. 'Many false prophets, too, arose; and seduced many, by promises of deliverance from the Romans, to take up arms. Meanwhile the greatest disorders were allowed to prevail in Jerusalem; and the functions of the government were wholly abandoned. Felix was now recalled; and the principal of the Jewish inhabitants went to Rome to accuse him. He would certainly have been brought to punishment, but that Nero yielded to the solicitations of his brother Pallas. Nero was also prevailed upon by bribes to disannul that equality of the Jewish privileges of citizens, which they had hitherto enjoyed; and this became an occasion of the miseries that subsequently befell our nation.'

 Festus dying soon after he had assumed the government, Albinus was appointed to succeed him. "There was no species of enormity, which he did not commit. Not only in his official capacity did he purloin and pillage the property of individuals; not only did he burthen the whole nation with imposts; but such as had been thrown into prison for robbery, either by their respective magistrates, or by former procurators, he allowed their relatives to ransom; and he alone, who would give nothing, was left incarcerated as a malefactor. At this period the audacity of the malcontents in Jerusalem received a new impetus, their leaders having by means of money obtained license from Albinus to proceed with impunity in their seditious practices. That portion of the populace, whose element was disturbance, united with those who were in correspondence with Albinus; and these ruffians, severally surrounded by their own bands, figured among them as brigand chiefs, or tyrants, employing their satellites for the plunder of the peaceably disposed. Hence it occurred, that those who were deprived of their property were silent, too much reason though they had to complain; while those as yet exempted from violence, through fear of similar ill-treatment, cringed to him who merited punishment. In a word, none ventured to speak their mind, beset as they were on every side by tyrants; and the seeds of future capture were, from that date, sown in the city."

"But, though such was Albinus, the conduct of Gessius Florus, his successor, exhibited him as being in comparison a man of the highest probity. Albinus was for the most part private in his villanies, and
perpetrated them with dissimulation: Gessius, on the contrary, made an ostentatious display of his outrages against the nation. And, as if a public executioner commissioned to carry the law into effect against criminals condemned already, he committed every species of rapine and severity. In a case which called for compassion, he was cruel in the extreme: while in matters of turpitude he was devoid of shame. In smothering the truth, none was more successful; nor in devising artifices of deception were any more ingenious. To make gain of a single individual he deemed a trifle: he despoiled whole cities, ruined populous communities, and did all but proclaim throughout the country, that everyone was at liberty to rob, provided he might share in the plunder. Through his avarice, accordingly, it occurred, that entire districts were reduced to desolation. No bounds were set to the miseries of the nation; but the unhappy Jews, when they were not able to bear the devastations which the robbers made among them, were all under a necessity of leaving their own habitations, and of flying away, as hoping to dwell more easily anywhere else in the world among foreigners than in their own country. And what need I say any more on this head? since it was this Florus who necessitated us to take up arms against the Romans, while we thought it better to be destroyed at once than by little and little."

The historian goes on to show, how Florus used every means he could devise to drive the Jews to rebel. "Fired with rage," says Josephus, "at the Jews denouncing him to Cestius the President as the bane of the country, Florus laid his plans for involving the nation in war;—the sole hope he had of concealing his atrocities. For, should peace continue, he expected the Jews to accuse him before Caesar; but could he bring about a revolt, the greater calamity would, he trusted, divert their attention from the less. In order, therefore, that he might drive the nation into rebellion, he daily aggravated their sufferings." Josephus goes on to give instances in illustration. At Cæsarea various expedients having been used to annoy the Jews in their worship, and all other means of obtaining redress failing them, they attempted to influence Florus by a large bribe. He took the bribe, but afforded them no redress. On the next day, being the Sabbath, a new and greater insult was offered to them, while assembled in the synagogue. On an appeal being made to Florus, he seized the deputation, and put them in chains. "Indignant as were the inhabitants of Jerusalem at this, they yet restrained their feelings; while Florus, as if he had hired himself out for this special object, fanned the flame of war; and sending to the temple-treasury, withdrew seventeen talents under pretence of Caesar's service. The people being thrown into a ferment by this outrage, he marched to Jerusalem
to pillage the city. Anxious to shame him from this purpose, the people met the troops with acclamations, and prepared to receive him with obsequious attentions. But he returned only revilings and taunts, telling them that, if they were not cowards, it became them to approve their love of liberty, not only in words, but in arms. Having taken up his quarters in the palace, he ordered his troops to plunder the market, and to kill all they met with. In consequence they broke into every house, and massacred the inmates. Fugitives crowded the streets: all seized were slaughtered: and every species of rapine was committed. Many of the moderate party were apprehended, and brought before Florus, who first scourged, and then crucified them. This calamity was rendered more grievous by the novel cruelty of the Romans. For, what no one had ever before attempted, Florus then ventured on, namely, to scourge and crucify in front of the tribunal men of equestrian rank, who, though of Jewish extraction, enjoyed that Roman dignity. And when Bernice appeared barefoot before his tribunal, and implored him to put a stop to the slaughter, she was not only treated disrespectfully, but narrowly escaped with life.

'The next day the multitude being goaded to madness, crowded to the market-place, uttering invectives against Florus. Nevertheless, when the leading men and the chief-priests, rending their garments, implored them to forbear, they at once complied. Florus however, chagrined at the cessation of the disturbance, and labouring to renew it, required the people to go and meet two cohorts of soldiers, who were then on their march to Jerusalem. At the same time, he sent orders in advance to the soldiers not to return their salute, and to be ready on the first occasion to use their arms. Only by the most urgent representations and entreaties of the chief priests could the people be prevailed on to comply with the demand of Florus. And on their compliance the result contemplated by him ensued. The soldiers fell upon them, and beat and slew numbers. Then the people could no longer be restrained; but, rising in a mass, they cut off the communication between the tower of Antonia and the Temple. Florus now, with a view of furnishing fresh matter for hostilities, wrote to Cestius, falsely accusing the Jews of revolt, charging them with the very excesses from which they had themselves been the sufferers.' And now he had fully attained his object. For the cup of tyranny being full to overflowing, the war broke out in earnest, and the doom of the Jewish nation was sealed.

The foregoing abstract of Josephus's account of the causes, which led to the last Jewish war, clearly establishes the following points:—that the war was occasioned by the tyrannies of the successive Procurators, who were sent by the Roman emperors to rule over the Jews:—that, towards the last, these tyrannies were systematically
resorted to with the express object of provoking the nation to rise in rebellion, in order to ensure its destruction—that the people for a considerable period endured the insults to their religion, and the cruelties practised on themselves, with the most exemplary patience and forbearance—that this long-suffering averted for a time the ruin of the Jewish Church and polity—and that the main, or (it may be said) the sole cause of the war was the zeal of the Jews for the honour of Jehovah. Hence—to speak only in reference to the verse under consideration—it is shown how the nation, by its forbearance in swallowing down as it were the flood of oppressions vomited by the Roman dragon, afforded succour to and prolonged the existence for a time of the ancient Church.


XII; 17. 846—848. And the dragon was enraged against the woman. And he went off to make war with the rest of her seed, who keep the commandments of God, and hold the testifying of Jesus.

846. The dragon was enraged. The meaning is doubtless identical with that of the phrase in the trumpet-syllabus (769); “The nations,” i.e. the heathen, “were enraged.”—Against the woman. It must be remembered, that the heathen made no practical distinction between Jews and Christians; but regarded the latter as being a sect of the former.

847. The phrase to make war is a technical one, as may be gathered from the various places in which it occurs: cp. 11: 7: 13; 7: 16; 14: 17; 14: 19; 19. Hence it is not to be taken literally, but in that wide and comprehensive sense which is appropriate to mystical phrases. So that it would include any kind of attack on God’s people, whether in the nature of a persecution or of an ordinary war. An important change in the object of the dragon’s attack is to be observed here; and to which the introductory expression he went off seems intended to call attention, as well as to indicate a change in the locality. It is not upon the woman, but upon the rest, or remnants, of her seed, that he makes war. Inasmuch as the clauses which follow this phrase are explanatory of it, we shall best ascertain its precise meaning in considering those clauses. But we may here remark, that, while the thing signified cannot be wholly identical with that denoted by the son of the woman (as the difference of the term made use of shows), yet as both are the seed of the woman, they must be substantially the same.

848. Who keep &c. The last clause leaves no room for doubt, that Christians are included in the parties spoken of. Cp. ve. 11: also 1; 2, 9: 11; 7: 14; 12: 19; 10. When Christians were brought before
Synoptical interpretation.

heathen tribunals, and they refused to renounce their religion and anathematize Christ, they were said to hold fast the testifying of Jesus, that is, the testimony which Jesus testified. The only question that can be raised is, whether they are exclusively had in view. Such may be the case, but I incline to think that it is not. The expression the remnants of her seed is wide enough to include Jews as well as Christians; and it seems to be, under the circumstances, specially appropriate to the former. And as the martyrs under the fifth seal, who were described as 'those who had been slain for the word of God,' were Jews; so may Jews be intended here by the clause, 'those who keep the commandments of God.'

In regular chronological order we have now been brought down to the epoch of what is called by early writers (e.g., by Lactantius and Tertullian) 'the first persecution,' that is to say, the persecution by Nero. And as Christians,—'the seed,' though not 'the son,' of the woman, are undeniably included in the number of those against whom the dragonic serpent wages this war, we cannot hesitate to conclude, that that persecution by the δεινός δράκος, the terrible serpent (as Nero is called in the Sibylline Oracles, Bk. V: A.D. 100) is immediately had in view. But as the expressions used are such as to lead us to suppose, that the symbolism was intended to have a wider range, we may venture to think it probable, that the war which Nero waged against the Jews is also adverted to. As both of these will come under consideration in the more detailed symbolizations relating to them in C. 13, we need not dwell on them here.—Stuart refers the whole of vv. 13-17 to Nero's persecution of the Christian Church. But no consistency of interpretation can be maintained on this view. For instance: the woman, who at the beginning of the chapter is taken to be a symbol of the Jewish Church, at the end of it is made to symbolize the Christian Church.

Synoptical interpretation of the first heptadal tableau of the seventh trumpet. XII; 1. The Church of God (which at the era of this trumpet, namely, the birth of Christ, is necessarily under its Jewish division) is first brought to view. She is depicted as radiant in the Evangelic beams of the Saviour's righteousness, with which she is clad as in a glorious robe; as further illuminated by the holiness, which the Law enjoins, and which the Spirit produces as the necessary result of being endued with the robe of Christ's righteousness; and as being crowned with the victor's crown, ornamented with twelve stars, which at this epoch must represent the Patriarchs of the Law. 2. This Church, the Church of the Law, is represented as being in the very act of giving birth to another, which is to take her place. And of these two Churches Mary and Jesus are personi-
fications. 3. A second sign brings to view the great and cruel enemy of the Church of God,—the heathen power of imperial and despotic Rome, as wielded by the dynasty of Cæsars, and actuated by Satan. 4. The first act of this power is, by means of its Idumean tail, to sweep from their high eminence many of the chief rulers in Church and State. 5. As soon as the Church of 'the Son' (the real first-born conceived from the beginning), which stood to the Jewish Church in the relation of the sun to the moon, of the male to the female, in respect of pre-eminence, and which was about through its pastoral instructions to rule with absolute sway over the heathen,—as soon as this Church was brought into the world in the person of 'the only-begotten Son of God,' it was taken under the special protection of Divine Providence, in order that it might be preserved from the wiles of the devil and the machinations of its enemies. 6. Meanwhile the ancient Church lapsed more and more into a state of barrenness, spiritual destitution, and external adversity; though she was preserved under it during the time appointed by God. Of this providential care of the one and preservation of the other, during their destined period of conjoint testifying in affliction, the circumstances attending the flight of Mary and Jesus into the ancient house of bondage, and their residence there for 3½ years, formed a lively type and individualization. 7. At the time of the ministries of John the Baptist and Jesus the Christ, the great conflict between the powers of light and of darkness, between Christ, the God-man Mediator of the new Covenant, and Satan and his angels,—the conflict which had begun at the incarnation, attained its climax. This conflict was both civil and spiritual; and, in order to give Satan spiritual advantages in respect of the latter (so that the Saviour's triumph might be more complete and glorious), he was permitted during this period to exercise extra-ordinary power over the bodies and the souls of men. 8. But the result of the contest was, that he was ignominiously defeated, and driven from the vantage-ground, which he had hitherto occupied. 9. Despite all the force of calumny and persecution, which as 'the roaring lion' he could use to terrify, and all the deceitful machinations and false accusations, which as 'the deceiver of the whole world' he could devise to seduce, 'his head was bruised' by a deadly blow from the cross, by means of which he had succeeded in wounding the Saviour, but only as to his 'heal.' 10–11. To celebrate this victory of the Lamb, the 'great multitude' of those who in former times (and that through his merits, though they had not personally known him)—those who had been admitted into a state of 'rest' and 'peace,' burst forth in a song of praise and thanksgiving, attributing to his blood and the constraining power of his cross, that his servants were enabled
to hold firmly to their testimony, even unto death, so as to secure the victor's crown, and be made fellow-partakers in the coming deliverance and the kingdom of God and of Christ,—the necessary sequel of the defeat and downfall of the unwearying accuser of the saints. 12. They call on all believers in 'the Son,' whether on earth or in Paradise, to join in exultation: and they announce coming woes on Judea and heathendom from the extra-ordinary power accorded to the devil for an appointed but a limited season. 13. No sooner had Satan recovered, as from the stunning blow which had hurled him from heaven to earth, than he forthwith instigated his warlike agent, the imperial power of heathen Rome, now administered by the cruel Caligula, to commence a persecution against the Church of God. Accordingly, the tyrant issued his mandate, that a statue of himself should be placed in the temple of the Lord, and be honoured as God: and, on the refusal of the Jews to admit it, he sent large forces with orders to carry fire and sword through the land, and to set up his 'image' at any cost, even though the lives of all the inhabitants of the land should become a sacrifice as it were on his altar. 14. But a special providential care was extended over the Jewish Church (depraved and fallen though she was) in this her faithful testifying for Jehovah. The Lord once again 'bore her on eagle's wings' through her trials, and protected her from her wily adversary during this emperor's reign, which was terminated at the end of 3½ years: A.D. 37-41. 15–16. Satan next prompted successive Governors of Judea to pursue a course of conduct calculated to drive the people into a rebellion, which might lead to the destruction of their 'place and nation;' but their endurance of the tyrannical inflictions for a time frustrated his schemes. 17. Then Satan was still more incensed against the Church. And he instigated another limb of his, 'the terrible serpent' Nero, to wage war upon those who were 'the woman's seed.' First, he set on foot a persecution against those who upheld the testifying of Jesus. Next, he directed his arms against the Jews, on account of their persisting in keeping the commandments of God, and refusing to render to Caesar the homage which was due to Jehovah alone.

Miscellaneous interpretations.—1st. Of the Woman. The Christian Church [Hippolytus, Methodius, Tichonius, Andreas, Joachim, Daubuz, Pyle]. The Church of the Patriarchs, Prophets, and Apostles [Victorinus, Augustine]. The V. Mary in Egypt [Arethas, Berengaud, Parens]. The true Church [Luther, Bullinger, Foxe, Faber, Lee, Cuninghame, Elliott]. The Church in the last days [Ribeira]. The primitive Christian Church [Jenour]. The Jewish people [Burgh, Todd]. The Church in pagan and papal times [Croly].—2dly. Of the Dragon. Satan simply [Most Commentators]. Paganism [Eusebius,

Before passing on to the next heptad, it will be proper, that I should call the reader's special attention to the epoch at which, in the orderly chronological evolution of the Vision, we have now arrived. I consider, that we are here at the time present of the author, that is, at the date of the composition of the Apocalypse. And this is obviously a turning-point in the vision. Not only so; but it is one, which the author has, if I mistake not, emphatically marked out by the introduction of technical breaks in those places, in which the occasion required or admitted of such an indication of parallelism. Of the seven synchronizing tableaux contained in the seventh trumpet, the first,—the one before us, did not admit of such a break; because it only reaches down to, but does not pass beyond the time present. The two last, again, contained in Cs. 18 and 19, did not admit of breaks; because they are to be regarded as commencing after the date of writing. But the four intermediate heptads (Cs. 13, 14, 15–16, 17) are severally divided at the epoch of the time present by the interposition of an interlude, which, while it has a special appropriateness to the series to which it belongs, serves also to mark a parallelism with those in the other series; and it thus indicates an arrival at the same chronological epoch. The interludes to which I allude are contained in Cs. 13; 9–10: 14; 13: 16; 15: 17; 9–10. Now it will be obvious, that, if I am right in supposing, that the matter which precedes these has reference to the past, and that that which follows them relates to the future of the author, there may be all the difference in the world in respect of the interpretation of the two portions. As to the real meaning of the former, at least in the main, there ought to be no room for doubt, when once the true inter-
The interpretation from the author's present.

pretation has been hit upon. But as to that of the latter, the case may be very different. Divers opinions may be entertained; and in particular two opposite schemes of interpretation may be advocated, one of them compatible, the other incompatible with the inspiration of the book. The general character of the views maintained under the latter would be as follows.—The author's vaticinations are such as these. The Roman armies would speedily be gathered together to make a final assault on God's people (14:20:19; 19). At the last moment the Lord would visibly appear, attended by the hosts of heaven (14:14:19; 11-16); and with the breath of His mouth would hurl into perdition all the enemies of His people, and destroy those who were destroying Judea (14:17-20:19; 11-21:17; 11-15:11; 18). He would then avenge His people, first on Rome herself, as the head-quarters of the beast and of heathenism, next on the Roman state proper, and lastly on the Roman empire in its widest extent, all of which would be utterly destroyed (18:1-24:17; 16-18:16; 17-21). Judea, too, would be the theatre of His judgments, in so far as that there also He would root out all the adversaries of his saints, that is, all those, whether Jews or heathens, who had been willing 'to worship the beast,' or to persecute His people (14:14-20). Finally, he would bind Satan, so as to restrain him from tempting His servants any more, or inducing the nations of the earth to molest them (20:1-3). Having thus put all enemies under his feet, He would appear in glory on Mount Zion, attended by a retinue of the martyrs, who had suffered for His name's sake (14:1-4). On these He would confer crowns and thrones, and constitute them assessors in the pre-millennial judgment, which He would proceed to hold. In this judgment a preferential life and reign with Christ over the nations of the earth, in a Paradisiacal state of bliss, would be awarded to all the confessors of His name. This reign would last for 1000 years, during which the rest of the righteous dead would remain in the state of rest in Hades, and the wicked in torments (20:4-6). At the expiration of the thousand years, Satan would be permitted to incite the inhabitants of the distant parts of the earth to march from every quarter to attack the central city of the righteous. They would encompass the kingdom of Christ and his saints on every side. But then fire would come forth from heaven, and destroy them; and their leader, Satan, would be consigned to final perdition. The judgment of the great body of the righteous, and of all the wicked, would immediately take place, wherein the former would be sentenced to the fulness of bliss, and the latter to the fulness of misery. After this, a reconstitution of the state of things on earth would supervene. All the righteous, who had been appointed to receive crowns and thrones in the two previous judgments, would be
constituted a kingdom of heaven on earth. There they would exist for ever, free from all sin and misery, and in the enjoyment of the highest honours and happiness, and of the manifested presence of God and the Lamb: while the surrounding nations and their kings would render to them tribute and homage.—Such a scheme of interpretation as the foregoing is obviously incompatible with the inspiration of the book; and, as I am not prepared to surrender the doctrine of its Divine origin, it will be incumbent on me to offer a scheme, which, while it is consistent with the maintenance of that doctrine, may be deemed worthy of reception. This I shall aim to do, as we proceed.


Introductory remarks. This heptad is parallel to the first, inasmuch as it relates generally to the same period; but this refers more to the concluding part of the period, and that to the earlier; and this regards the conflict of heathenism with the truth from a somewhat different point of view to that.

The demonstration which I have made in the Guide, Chs. II. and III., of the chief epochs and synthetical structure of the Apocalypse absolutely excludes the popular application of the prophecy to papal Rome. On this account, and also because it is not my wish to make the present work unduly polemical, I shall not enter at length into the arguments for or against the anti-papistical interpretation of the two beasts of this chapter; but will content myself with merely mentioning here (as supplemental to the arguments advanced in Vol. I. p. 5) the heads of the leading general reasons for believing, that it is pagan Rome that it had in view. The question is fully discussed in the works of Stuart and Hengstenberg, from which I shall take such arguments as appear to me to be valid and sufficient.

1. 'The apparent object and tenor of the book lead to this belief.' Evils then present and pressing called it forth; and it must have been adapted to meet the exigencies, which gave occasion for it.

2. Interpretations of the kind referred to are opposed to the general tenor of prophecy, which in reference to distant ages is always generic, and not like this specific.

3. 'The characteristics of the two beasts are such as to constrain us to apply them to heathen and idolatrous worship, and not to degenerate Christianity.' The no pius ultra of heathenish idolatry is depicted in Cs. 13 and 17; while the worst that can be said of Romanism is, that it is a quasi or half-way sort of idolatry. The first beast, according to
The two beasts: the first.

ve. 2, is an instrument of the dragon or Satan. But the papacy was never regarded as a purely Satanic institution. On the contrary, its baptism and its orders are recognised as valid modes of admission into the Church and the ministry. Other illustrations of this argument will appear in the course of exposition.

4. 'The explanation in C. 17; 9–17 settles the question beyond reasonable doubt.'

5. The immense chronological break, as compared with the plain reference in C. 12; 1–6 to Christ's infancy, which this theory involves, is a strong argument against it.

6. The precedents in Daniel relate to a heathen and avowedly God-opposing power; and hence, if these beasts represented a Christian and professedly God-serving Church, utter confusion would be introduced into the symbolism of the Scriptures.

Hengstenberg advances sundry arguments against the view, that 'the beast is the anti-Christian worldly power of Rome,'—that 'his seven heads represent the seven first emperors,'—and that 'Nero in particular is the beast and his eighth head.' In reference to these I will only remark here, that, being directed against the theories of Ewald and Lücke, they apply for the most part to them only; and that, in so far as they bear on my view, they derive any weight they may be thought to possess (e.g., his remarks on what is meant by 'blasphemy' and 'names of blasphemy') from viewing the matter with the eye of a modern, and not of a contemporary of the writer. His several arguments will be met, so far as appears to be necessary, in the several places on which they are based.

DIV. I. THE FIRST BEAST: DESCRIPTION OF HIM. Marks to identify the Cæsarian beast in general, and the Julian dynasty in particular.

XII; 18: XIII; 1–2. 849–867. And I stood on the sand of the sea. And I beheld a wild-beast coming up out of the sea, having ten horns and seven heads; and upon his horns ten diadems, and upon his heads names of blasphemy. And the wild-beast which I beheld was like a panther, and his feet as it were a bear's, and his mouth as it were a lion's mouth. And the dragon gave him his (the dragon's) might, and his throne, and great authority.

849. I stood or was stationed. There is an important variation of reading, which has arisen either from the insertion or from the omission of a final letter (according as one or other word was the original reading), and which has the effect of making the text read he (i.e., the dragon) stood. If this be the genuine reading, the clause will connect with the preceding context: and accordingly it is found in the received Greek text, as forming an 18th ve. in Ch. 12. It will be proper in the first place to inquire, what grounds there are for
regarding the one or the other to be the genuine reading. And first as to the MSS. authority for each. Tregelles, who professes to be governed solely by ‘the most ancient authorities,’ has; he stood. And Victorinus evidently read he stood. But Griesbach, Scholz, Hengstenberg, and the generality of critics consider I stood to be the best authenticated reading. So that we may say; ‘In the judgment of the majority of critics I stood is to be preferred.’ All other considerations appear to confirm this conclusion. It is much more probable, that a letter would be overlooked, than that one would be erroneously inserted (cp. on 875). Again, the connexion with the context will be seen to be very unnatural, if the clause be read as he stood after what precedes. The reader is led to expect, that something will result from the dragon’s so standing; but he finds himself brought to an abrupt stop, nothing more being said about the dragon, except that he gives his power to the beast, but this is mentioned only incidentally, and neither required the statement, that the dragon stood on the sea-shore, nor serves to satisfy the expectation raised by it. If, on the other hand, I stood be read in conjunction with the adjoining context, all will be found natural and easy. It would be quite natural, that mention should be made of the seer’s being in a suitable position for seeing so important a symbol, and taking note of all its details; and quite congruous, that to behold an emergence from the sea he should be placed on the sea-shore. Indeed, so intimate is the connexion then, that this clause may be (as it is in the A. V.) thrown into one sentence with the next verse. Moreover, as it was implied but not stated in C. 10; 8, that the seer was on the shore, when he was last brought to view, as taking the opened roll from the angel, who was standing on the sea and land, it was appropriate, that the reader should be reminded of this, or have all doubt on the point removed by its being said, I was stationed. If, again, we advert to the connexion in respect of the real history, he stood will not be found to suit it so well as I stood. If my view of the application be well founded, we are brought at the end of C. 12 down to Nero’s time, and now at the beginning of C. 13 we shall be seen to start from Caligula’s, if I should not rather say, from Julius Caesar’s reign. But it would not appear to be quite consistent with this view, that one of the actors should remain on the scene from one tableau to the other; since his doing so would seem to imply a continuous chronological narrative. Once more, the precedents make it almost certain, that one of the phrases, “the dragon” or “the serpent,” would have been introduced here, if the dragon had been spoken of; since one or other is invariably used at the commencement of every new sentence or paragraph: see C. 12; 4, 7, 9, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17. Again, in Da. Cs. 8 and 10 the seer sees his visions by the side of
waters; and it is most probable, that John would follow these prece-
dents here, since he does so elsewhere. On every account, then, I
conclude, that I stood is the reading to be preferred.—Comparing
Chapter 20; 8, the place of standing and the beast's treading on
the sand of the sea in his emergence may perhaps be thought to
denote, that the power symbolized ruled over peoples, 'the number
of whomwasasands of the sea.'—Elliott makes the sea to be
identical with the river, which the dragon cast out of his mouth.
But a sea and a river have totally different symbolical significations
(see Vol. I: p. 11). Moreover, in C. 12; 15 the river denotes, so far
as appears from the symbolization, only a means of destruction gener-
ally; and what the particular character of the means is can be learnt
only from the history. Elliott's interpretation is plainly an adapta-
tion to his scheme. "Mr Elliott," says Barker, "prolongs the
river's existence for special ends of his own; viz., that the beast may
rise out of it, just as Popery arose out of the flood of Arian Gotha.
But Greek is a stubborn language, and a river is not a sea in it, any
more than in English; nor ever will be."

XIII; 1. 850. A wild-beast. Before proceeding to consider this
particular beast, it will be proper to speak of the meaning of a sym-
boric beast in the abstract. Θήρα, a wild beast stands opposed to
λιον, a living creature (see on No. 306), and also to τερατος, 
domesticated quadrupeds (Acts 10; 12). As an entire animal it
denotes a corporate body (see Vol. I: p. 18). As to the particular
kind of body:—that it is a kingdom in its civil aspect under a succe-
sion of one (13; 11 ss.: 19; 19, 20: Dan. 7; 4, 5, 11: 8; 4) or more
kings or dynasties (13; 1, &c.: 14; 9, 11: 16; 13: 17; 3, &c.: Dan.
7; 6, 7, 19, 23), all the texts in which it is found show. —And
further, that a wild beast, by reason of its savage nature, symbolizes
a power of darkness under Satan's dominion, that is, a heathen power,
hostile to the Lamb, and oppressing his servants, is evident from every
place in which the word occurs. See on 726.—This, like other
corporate symbols, is sometimes individualized, and applied specially
to denote one particular member of the series, distinguished either as
the founder of the dynasty or kingdom (13; 11: Dan. 7; 17), or by
some special manifestation of hostility (13; 3, 4, 5: 17; 8, 11): see
Vol. I: p. 452. And it may be observed, that early Christian writers
appear to have commonly designated persecuting emperors as 'wild
beasts.' For example, Lactantius calls Nero "a vile beast:" and he
speaks of Diocletian and his persecuting colleagues as "those most
savage beasts." Julian, too, stigmatizes Caligula, Galba, Otho,
Vitellius, and Domitian, as "wild beasts."—The model of the beast,
before us is to be found in Dan. 7, where four great beasts are seen
by the prophet. As the fourth of these is commonly said to be
identical in signification with this Apocalyptic beast, it will be proper briefly to inquire here, whether such is the case. Now, the first of Daniel’s beasts was like a lion, the second like a bear, the third like a panther, the fourth diverse from the rest and had ten horns. The four came up from the sea, and had among them seven heads and ten horns. The Apocalyptic beast, likewise, came up from the sea: he had seven heads and ten horns, and was like a panther, having the bear’s feet, and the lion’s mouth. Apart from all interpretation, what would seem to be the natural inference from these correspondencies between the symbols? Clearly, not that John’s beast is identical with Daniel’s fourth, but with Daniel’s four, if any identity at all exist between them. But it is manifest, that John’s single beast cannot be identical with Daniel’s four. And consequently we must seek for some other reason than identity to account for the points of resemblance. And where else can it be found but in the view, that the Apocalyptic beast was designed to symbolize a wholly different power, but at the same time one combining in itself all the evil qualities of the four of Daniel’s Vision? We have already met with an instance (see Vol. I: pp. 397–8) of Rome being represented as concentrating in herself all the hateful qualities of the four previous kingdoms: and this circumstance might alone suffice to recommend this view. The differences observable between John’s beast and Daniel’s fourth also show, that there can be no identity between them. So far, then, as the symbols themselves go, it appears to be most unquestionable, that different powers must be symbolized. Any arguments to the contrary must be drawn from the expositor’s own scheme, and not from the symbolizations. Such, so far as they are worthy of notice, will be refuted in the course of exposition, though what has been said in Vol. I: pp. 50–52, 313 ss., 316, might well suffice. As to the points of resemblance in the details relating to one member of each of the two beasts (see Vol. I: p. 50), they are not more, nor more striking, than I have shown in Vol. I: p. 51, to exist between the Babylon of the old prophets, and the Babylon of John. If, then, no one advances these parallelisms as a proof, that the same city and state is denoted by the two Babylons, neither can those which exist between the two beasts be rightly alleged to prove identity between them (see Vol. I: p. 52).—Before I leave this topic, however, there is an apparent corroboration of my view, to which I would wish to direct attention. It may be observed, that the order of the descriptive particulars of the beasts, which correspond in Daniel and in the Apocalypse, is inverted in the latter, in which the order is panther, bear, lion. Why has this regular inversion been made, if not to intimate, that the power symbolized in the Apocalypse, rose up in the opposite part of the world from that, in which Daniel’s first king-
dom had its origin; and, advancing in an opposite direction to the preceding kingdoms, extended its sway over their several territories in succession?—If, independently of the precedents, the general antipathy to a monarchical form of government, the change from a democratic form of many centuries' duration, and especially the extent to which all the powers and functions of government were concentrated in one person, be taken into account, it will not appear surprising, that both heathens and Jews should stigmatize the first emperors by the most opprobrious figures of speech, that they could devise. To refer, now, only to the last-mentioned cause for antipathy. "Under the appellation of Augustus, Octavianus was gradually allowed to unite the power of imperator or emperor, which rendered him the uncontrolled head of the executive and soldiery; of proconsul, which gave him the supremacy in any province he might visit; of tribune, rendering his person sacred, and giving him a veto in all public proceedings; of censor, or superintendent of manners; of supreme pontiff, or the head of religion; and lastly, he was endowed with a dispensing power from observing the laws, whenever he thought proper." When such powers as these came into the hands of a Tiberius, a Caligula, a Nero, or a Domitian, it is not strange, if the very name of emperor, Caesar, or king, became to the people a synonyme for everything that is detestable, or that a savage beast of prey was thought to be the most fitting emblem of such a ruler.—Coming up out of the sea. The sea, conceived of as agitated by tempestuous winds and in a state of restless fury (as in Da. 7; 2), is the habitat or territory of the heathen in general, and of the dominant world-power pro tem. in particular; and so the phrases are used, "the sea of peoples," "the restless world" (Hengstenberg, Bossuet, Michaelis, Havermick). The passage before us, especially as contrasted with the phrase the earth in ve. 11, is alone a sufficient proof of this. So, also, is the explanation given in Da. 7; 17. And in like manner in 4 Ezra 11 an eagle, which by Stuart and others is said to be 'a symbol of the same empire, the Roman,' is represented as coming out of the sea. And in Je. 51; 42 it is said; "The sea" (meaning a multitude of nations) "is come up upon Babylon." If, then, the sea symbolizes the heathen world generally, the beast from the sea will symbolize the dominant world-power. That that power was in this instance Rome, there is and can be no doubt. And the particulars which follow will prove, that, while there is a specific diversity, there is a generic identity between the dragon, and this and the other two beasts.—The beast being seen coming up denotes, that, at the epoch which the Vision in its evolution has reached (say A.D. 37, as will be seen from ve. 3), the kingdom symbolized comes into the prophetic narrative here, as the blaspheming and persecuting power. Rome came up origi-
nally as 'the great mountain,' that is, the hostile republican world-power, in B.C. 70 (see Vol. I: p. 351 ss). And afterwards in B.C. 48, as 'the wild beast,'—the despotic monarchical power (see Vol. I: p. 399); when Julius Caesar founded the empire, and when he first made the Jews pay tribute to Rome.

851. Having ten horns and seven heads: and not, as in the R. T., seven heads and ten horns. Emblematically a horn denotes power, and a head elevation; and hence symbolically the former a king, and the latter a mountain or a king. The coincidence of this statement with that in C. 12: 3 shows, that this beast is substantially identical with the dragon; while the inversion of its terms, as compared with 785, may be thought to intimate, that, as there the primary reference is to the power as theoretically resident in the seven hills of Rome, that is, in the Senate and people, so here it is as being really wielded by the imperial dynasty of the Caesars. How both the ten horns and the seven heads may represent one and the same dynasty, I will show on 889, and 1158. Suffice it here to state, that the first three Caesars (Julius, Augustus, and Tiberius) are adverted to in ve. 2: the fourth Caesar (Caligula) in ve. 3: the fifth (Claudius) in vv. 3–4: the sixth (Nero) in vv. 5–10. These are the first six horns. The seventh, eighth, and ninth Caesars are omitted from the detailed symbolization, as being only (as Suetonius calls them) "rebels;" but they correspond to the three next horns. Vespasian answers to the tenth horn. And the two ungrown horns of the second beast denote Titus and Domitian, the two last Caesars.

852. On his horns ten diadems. The diadem being the symbol of a tyrant, the allocation of these is a further indication (especially when the parallel statement in reference to the dragon is brought into contrast with this), that the despotic power is here regarded as being resident in the emperors. At the same time, the circumstance that the diadems are on the beast's horns, but on the dragon's heads, further indicates a substantial identity in the thing signified by the two animals.

853. On his heads names of blasphemy. Names, and not name (as in the R. T.) is the genuine reading.—As the dragon is specially the symbol of Satan, it might rather have been expected, that these would be found on his heads. Yet they are wholly omitted in respect of him. But this may easily be explained on the view just indicated. The dragon represents the military power of Rome, and the beasts the civil in the hands of the Caesars; and it was as civil rulers, that the emperors assumed titles and honours, which were blasphemous as arrogating the prerogatives of deity.—In order to apprehend rightly the purport of this statement, the reader should call to mind the comprehensive sense, in which the terms name and blasphemy are used in the N. T., and especially in the Apocalypse (see on 752 and
879). If they be used with so much latitude in the literal compositions of the N. T., how much more in the symbolical! We cannot err then, I think, in taking the phrase names of blasphemy to include every impiety, by which that honour which is due to God alone is transferred to man. I shall proceed to give some illustrations (more immediately appropriate to this place), which will show the applicability of this statement to the Caesars, reserving others till we come to the texts, which speak of worshipping the beast, and his image. For example, then:—Emperors generally were styled Divus and Dominus et Deus. The deification of the Caesars began with the first of them. Julius "pompa, templo, aras, simulacra juxta deos, pulvinar, Flaminem, Lupercos, appellationem mensis e suo nomine" (Suetonius, Julius, 76). "Augustus Deus... dum viveret, vocatus est, et divinus honoribus auctus" (Justin Martyr 49). See also Propert. iii; 4: Hor. Ep. ii; 1. Caligula took the title of Optimum maxim. (Sueton. Calig. 22). Nero was saluted as "The only eternal One." Domitian required to be styled "Dominus et Deus noster," and forbade "ne scripto quidam ac sermone cujusquam appellaretur aliter (Suetonius)."—"When," says St Jerome, "that which is temporal claims eternity, this is a name of blasphemy."—Vitrings has remarked on this clause; "Names and designations are meant, which are in the highest degree blasphemous, and insulting to the true God and his son Jesus Christ. For such is what we properly call blasphemy: it is a smaller crime to assume the honours and titles of imaginary deities." But there is no reason, why the smaller crime should not be included here as well as the greater. And, if we call to mind how sensitive were the Jews of this epoch on the subject of idolatry, and remember, that the author of this work had been born and bred a Jew, and that his work was primarily written for those who had been Jews, we shall have no difficulty in believing, that even a low degree of impiety might satisfy the statement. It must be remembered, too, that this phrase has reference to a series of kings, against whom the charge of blasphemy could necessarily be made only in different degrees. To the greater part it might be applicable only in the lower degree: to a few only "in the highest." There might be but two or three, whose conduct was similar to that of the king of Assyria, when "he reproached and blasphemed the living God," mocked all confidence in him, and "lifted up his eyes against the holy One of Israel" (Is. 36; 13 ss.: 37; 10 ss.); or whose audacious utterance was similar to Pharaoh’s, when, to the declaration of Jehovah; "I am the Lord," he made answer; "Who is the Lord, that I should hearken to his voice?" Yet, that such blasphemy as this was chargeable upon the Roman beast seems to be implied in this book. Jesus appears under his name Michael; ‘Who is like unto God?’: And
the adherents of the beast exclaim; 'Who is like unto the beast?'

"Rome and its emperor," says Hengstenberg, II: 15, "had already assumed the proud title of 'lord of the world,' but the blasphemy never reached its consummation, till this assumption came to be directed against God, his Son, and his church." This it was, when Caligula commanded, that his image should be placed in the temple of God, to be worshipped side by side with Jehovah,—when Nero persecuted God's people as such,—when he, and when Vespasian waged war upon God's ancient people, because they would not make compliances, which they believed to be derogatory to the honour of Jehovah,—and when, again, Domitian persecuted the disciples of Christ 'for His name's sake.' In this book Jesus claims to be "King of kings and Lord of lords;" and it is recorded of one, who may justly be considered to have been a member of the beast (as having been a member of the second Triumvirate, and consequently included in the period of the beast), that he conferred on each of his sons the title of 'King of kings and Lord of lords.'—It should be well observed, that these names of blasphemy are assigned, not to one only of the heads, but to the heads generally. Presentists will never be able to establish their applicability to the Kings, Consuls, &c., of ancient Rome to the satisfaction of any unbiased persons.

XIII; 2. 854. The beast was like a panther, that is, as to his body; for his feet and mouth are excepted; but there was no exception in the case of Daniel's third beast. Wemyss says (Cla. Sym.); "The symbolic character of the panther rests chiefly upon three of his distinguishing qualities, viz., cruelty (Is. 11; 6: Je. 5; 6: Ho. 13; 7), swiftness (Ha. 1; 8), and variety of skin (Je. 13; 23)." By these the thing signified is stigmatized as being, while beautiful to look upon, stealthy, cruel, and bloodthirsty in conduct, or (as Hengstenberg says) of "terrible and savage energy."

855. His feet as a bear's. In attacking a bear uses his fore-paws; and the power he possesses to crush them is well known. Cp. 2 Sa. 17; 8: Ho. 13; 8: Pro. 17; 12; "Let a bear, robbed of her whelps, &c.:" Pro. 28; 15; "As a roaring lion and a raging bear, so is a wicked ruler over the poor people." This last text may best indicate the idea, out of which this and the next symbolization originated.

856. His mouth as a lion's. This is the most striking emblem, that could be used to denote an irresistible power of tearing the flesh, and breaking the bones of a victim. Perhaps there is also an allusion to the lion's fearful roaring, which is "in itself one of the most terrible sounds in nature, and the sure prelude of destruction to whatever comes in his way." "The lion hath roared, who will not fear?" (Am. 3; 8). "The king's wrath is as the roaring of a lion" (Pro.
19; 12). "The lion is come up from his lair" (Je. 4; 7) was said of Nebuchadnezzar. And so Daniel's first beast, which represented Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom, and himself in particular, was 'like a lion.' In like manner, speaking probably of Nero, Paul said; "I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion" (2 Ti. 4; 17). And so, when Tiberius died, Maresias said to Agrippa; "The lion is dead."

857. The dragon gave him his might, and his throne, and great authority. The throne is without a shadow of reason omitted in the Vulgate.—The dragon's throne is the same with "Satan's throne" in C. 2; 13, which I have thereon shown to be located at Rome. The same throne is called in C. 16; 10 "the beast's throne." —It may be thought, that this fourth item, containing three particulars relative to the origin of the beast's power, has been added in some measure for the purpose of attaching to the beast's evil qualities the idea of universal comprehensiveness in their reach.—The dragon is, as I have shown, the symbol generically of the military power of Rome, and individually of Satan. And it was by means of the former, as is well known, that the Caesars obtained their civil authority in the state: an authority, which, from the detestation in which their rule was held as being a despotism, might well be regarded as proper to and conferred by the devil, "the God of this world,"—he who claimed (Lu. 4; 6) to have had all the power and glory of the kingdoms of this world placed at his disposal. Hence, as 'Satan's power is in a sense universal, that of the beast, his vicegerent, becomes universal. What the writer means to say is, that the power and dominion and authority of the beast were widely extended, like those of Satan, from whom they had been received.—So natural and easy is the interpretation now given of this clause, that it must, I think, be allowed to reflect a strong presumption in favour of my view, that the dragon and beast are meant to represent respectively the military and civil elements of the Roman empire.—From the circumstance of the dragon's being represented as giving his throne, &c. to the beast, some commentators have inferred, that the thing signified by the beast succeeded in the order of time to that symbolized by the dragon, the latter passing from the scene altogether. But this is an unwarrantable inference. One person may give power and honours to another without the least diminishing his own. The Father gives to the Son to sit on His throne, and the Son in like manner to those who conquer (3; 21), yet neither the Father nor the Son on that account vacate their thrones. So far is the dragon from yielding his place to the beast, because he endues the latter with his power, that in one sense he continues in existence, and in the possession of his power, long after the beast has gone into perdition (cp. C. 20; 2, 7, 10, with C. 19; 20). In truth, as the beast received his throne and authority
from the dragon at the first, so he remained to the last wholly dependent on the dragon for the continuance thereof: that is, the possession of the imperial authority by the Cæsars was obtained through, and maintained solely by the military power. Hence, those schemes, which have been based on the assumption of the beast’s succeeding the dragon, are clearly erroneous.

Summary application.—The empire located on the seven hills of Rome, and as limited to the dynasty of Cæsars, is here represented as a despotic world-power, raised up by Satan to be in antagonism to God and to God’s people. ‘By combining in one monster all the ferocious and powerful beasts, which Daniel had successively brought upon the scene as representatives of different empires, John has exhibited this empire as comprehending in itself all the elements of the terrible and the oppressive, which had existed in the aggregate in the great empires that preceded it, and as being equal in extent to all these united.’ Stuart. Having respect only to the outward symmetry and grandeur of the empire, it might be thought, that the imperial dynasty of the Cæsars formed the most excellent of governments; but experience of its true character showed it to be unrivalled for bestial ferocity, for boldness in seizing its victims (whether states or individuals), for power to crush them in its cruel embrace, and for strength to tear them with lion-like teeth.—Besides this delineation of the character of the thing signified as a whole, there is, I apprehend, a special application of the three particulars in the description of the beast to the first three Cæsars severally. Such a secondary reference will be confirmed in the sequel by its being shown to be necessary to the completeness of the dynastic details. Every precedent in Daniel, also, tends to establish it. There is scarcely a member of any one of Daniel’s symbolic beasts, which does not symbolize some particular king. So that I do not hesitate to say, that, if both a general and a particular reference of the three descriptive items be deemed inadmissible, the general rather than the particular must be given up.—In proceeding now to the elucidation of my view, I must first remind the reader (see Vol. I: p. 409), that, in the early times of the empire, there existed two modes of computing the Roman emperors, the one beginning with Julius Cæsar, the other with Augustus. To determine which was the correct mode of reckoning will not be necessary here. It is sufficient for my purpose to know that two computations did exist; and that one or the other might be adopted, as best suited the immediate object of the writer. John, I believe, availed himself of the alternative thus offered. In the present instance, designing to make out ‘the twelve Cæsars’ of Suetonius, he begins with Julius. With Julius, then, the comparison will begin. He is the portion of the beast ‘like to a panther.’ And the compari-
The two beasts: the first.

son is appropriate, inasmuch as he, like that beast, was treacherous, daring, unscrupulous, and quick and bold in his movements. Augustus, again, in respect of the strong grasp with which he seized the reins of empire, and the tenacious hold he kept upon them during so many years, completely stifling the republican constitution, might be aptly symbolized by 'the feet of a bear.' And in like manner the savage cruelty of Tiberius, in ruthlessely destroying so many of the chief men of Rome, is fitly represented by 'the mouth as a lion's:' and it is a curious coincidence, that Tiberius (as we have just seen) should have been designated as 'the lion' by a contemporary.—But why, it may be asked, should these three have been distinguished from the rest by being merged as it were in the beast as a whole? One reason may have been, that the first three Caesars were introduced merely for the sake of completeness, and in order to the better identification of the beast by the exhibition of the number twelve. They were not brought in individually; because the symbolic history was intended to treat formally only of those emperors, who were persecutors of God's people: and accordingly it begins with Caligula. The Julian beast began, indeed, to rise from the sea at Caesar's rise (and hence the symbolization is thrown back in the preceding trumpets, so as to trace the successive steps of his rise); but he comes into account as directly 'blasphemous' towards God, 'and a persecutor' of His people, only from the time of Caligula's claiming a place side by side with God in his own temple; and this will presently be seen to be indicated by the relation, in which vs. 2 stands to its context. Another reason for the difference may have been, to intimate a mode of computing, by which the apparent discrepancy, in respect of the same series of kings being represented by two different numbers, viz., seven heads, but ten horns, might be reconciled. While the first three emperors are reckoned as horns, they may be omitted in reckoning the heads; because they are had in view in the three details of the description of the beast; and because they do not come immediately and individually on the scene,—at least, not as members of the beast, nor in this period of crisis; for the detailed symbolization takes up the history (as I have observed) at the reign of Caligula. And thus the assignment of ten horns, and also of seven heads, to represent the same dynasty may be accounted for, and shown to be compatible. And it will hereafter be seen, that an important object may have been subserved by thus providing a method for adopting two modes of computation. I must add, however, that, in the exposition of C. 17, another way of reconciling the discrepancy alluded to will be suggested.
DIV. 2. THE FIRST BEAST: HIS SLAIN HEAD. 


XIII; 3, 888. And [I beheld or having] one of his heads as it were slain unto death.

_I beheld_ is found in the R. T., but rejected in critical editions. Considering the manifest occasion there is for a verb (when the passage is read as it is pointed in the R. T.), and that the case in which the Greek word for _one_ is put implies a verb before it;—considering, too, the remarkable frequency of the introduction of the verb _I beheld_, even where it might well have been dispensed with, it was very natural, that some copyist should insert it, to supply what he supposed to be an accidental omission. But if the first and third verses be read in connexion, omitting the second, it will be seen, that there was no real occasion for the insertion of the verb. They will run thus:—‘I beheld a beast... having seven heads, ... and one of his heads, &c.’ Hence it appears probable, that ve. 2 was intended to be read parenthetically, the statements which it contains being meant to be regarded as having been introduced incidentally, that is, only for the purpose of identifying the beast by exhibiting him in his completeness, and not because these particulars formed a part of the matter immediately in hand.—The R. T. after _one_ omits _&c._, _out of (so. the number of_), which is read in critical editions.—For _&c._ Tischendorf has _&c._. But it is specially objected to this reading, that the latter word is never used in the Apocalypse.—_As it were slain unto death._ The Greek expression does not mean that the head was merely ‘as it were wounded to death’ (as in the A. V.), that is, that it received what appeared to be a deadly wound, but did not prove to be such. It intends, that the head was actually slain. The same phrase is used in C. 5; 6, “a lamb as it were slain,” where there is no doubt, that Christ, who had been slain, is meant. Further, the very next clause shows what the meaning is; ‘The stroke of his death,’ that is, which occasioned his death. And ve. 12 shows, that the death of the beast was involved in the death of this head: “The stroke [or wound] of his (the first beast’s) death.” Hengstenberg agrees in this, saying; “The expression signifies, not wounded, but _killed_. By _killing_ is always denoted a violent death: cp. 1 Jo. 3; 12: Re. 5; 9: 6; 4, 9, &c.” And again, “the as it were refers not to the seemingness of the death, but to the traces of the absolutely mortal wound, which might be discerned on it, after it had returned to life again.”—I have dwelt the more on this point; because few schemes of interpretation will be found to stand the test of the head being actually slain, and not merely wounded.

The most important question, however, here is; _which was the slain head?_ And, to judge from the variety of opinions, it might be supposed, that this is a very difficult question. For no less than five
answers are given it. Bertholdt says; The first. I say; The fourth, if the reckoning be supposed to begin with J. Caesar; but the first, if with Caligula. Stuart says; The fifth. Hengstenberg; The sixth. Elliott and the generality of expositors; The seventh. Of my four opponents Bertholdt (who supposes J. Caesar to be meant) alone pretends to derive any support for his view from the text. The most, however, that he can say is, that the Greek phrase may mean 'the first of the heads.' No. 385 is, indeed, sufficient to show this; but then, there and in every place in which the same sense is found, it arises not from the force of the expression itself, but from the subsequent context. So that, where the context does not attach the sense to the phrase, it cannot be affirmed that it must exist. Indeed, the presumption rather is, that it does not; since ordinarily the article would be used (as in 9; 12), if priority were intended. Stuart says; 'The pronoun, in such a sense as Bertholdt claims, must naturally have the article. As in Rev. 13; 3 it has no article, it cannot mean the first, but only one of.' This, however, is going too far. Again, Stuart adds; "It is conclusive against Bertholdt's opinion, that the beast now in question was a fierce persecutor of the Christian Church; whereas Caesar perished about a century before persecution began." (Substitute, in respect of this head, 'Jewish' for 'Christian'; and I can recognise the validity of the argument; but it will be observed, that it holds good only against Caesar being meant, and not necessarily against the first head. It must, on the whole, be admitted, that there is nothing in the text itself, that positively and necessarily determines, which head is meant. Nevertheless, a satisfactory solution may be obtained, I think, from the context and the circumstances, without deducing the answer (as is commonly done) exclusively from the expositor's own scheme. And first, if I am right in supposing, that Julius Caesar, Augustus, and Tiberius are had in view in the three items of the general description of the beast, then these will answer to the first three heads, if they are to be brought at all into the reckoning of the heads; and the next head that is mentioned will be the fourth. Now the next mentioned is this slain head. Secondly, if the correctness of Stuart's view be admitted so far as to allow, that the greater part of the passage after ve. 2 has reference to Nero, then I contend, that ve. 3 cannot relate to him; because no writer would perpetrate such an anachronism, as to speak first of a ruler's death, and afterwards of his life. Neither will the circumstances of Nero's death correspond to the symbolization. He was not slain, but killed himself. The empire did not with him cease to exist, nor did any one suppose that it had come to an end. Consequently no revival of it could have taken place, nor been spoken of. Neither did Nero himself survive his wounds, nor revive;
for as to the hirailation about his revivification, it was (at least as to his restoration to life) a superstitious notion of later origin, and one of course never verified; whereas of the beast it is positively said, that 'the stroke of his death was healed.' Stuart, indeed, occupies a long Excurssus in the attempt to prove, that Nero was meant by this wounded head. He quotes passages relating to his return or restoration to life from Tacitus, Suetonius, Dio, Zonaras, the Sibylline Oracles, Victorinus, Lactantius, Sulpicius Severus, and Augustine. But the result amounts, in his own words, only to this:—'that there was spread far and wide for a long time after Nero's death, but especially for the first fifteen or twenty years, a trembling expectation of his re-appearance, who would then lay waste his former dominions with fire and sword.' At first it appears to have been thought, that Nero had not actually killed himself, but had escaped into Parthia, whence he would return with a great army. Only three years after Nero's suicide, Suetonius states, that 'reports varied respecting his death, some believing that he was still alive.' And Dio, writing in Vespasian's reign, says; "Those around him left him as it were to destroy himself; for even to the present time, this is not certain, ... most even suppose, that he is alive." Long afterwards Sulpicius writes thus; "It is uncertain, whether Nero destroyed himself. Whence it is believed, that, although he may have pierced himself with a sword, yet he was saved by the cure of his wound." The truth of Stuart's conclusion may be fully admitted. But what is there to connect the hirailation about Nero with the wounded head? Positively nothing, but the coincidence of a supposed healing in Nero's case. And such a coincidence is of no account whatever: more especially as the most probable hypothesis is (as Browne has shewn, Ordo Seculorum, p. 681), that the hirailation arose out of a misinterpretation of the verse before us. But, in any case, no progress will have been made towards a solution; since it is not the head (the king), but the beast (the kingdom) in contradistinction therefrom, 'the stroke of whose death' is said to have been healed. We may safely conclude, then, on the grounds above-stated, that Nero is not had in view in ve. 3. But if the subsequent context relates to Nero, and ve. 3 does not; and if the preceding context relates to the first three Caesars, then, of necessity the statement under consideration must refer to Caligula; for no one can suppose, that Claudius is meant. Thirdly, the symbolism of C. 12; 13–14, if I have rightly interpreted it as referring to Caligula, affords a strong presumption, that he would not be omitted here. It is not to be believed, that, in a sketch of the Roman beast as a whole, the emperor who was the first persecutor (in respect directly of Jews, but as including in this case Christians) would receive not even a passing notice. And,
fifthly, the history of Caligula will suit the symbolization exactly; and, as I believe, in a way that no other event in history would. Mark well the statements of the text. They are these. One of the heads (that is, one of the emperors) was slain. In its death the beast perished (that is, the empire of the Caesars was subverted). But the stroke of the death of the beast (observe, not of the head) was healed (that is, the empire was restored). And now note the corresponding facts. Caligula was slain. With him the empire temporarily ceased to exist, as I shall show presently. But it was restored, became more firmly established than ever, and assumed more of a bestial persecuting character than before. Thus, the history exactly accords with the text.


XIII; 3-4. 859–865. And his wounding unto death was healed. And all the earth wondered behind the wild-beast. And they worshipped the dragon; because he gave the authority to the wild-beast. And they worshipped the wild-beast, saying; 'What [person] is like to the wild-beast?' and, 'Who is able to war with him?'

859. His wounding unto death: lit. the stroke of his (not its) death, of the beast, not of the head. Elsewhere, the word here rendered wound or stroke is translated plague. The expression the stroke of their wound, occurs in Is. 30; 26: cp. Je. 30; 12: Ho. 5; 13.—Was healed. The empire was restored by the elevation of Claudius to the throne.

860. The whole earth. I will not undertake to decide, whether the term earth here is used to denote the whole symbolical world, as including land and water, or the land or earth, as opposed to the water or sea: in other words, whether it signifies literally the whole Roman world, or symbolically Judea. Suffice it, that in either sense the statement would hold good; for there can be no doubt, that both the Roman world in general, and the persecuted Jews in particular, would be (so to speak) petrified with astonishment and dismay on receiving the news, that the despotic rule of the Caesars had been restored by the soldiery with a view to their own advantage.—Wondered. Similarly in C. 17; 8, on the occasion of the restoration of the first beast in the person of the second, it is said; "All who dwell on the earth will wonder."—Behind the beast. The word used is the same, that occurs in the phrase in C. 1; 10; "I heard behind me." The meaning I take to be, that they were afraid to show their astonishment and alarm to the beast's face, that is, openly, but they abundantly manifested it behind his back, that is, privately. Claudius, we know, banished all Jews (which would in this case include Christians) from
Rome. Probably they had shown their sentiments too openly under his eye; and in consequence were driven off to a distance. There they would testify 'behind his back' as it were. "The Jews," says Tacitus, "had shown symptoms of insurrection. On hearing of the death of the emperor (Caligula), they had not obeyed his command: but they feared, lest some other emperor should impose the same mandate."

XIII. 4. 861. And they worshipped the dragon. They yielded implicit obedience to the authority, usurped and conferred by the military power. To worship frequently means in the Apocalypse to render, not religious, but civil homage; and such appears to be the meaning of the word here, though it might be truly said of the Roman world in general, that they offered more than a civil homage to the emperors. Wordsworth and other writers, in their zeal to make this clause apply to the Church of Rome, have defeated their own object. They have laboured to prove, that the Cardinals and others offer religious 'adoration' to the Pope. Now, if they have made good this position, they have gone beyond the text; for it cannot be affirmed, that the Greek word must mean religious worship, much less, the highest kind of such worship: see on 511.—I may properly remind the reader by the way, that many heathen nations (as may be seen in Herodotus, Ælian, Sidon. Apoll., Minucius Felix, and others) rendered religious worship to the serpent, the symbol of Satan.—The term serpent, it should be observed, may include the land-serpent or snake as well as the water-serpent or crocodile, which is the serpent of this book: cp. Virgil's Æneid, II: 225.

862. Because he gave the authority to the beast. The emended text inserts the article before authority, and reads because instead of who.—The article may be used either to indicate, that the supreme authority is meant, or with a reference to the authority spoken of in ve. 2; but both are probably included, the meaning being, that the dragon again gave to the beast that supreme authority, which he had before given to him.—The Roman world in general may have deemed it a less evil, that the reins of power should be restored to the hands of an emperor, than that it should have remained with the lawless soldiery, or have been contended for by the armies of the different provinces, as appeared at first likely to be the case, and soon after actually was so. It is well known what mischiefs the legions afterwards wrought, when they even went so far as to put the empire up for sale to the highest bidder. To escape unbridled military license appears to have been the chief motive, which induced the Romans to yield not only a ready, but almost a glad allegiance to Claudius.

863. And they worshipped the beast, saying. They rendered obedience and homage to the dynasty restored in the person of Claudius. But,
indeed, in giving this interpretation, I am perhaps going much beyond the meaning of the text; for we are told in the next clause, wherein their worship consisted. And, so far from being religious worship, it does not even amount to civil homage; but may be only an exclamation of astonishment. This example may serve to show, how great latitude ought to be allowed to the term worship, and how little the mere force of the term can be relied upon to prove religious adoration.

864. **Who is like to the beast?** The Greek does not express, **What other beast is like to this beast?** which would be equivalent to, **This is an unrivalled beast.** But its purport is, **What man is like to the beast?** that is, to the reigning or active head of the beast, the individual who has restored the beast to life. Thus there is a *constructio ad sensum*, which shows, that the beast may be individualized, when the occasion requires. Claudius, as a man, could little have called forth such adulation; but this is a piece of flattery, very naturally put in the mouths of subjects, placed in such circumstances.—See on 801, and cp. C. 18; 18. See also *Guide*, p. 196.—Ewald says; “They held this for a kind of supreme God, to whom none could be likened; a form of speech borrowed from the Old Testament, where it is frequently employed of the true God: Is. 40; 25.” And Hengstenberg observes; “They make the beast a Michael, and scornfully challenge the true Michael and his servants to measure themselves with him.” But perhaps this and the next clauses ought not to be read as questions, but as exclamations of surprise.—The emended text inserts and before the next clause.

865. **Who is able to war with him?** that is, to contend with him. “A challenge,” says Stuart, “designed to vindicate his omnipotence.”

In order to the *historical illustration* of this and the second divisions, I must again quote from Josephus’s history; for his narrative is here so much to the purpose, that it is well worthy of citation. But first let me observe by the way, and once for all, that my appeal to Josephus is of a very different kind to that, which Presentist expositors, of every variety of view, are able to make so freely to the historian Gibbon. They go to him for testimony respecting wars and commotions, civil or ecclesiastical, such as may be found in any page of history. Or, they appropriate his *general* statements to their particular events, as though they were applicable to them alone; when in truth they would be found equally suitable to a thousand others. Whereas, my appeals to Josephus are made on precise and definite points. For example, in the present instance I understand the text to say or imply,—that a king was smitten to death or assassinated,—that that king was the fourth of a dynasty,—that by the fatal wound given to him the existing regime of the kingdom was subverted,—
that, nevertheless, it recovered from the blow given to it and was restored,—that the whole world was filled with amazement thereat,—that the restoration was effected by the military power,—and that the result was such an increase of power to the army and the sovereign, that men bowed down before them as to gods, and gave up all hope of recovering their former independence. The history which corresponds accurately on all these points must be, beyond all reasonable doubt, that which was had in view, let it be found wherever it may. The following, then, is the substance, so far as relates to the matter in hand, of Josephus's account of the circumstances attending the death of Caligula. To do justice to my view, the whole of the narrative ought to be adduced, but it is much too long for quotation.

'Caius [Caligula] was the fourth emperor. . . . Cerea [the captain of his guard] met him, and asked him for the watchword. Upon Caius's giving him one of his insulting words, Cerea drew his sword, and gave him a terrible blow. The stroke was not mortal, but he was speedily despatched by the swords of the conspirators. The whole body of the senators then assembled, and assumed the administration of public affairs.' The Consul, Sentius Saturninus, made a speech to them, part of which has been quoted in Vol. I: p. 362. 'He congratulated them on the recovery of their ancient rights and privileges, and dilated on the evils that had been endured, since the time that Julius Caesar dissolved the republic. He exhorted them to make provision for the public welfare, and in the first place to decree honours to the man, who, together with the slaughter of the tyrant, had set the state free from all the dreadful miseries, which arose from the tyranny, and had been the procurer of liberty. As the night was now far advanced, Cerea demanded of the Consuls the watchword; and they gave him liberty. These events were the occasion of wonder to themselves, and appeared scarcely credible; for it was now a century from the time when the republic was subverted, that the privilege of giving the watchword was restored to the Consuls. Cerea, having received the watchword, delivered it to those who espoused the cause of the Senate, being four regiments, which considered a government without emperors preferable to a tyranny. So these went away with their tribunes. The people also returned to their homes full of joy, and inspired with hope and courage at the thought of having recovered the democracy, and being no longer under an emperor.'—While these things were transacting, the praetorian band, the elite of the army, consulted what would be most for their advantage. Having come to the conclusion, that it would serve their purpose best to set up an emperor, from whom they might obtain largesses, they sought out Claudius (who, at the first disturbance, had concealed himself in great alarm for his safety) and compelled him, apparently against his will,
to assume the purple. The Senate, receiving no support from the people, and being misled by the intrigues of Agrippa, were soon constrained to yield. And thus was the empire set up again by the army, being indeed virtually sold to Claudius by the soldiery. Cherea and the other liberators were put to death. But the Roman people made offerings to their Manes, in order to appease their anger for the ingratitude, that had been manifested towards them.

Such is the substance of Josephus's account. If I mistake not, it contains, either by explicit statement or necessary implication, every one of the seven several particulars, which I stated to be contained in the text. And this being the case, can any reasonable doubt exist, that the subversion of the imperial tyranny by the murder of Caligula, and its restoration by the army in the person of Claudius, are the events alluded to in the second and third divisions of this heptad? If not, then Rome under the Cæsars, and in respect of its civil constitution, must be symbolized by the beast from the sea.


XIII; 5–8. 866–88. And there was given to him a mouth speaking great and blasphemous things. And there was given to him power to practise forty-two months: and he opened his mouth unto blasphemies towards God,—to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and those who tabernacle in the heaven. And it was given to him to make war with the saints, and to conquer them. And there was given to him authority over every tribe, and people, and tongue, and nation: and there will worship him all who dwell upon the earth,—[he] whose name hath not been written in the roll of life of the lamb that was slain from the world's foundation.

866. There was given to him. Four times, in two pairs ('there was given,' 'power was given'), this phrase is used in speaking of this head. It is introduced again twice in speaking of the second beast, who is the vicegerent of this; and elsewhere, in the indefinite form, only in C. 9; 3–4. I think, there must have been an object in view in its use in these places; and what it was I expect to be able to show in the proper place.—Commonly God is assumed to be the giver. But then the difficulty arises; How could God 'give him to blaspheme' against Himself? To obviate this difficulty it is said, that God gave him only permission. De Wette is of opinion; "We should say; It was permitted him to speak." But on this Hengstenberg remarks; "The idea of mere permission is not worthy of Him, in whom we live and move and have our being. Such an idea places the creature in a certain, though limited independence beside his Creator." And he suggests instead, that we are "not to think, in respect to the giving, of the inclination to blaspheme, but only of the liberty granted for
the indulgence of this inclination by God.” Now all this discussion would be saved, if commentators would be content to leave the text in the indefiniteness in which it stands, and take it to mean only what it says, namely, that the beast had the ability to do, that is, he did such and such things. I doubt not, that the phrase is merely a technical way of expressing this.—To him. The beast is now spoken of under a new head, namely, Nero; for the contents of the following verses will show, that this emperor is had in view.

867. A mouth speaking great and blasphemous things. In ve. 2 it is said; “His mouth was as it were the mouth of a lion.” How, it may be asked, if the beast had seven heads, could he have only a mouth? How, again, in the one place a lion’s mouth, and in the other a man’s mouth; for such, as having the power of speaking, it is implied that that of ve. 5 was? I apprehend, the only solution that can be given is, that in the two places particular and different heads are spoken of:—say, in ve. 2 the third, and in ve. 5 the sixth. If so, the application of each member to a particular king is unquestionably established.—Great things and blasphemies is the reading of the R. T., and also of Scholz. Blasphemy is found in some authorities. I have adopted the reading, to which Tregelles gives the preference. But I do not see, that any perceptible difference is made, whichever reading be adopted.

—The very same words as in the R. T.,—“a mouth speaking great things,” are found in the LXX. of Dan. 7; 8. Indeed, the whole passage there relating to the little horn of the fourth beast, has been so closely followed here, as to have misled many expositors into the error of supposing an identity of meaning in the two. Thus, e.g., Bp. Newton, after mentioning some of the points of correspondence which I have adduced in Vol. I: p. 50, goes on; “We see that, not only the same images, but almost the same words are employed; and the portraits being so perfectly alike, it might fairly be presumed, if there was no other argument, that they were both drawn for the same person; and having before clearly discovered who sat for the one, we cannot be at a loss to discover who sat for the other. It is the Roman beast in his last state, or under his seventh head.” Now, such a line of argument is most fallacious. It may be turned with effect against him who advances it. With equal justice, I might argue that John’s beast is identical, not with Daniel’s fourth, but with his first beast; because John’s, like this, is said to be “like a panther.” Or, on the other hand, I might argue with more reason, from the differences observable between the Apocalyptic beast and the little horn, against the existence of any identity. Thus, before the little horn three horns were plucked up: this horn had eyes like a man’s, a look more stout than his fellows, it was diverse from the rest, the great words which it spake occasioned the slaughter and destruction
at the judgment-day of the beast to which it belonged, none of which things are said of this head of the Apocalyptic beast: while it is predicated of this head, but not of the little horn, that it blasphemed God's tabernacle and them that dwelt in heaven, that it had power over all peoples, and that all would worship it, whose names were not written in the book of life. Manifestly there are as many points of difference as of coincidence. So that the argument from resemblance is not in the smallest degree to be relied upon. The truth is, that the author has framed his symbols after the types and models of the ancient records. Hence arise endless parallelisms, with which, it is needless to say, the Revelation abounds from beginning to end. But parallelisms (as I have shown in Vol. I: p. 48 ss,) are far indeed from implying identity of signification; and endless confusion has arisen, and must ever arise, when such an inference is drawn from them. In the present instance, this head of the beast is modelled after Daniel's little horn; and the reason why may readily be seen. The little horn represents Antiochus Epiphanes: and the recalling of his image and character would convey to the Jewish mind the highest possible idea of a savage and relentless persecutor; for there had come to be associated with him the notion of everything, that is hateful and terrible. Hence, when John would depict a persecutor in the blackest colours, he takes the little horn as a model for his tableau; and follows it closely, as far as circumstances would permit, but of course not further.—How truly the statement before us might be made in respect of Nero has in part been shown under 853, and will more fully appear in the sequel. Boastfulness, and self-exaltation in an insane degree are well-known to have been salient features in his character. He, who could 'claim divine honours' (Asc. Ec. iv),—who could enter Rome in a triumphal chariot, merely because he had been a conqueror in the public games of Greece,—who could accept the adulation offered by senators and people in such shouts as these: "Victories Olympic! Thou august, august! To Nero, the Hercules! the Apollo! Sacred voice! Happy those who hear thee!" and more to the same effect, insomuch that Dio thinks it necessary to apologize in relating such things, lest they should be considered a disgrace to his history,—he, I say, may well be believed to have had 'a mouth speaking great and blasphemous things.' Josephus reports (Wars III: i; I), that, when Nero received the news of the revolt of the Jews, he blustered greatly, and affected to treat the matter with indifference and contempt; but he was in reality in great consternation and terror. He was notorious for 'absurd and childish vanity,' and for blasphemous profaneness. Like Antiochus Epiphanes, 'he made no scruple of plundering the most sacred temples in the empire.'

868–9. And power was given him to—make, do, continue, act, operate,
practic, cause, exercise, work, fulfil, or bear; for the Greek word has been or may be translated by every one of these words; and in the A. V., in the nine instances in which it occurs in twelve verses of this chapter, five of them actually have been used (see on 730). This fact may serve to show how loose and technical a sense the word is used, and so prepare us for some peculiarity in its use. Commonly there is supposed to be a hiatus in connexion with it, since the usual complement is wanting. The generality of commentators supply ἔργον, and render to make war. This view has in its favour the Elzevir edition (in which that word is inserted), and also the frequent examples elsewhere of the resulting phrase, see C. 11; 7: 12; 17: 13; 7: 19; 19. Stuart prefers to insert τῷ θελητῇ αὐτῶν, and to render to do his own will. But Hengstenberg thinks it would be better to supply what the mouth spake, considering that there is an antithesis between the speaking and the doing. That no word has been accidentally omitted is, I think, certain, both from the improbability of an omission in such a case, and also from precedents in Da. 8; 12, 24: 11; 7, 28, 30, where, in speaking of Antiochus, the Hebrew verb (translated in 8; 12, 24, practice) is used without a complement, an explanation being given in C. 11; 36. I have therefore used that English word, which would best express the meaning without requiring a complement, and to which we have become accustomed by its use in the precedents in Daniel. But doubtless there is a technical sense attaching to it, which, from want of a more perfect knowledge of the mystical system, we cannot wholly fathom. Probably some difference in the character of the persecutions may be referred to by the use here of the verb only, to make, and in v. 7 of the phrase, to make war: but this is a point on which I shall be better prepared to speak, when I come to consider the latter expression. Cp. on 847. I must not, however, omit to notice here, that Griesebach indicates a probable omission of the verb altogether, making the clause read, and power was given to him for forty-two months.—Forty-two months. Both the extent and the duration of Nero’s persecution have been made questions for discussion, and any one who takes sufficient interest in the points may obtain full information and satisfaction respecting them from Stuart’s Commentary, § 13. For myself, I think it not worth while to enter into these questions at any length; because I deem it sufficient, that in coeval mystical works the same view is taken on these points, that is presented in the Apocalypse. The precedent, in the case of Antiochus Epiphanes, having assigned to the Antiochian persecution a duration, varying from different stages of it (see Vol. I: p. 333) so as to make periods of “3½ times” (= 42 months or 1260 days), “2300 days,” a ‘half-week’ or ‘half-heptad,’ “1290 days,” and “1332 days,” this duration became “the period of
fatality,' with which under similar circumstances, and when the case would in any way admit of it, a parallelism must be made. In the present instance, the case was easy of adaptation. The persecution of Christians, after the burning of Rome by Nero on the 19th of June 64, must have begun at a date, that would leave in round numbers about 3¾ years to the day of his death, the 9th of June 68. And as the persecution, or at any rate the emperor’s animosity, would continue in force with more or less virulence during his reign, the remainder of it might, for appropriateness with the character of the work, be regarded as the time of his ‘practising’ against the saints, or as a period of fatality: and this it might the rather, because the tyrannies of Nero’s lieutenants in Judea, and the war which he began to wage upon the Jews in A.D. 66, may be included in the practising. We are not of course to suppose, that a period of 42 months, neither more nor less, existed during which a persecution raged: much less, that we can at this time prove from history the existence of such a persecution, and that a general one, for this precise period. The duration has manifestly been assigned from the precednt, and because it constitutes the appropriate mystical period. And that no exactness was contemplated may be presumed from a passage in the Asc. Eiseia, which I shall have occasion to quote in illustration under No. 920. Therein the duration assigned to the Neronic persecution is 3y. 7m. 27d., being 1332 or 1335 days, thus still making out a Danielic number.—In this connexion it will be most important to bear in mind, on account of the vastly greater impression that would be made by the circumstance, that Nero’s was the first persecution of Christians directly on religious grounds.

As this is the last of the five places in which the period of fatality is mentioned, I will present here a synoptical view of them in chronological order.

1. A.D. 1-4. The flight into Egypt. The woman and her son. 1260 d. C. 12; 6.

Both the circumstance of each mystical period being on my view referred to a different historical period, and the orderly arrangement in pairs, into which the technical descriptions fall, tend to give confirmation to the view. The days are seen to refer more immediately to the ecclesiastical testifiers for the lamb: the months to the practising and triumphing of his enemies: and the times may be thought to hold an intermediate position, having reference to a persecution threatened by Satan, but averted by Divine providence.

XIII; 6. 870-1. And he opened his mouth in blasphemies towards
God. Blasphemy is the reading of some copies. In a work of this description such a term is (as I have shown on 853) not to be tied down to its strictly literal meaning, but to be taken to include every-thing, in deed as well as in word, which is calculated to derogate from the honour due to God. How opposed is ‘blasphemy towards God’ to the demand of the Gospel of “repentance towards God.”—This clause manifestly contains a general statement, of which the three that follow furnish illustrations. See on 867.

872. To blaspheme his name. Paul says of himself, when “a blasphemer and a persecutor” (1 Ti. 1; 13: Acts 26; 11), “I compelled them to blaspheme.” And of the Jews (Ro. 2; 24); “The name of God is blasphemed through you.” And he exhorts some so to act, that “the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed” (1 Ti. 1; 20: 6; 1: Ti. 2; 5). Stephen was charged with speaking ‘blasphemous words against Moses and God, the temple and the law’ (Acts; 6; 11, 13). James asks (2; 7); “Do not they blaspheme that holy name, by which ye are called?” And Josephus speaks of Apion as uttering blasphemies against the Jews in Caesar’s presence. These examples may serve to show the latitude, with which the term blasphemy was used by the Jews. In no one of the instances was the party charged with it guilty of blasphemy in the highest, or in what we should perhaps consider to be the proper sense of the term. Yet Nero might be charged with this crime in almost the highest sense. For, of all the kinds and degrees of blasphemy none could rival that of accepting as one’s own the name, which above all others is the peculiar and distinctive appellation of God. Of all His designations none perhaps so distinguishes Him as the title of ‘the Eternal.’ and of all the blasphemous follies of which man, ‘who perisheth before the moth,’ could be guilty, none can compare with that of assuming a name, which would import self-existence and eternal duration. Yet, with this unparalleled blasphemy Nero, as I have shown on 853, was justly chargeable.

873. And his tabernacle. “That the tabernacle of God is here used as a designation of His Church admits of no doubt,” says Hengstenberg, “from the connexion in which it stands with those, who dwell in heaven.” See on 774 and 1019.—Under this head I may properly adduce, as a special instance of Nero’s blasphemy, “his sitting in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God” (2 Th. 2; 4 ss.); for to him it was believed in the earliest times, as Augustine testifies, De civ. Dei: xx: 19, that St Paul’s words were intended to apply. And what would be the view entertained of such blasphemy, even if it were only permissive (as may be said of the instance noticed under 872), may be judged from Herod’s case (Acts 12; 22); “The people gave a shout, saying; It is the voice of a god, and not of a man.
The two beasts: the first.

And immediately the angel of the Lord smote him, because he gave not God the glory: and he was eaten of worms, and gave up the ghost." Nero persecuted Christians as "the teachers of a new superstition;" and he would doubtless be regarded by them, equally as by the Jews, as making war upon the latter, with the view to compel them to render to him the same blasphemyous homage, that the heathen rendered. In such a case, Christians would feel themselves to be included in the number of those, against whom the war was waged. And the arch-enemy might appropriately be spoken of in a figurative way, as one sitting in God's temple, exhibiting himself as 'the alone eternal One.'

874. And those who tabernacle in the heaven. On 571 I have shown, that this is a mystical phrase designate of Christians (ep. Ph. 3; 20: He. 12; 23). Thus, this and the preceding clause go to show, that the persecution of the Christians by Nero is had in view in this sentence. Nero was notorious for the use of opprobrious terms and offensive language.—Lachmann and Tregelles reject the copulative, which introduces this clause. It must then be regarded as explanatory of that which precedes it; and the two will still be equivalent to 'the Christian Church and its members.'

XIII; 7. 875. And it was given to him to make war with the saints. Nos. 875–6 are omitted, as Tregelles says, "in the most ancient MSS., A and C, and also by Irenæus; but, as all the ancient versions contain them, the omission was probably occasioned by the two following clauses (in the Greek) commencing with precisely the same words; a transcriber in such cases continually passed from one clause to another." Hengstenberg argues to the same effect, and subjoins other reasons, why the clauses "cannot be dispensed with." But to my mind the most cogent reason of any in favour of the genuineness of the clauses arises from the parallelism, which I am about to notice.—Vitrings and Hengstenberg agree in thinking, that in ve. 5 we have 'the general plan,' and in vv. 6–7 'the filling up' of that plan. But this view is in truth only a reflection from their own schemes. These would not afford them the means of making a separate reference to two distinct series of events; and therefore they threw the two portions of the text into one as it were. But unquestionably the natural construction would be to regard the text, as proceeding on to notice successive events in the order of their occurrence. And, apart from any interpretation, if the reader will carefully peruse the passage as I have pointed it, he will, I think, be satisfied, that I have laid it out according to the mind of its author. It will be observed, that in vv. 5–8 there are four sentences having alternating commencements; from which it may be inferred, that they were designed to form two pairs, containing parallelisms to one another.
The placing, as in the A. V., a comma after blasphemies in ve. 5 instead of a period, and a full stop after months instead of a colon, and again a colon after them in ve. 7 instead of a period, and a full stop after nations instead of a colon, utterly mars the sense, and has blinded the reader to the true construction. Ve. 6 is clearly designed to carry on the topic introduced in the latter half of ve. 5, and to show how the ‘practising’ was manifested. And in like manner ve. 8 continues for substance the statement made in the latter half of ve. 7. But why have these pairs of parallelistic sentences been framed? Doubtless to indicate a distinctiveness, and at the same time a similarity of reference in the two parts. And such a distinctiveness and similarity will be found in the realizations, if the two parts be referred, the former to Nero’s persecution of Christians, the latter to his war against the Jews. Moreover, the reason for and propriety of the different modes of expression will then become apparent. For the purpose of distinguishing between the two, the persecution of Christians might appropriately be called here a ‘practising,’ and the attack upon the Jews a ‘making war.’ How well this view will suit the terms of the text has been shown in respect of the former, and will presently be seen in respect of the latter.—

The saints is a designation, which might in this instance be given with propriety to the Jews; since in resisting Nero’s mandates they acted out of zeal for the honour of Jehovah, and were therefore still, quoad hoc, God’s people. Besides, it must be remembered, that Christians in general, being for the most part resident in Judea, and everywhere deemed by the Romans a Jewish sect, would be involved more or less in the vengeance, which was wreaked on the Jews: and hence a term must be used, which would include both Jews and Christians. The former were not as yet wholly and finally cast off by God. For the Jewish Church may be considered to have ceded its place and privileges to the Christian by the following steps. The first was at the Saviour’s birth: the second at John’s announcement of the kingdom of heaven: the third at the commencement of Christ’s preaching the gospel: the fourth at Peter’s opening the gates of the Church to the Jews on the day of Pentecost: the fifth at the preaching of the gospel to the Samaritans: the sixth at the admission of Gentiles to the Church: and the seventh during the period of the destruction of the Jewish city, temple, and polity: see Vol. I: pp. 483, 488, 494. But it was only at this last epoch, that the Jews wholly lost their right to a preference and to precedence, as may be inferred from St Paul’s conduct at the latest period, to which our history of him reaches: see Acts 13; 32, 40, 42, 46: 18; 6: 28; 17–28: cp. Ho. 12; 26, where (quoting Hag. 2; 6) it is said; “Yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also the heaven.” Here
The two beasts: the first.

the earth means the heathen idolatry, and the heaven the Jewish religion. And in ve. 27 it is explained, that this shaking denotes the abolition of the things shaken, that they may give place to the things not shaken, i.e., the Christian faith. This shows, that at the date of the Epistle (A.D. 64), the Jewish Church was regarded as being not yet superseded by the Christian. Until A.D. 70 the Christian society may be regarded as being in some measure, more or less, a branch of the Jewish Church: at any rate, the recognized coexistence of the two is clear, if only from Acts 21; 20 ss.; "Thou seest, brother, how many myriads of Jews there are that believe, and they are all zealous of the Law: &c." The Christian Church arose from Judaism, and had no separate corporate existence at all till A.D. 38. Neither did it sever itself from the older Church, so much as the Church of England did at the Reformation from the Catholic Church, of which it yet claims to be a true and living branch. See further in the Guide, pp. 71, 72.—The different views, that would be taken in reference to the Jews, according to the different relations in which they were regarded as standing, must be constantly kept in mind. If regarded in their relation to the heathen, they would be deemed, in consequence of their testifying to the sole Deity of Jehovah, as being "saints:" but, if regarded in their relation to Christians, they would be esteemed, by reason of their persecuting the Church of Christ, enemies of God. The principle of the distinction is laid down in Rom. 11; 28; "In respect of the gospel, they are enemies for your sake; but in respect of the election, they are beloved for their fathers' sake."—If it be asked, why the duration of the Jewish war has not been mentioned here, as might have been expected, two answers may be given. 1st. Because its duration had already been specified in C. 11; 2. 2dly. Because only a portion of it belonged to Nero's reign.

876. And to conquer them. Just so the beast is said (11; 7), at the end of the contemporaneous testifying of the two witnesses, to "make war upon them and conquer them,"—a strong indication, that the conquered saints here include Jews and Christians. And, inasmuch as the war here spoken of is identical with that of C. 11; 7 (as also with that mentioned in C. 12; 17), it is evident, that the war waged by the beast cannot synchronize with the 1260 days of the witnesses testifying (11; 3),—an inference fatal to many schemes of interpretation.—See on 727—9.

877—8. Power was given him over every tribe, &c. In the R. T. and people is omitted, but both the best authorities, and all the parallel examples of this formula fully authenticate the phrase.—The general purport of the formula has been shown on 366, 699, and 733. The meaning is not to be gathered by looking at the terms separately in their literal significations, but by taking the one general idea, which
they convey in the aggregate. This is in the present instance, that the authority of the beast was fully established over every class and section of those, against whom his power had been put forth.—Wherever, as here, the terms are put in the singular the Jews are, I think, intended. And the selection made here tends specially to confirm this view in the present instance; since every one of the terms is used in reference to the Jews, e.g., in "the tribes of Israel" (7; 4), "the people of the Jews" (Acts 26; 17), "the Hebrew tongue" (Acts 2; 8), "the nation of the Jews" (Acts 10; 22). The phraseology has been derived from Daniel: see 3; 4: 4; 1: 6; 25.

XIII; 8. 879. And there will worship him. As I remarked on 861, the Greek word for worship does not by its own proper force necessarily imply more than civil obedience and homage; and such appears to be all that can be intended here; for on no view seemingly could it be said, or would it prove true, that all, with a small exception, would render adoration to the beast as God.—Compare with this clause the threats in C. 14: 9; 11; "Whose worshippeth the beast shall drink from the wine of the cup of God’s wrath!" "and they have no rest day nor night who worship the beast."—Hengstenberg has a remark here, to which I can fully assent; though our applications of the passage are very different. He says; "The will worship shows, that the matter was viewed as still in the act of becoming, and that the prophet saw the end only in the act of beginning."—The genuine reading has the pronoun in the acc. masculine, him, referring by a constructio ad sensum to a king, and not it referring to the beast. This is a most important correction; because it shows that, not the beast in his entirety, but a particular head of him is had in view: and thus an additional proof is furnished of the practice of individualization from time to time.—Nos. 879–883 are almost identical with Nos. 1149–1151, which may be taken to be an indication, that we are here at the same epoch as in C. 17; 8.

880. All who dwell upon the earth. This was shown on 571 to be a mystical designation of the enemies, whether heathens or Jews (as the case may be), of God’s people in Judea. For example, in the present instance the partisans of Herod Agrippa, and the party (probably not a small one) which from the commencement of the war advocated submission to the emperor, would be included, together with others. The contrast of this phrase with that in 874 tends strongly to establish the significations, which I have attributed to the two phrases.

881. [He] whose name hath not been written. Tregelles says; "The most ancient authorities read the relative thus in the singular. So too Irenaeus in the second century; cujus nomen." Following him, I have admitted the reading; though I cannot but think, that great
doubt attaches to it. 1. Neither Gréebach, Scholz, nor Tischendorf appear to have had any knowledge of it; for it is not noticed in their texts. They do, indeed, prefer the reading name, for names; but this variation would not necessarily imply the other. 2. The latter is a variation, which may easily have arisen in transcription; since the letters of the word in the new reading are identical with those in the negative particle, which immediately follows it. 3. It gives rise to a remarkable difference,—almost a contrariety, as compared with the reading in C. 17; 8,—a reading, which makes it more probable, that δω has been corrupted into δε δω than vice versa. 4. But the strongest reason of all is, that the resulting sense is a highly improbable one. We can scarcely believe, that the idea of the bare possibility of such a thing, as that of the blasphemying and persecuting beast’s name being written in the book of life, could enter into the writer’s mind; and, if not, he would not have thought of putting a negative on such a supposition, much less, of introducing it in a way, which seems to imply something strange in the fact. 5. Further, this reading makes the latter member of the sentence appear to be a most lame and improbable termination to the former: the sentence then seems to halt as it were on both legs. However, as this is a case of authorities versus probabilities, and one which does not affect any point in the scheme of interpretation, I have no special call to settle the question, and will therefore leave to each reader to form his own opinion.

882. In the roll of life of the lamb slain, &c. See on 217.—In C. 17; 8 the text runs in the roll of life from the foundation &c.: in 21; 27 in the roll of life of the lamb.—Stuart says: “This book is the Lamb’s, because his followers are designated therein.” I think it should also be said; because ‘he hath life in himself’ to give to whomsoever he will. And hence I consider, that Hengstenberg’s remarks are very pertinent. “Whatever name is not written by him in the book of life, that name shall never be found there. Since the book of life is unreservedly ascribed to the Lamb that was slain, all salvation, not excepting that of the saints of the Old Testament (cp. 6; 16: 7; 10, 14, 17: 12; 11), is thus represented as depending on the one sacrifice of Christ. Those who have been reconciled through the blood of the Lamb, and have their names written in his book of life, have power to overcome Satan and the beast. But if salvation has been won for believers by blood and death, they are thereby made to understand, that through blood and death they also must gain the victory: see Ro. 8; 17, 36: Re. 2; 10: 12; 11.”—These writers, however, manifestly suppose a direct reference in this clause to ‘the Lamb of God,’ the Lord Jesus Christ. But such is not intended. The writer has primarily in his mind’s eye the symbolic lamb, which he brought to view in C. 5 as the central figure in the scene of judg-
ment. And the book of life is this lamb's by the same title, that the sealed book was his (and consequently he alone was able to take and open it), namely, as the symbol of him, who is the Mediator from the beginning.

883. That was slain from the foundation of the world. Stuart and Hengstenberg agree in rejecting the custom and usually received connexion of the last six words; and they transpose them, so as to make the clause read, "whose names are not written from the foundation of the world" &c. The only reasons they assign are, that 'this seems to be the connexion of the sense,' and that it 'appears from the parallel passage, 17; 8.' The validity of these reasons I deny. At the least, an equally good sense is made by the ordinarily received and natural connexion. And as to the parallel passage it is unwarrantable to suppose, that absolute uniformity with it was intended,—that the author could not or would not vary his idea,—and that, consequently, a Procrustean method must be adopted to make him say, what he does not appear to say. I believe, on the contrary, that he has introduced the words of the lamb slain, and placed them in the position they occupy, expressly for the purpose of making a variation, which may introduce a new idea, and state a different doctrine. Both statements are compatible, and equally consonant with the general tenor of Scripture. That "the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world," and 'gave his flesh for the life of the world,' was slain from the world's foundation (meaning necessarily in the predetermined purpose and decree of God, and in consequence of his own fixed determination to redeem fallen man) may be gathered from Mt. 25; 34: Jo. 1; 1: 17; 24: Acts 8; 32: Ep. 1; 4: Ho. 9; 16–28: 10; 4 ss.: 1 Pe. 1; 19–20. And it is preeminently and clearly an Apocalyptic doctrine. For that, which is here put into words, had been previously in C. 5; 6 presented to the eye by symbol. The reference here is (as I have said) not directly to 'the Lamb of God,' but to the symbolic lamb, who there appeared "as it had been slain" from the foundation of the world; for it was only by virtue of his having this character from the beginning, that he was qualified to take the book of the seven ages from the creation, in order that he might open out the history of his own acts as Mediator from the foundation of the world. So, also, he goes forth at the creation as the Conqueror 'conquering, and in order that he may conquer.' Stuart allows, that "there can be no great difficulty in explaining the assertion as meaning, that God from the beginning had purposed and determined, that the Lamb should be slain; and what was thus determined by omnipotence and omniscience, might be spoken of by John as done; for the like is very common in the prophetic writings." I hesitate not, then, to adopt that, which is the most natural con-
nexion of the words, and gives a statement, which accords with the Apocalyptic scheme and doctrine. I may add, that the other is scarcely compatible with the reading, which Tregelles has adopted as the best authorized,—he whose name. And I may refer to the passages cited on 389 from coeval works, as tending to accredit the construction which I advocate.

The general purport of the division we have now considered is as follows. The head here brought before us, namely Nero, was preeminently characterized by his vain and boastful self-laudations, his contumelious treatment of others, and his profane conduct towards the Deity, and everything that had reference to Him. He used the authority he possessed to operate against Christ's Church; and during 3½ years (A.D. 64–68) 'he did according to his will, and exalted himself, and magnified himself above every god,' even so as to sit as it were 'in the temple of God, showing himself that he was God;' and 'he spake marvellous things against the God of gods, and prospered till the period of indignation was accomplished.' Moreover, he waged war against God's ancient people, and reduced them to great straits. He established his authority over every class, and was in a fair way at the time of his death to compel all to render to him the most abject submission.

TECHNICAL BREAK AND INTRUDE, marking the time present.

XIII; 9–10. 884–888. If any one hath an ear, let him hear! (If any one gather together into captivity, into captivity he goeth. If any one will kill by the sword, by the sword he must be killed.) Here is the endurance and the faith of the saints.

The first and last sentences appear to connect together and form a break, marking an important transition in the symbolization; while the two intermediate sentences are thrown in parenthetically as it were. At the same time, the latter are shown to have a special connexion with the first sentence by the parallelistic commencements of the three.—That the transition consists in passing from the time past to the future, I have shown at the end of the last heptad. But it will be found, that the sequel of the one before us contains allusions to the events of Nero's reign. And it will naturally be asked; How is this circumstance to be reconcile with that portion being placed in the future, if the Apocalypse was written after Nero's death? I answer that, either it was the primary object of the author to assign the occurrences, in which Nero and Vespasian were respectively the principal actors, to them severally, and so to the two beasts of which they were the personifications; or else (and more probably) it was impracticable to represent in strictly chronological order the contemporaneous action of two parties, the participation of both of whom
must be exhibited. Either of these suppositions will suffice to account for the author's having subsequently regressed into the past, so far as was necessary to enable him to exhibit the characterizing conduct of the second beast in its completeness, though that conduct for the most part was manifested, while the second beast was either acting as the lieutenant of the first, or occupying a doubtful position during the contests for the throne, which ensued on Nero's death. The author could not place the break after the portion relating to the second beast, because that beast belonged to the future: and neither the circumstances, nor the nature of the symbolization, may have admitted of its introduction in the course of the symbolization relating to the second beast.

884. If any one, &c. This is the formula used in every one of the seven epistles to call special attention; but varied here, so as to be adapted to the place it occupies. In the epistles it invariably runs; 'He who hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith to the churches.' Its first clause has been varied, to make a parallelism with the two sentences that follow; and its last of necessity, to suit the subject-matter. That it is more immediately designed to call attention to what follows than to what precedes it, its parallelistic connexion with the former indicates: and in this Stuart and Hengstenberg also agree.—The formula is one frequently used by our Lord: see Mt. 11; 15: 13; 9, 43: Mk. 4; 9; 23: 7; 16: Lu. 8; 8: 14; 35. See Guide, p. 196.

XIII; 10. 885. If any one gather, &c. There are several variations of reading in this sentence, but none appears to affect the sense sufficiently to be worthy of notice.—The phrase to gather together into captivity seems to have been borrowed from 1 Macc. 14: 7: and a somewhat similar one taken from Ps. 68: 18 ('He led captivity captive') occurs in Eph. 4: 8: cp. Ju. 5; 12. 'It denotes the bringing together of captives, for the purpose of transporting them from their own to a foreign land.' The word to gather together is, I think, a catchword designed to mark parallel places in the other tableaux; for we find it used in corresponding portions of other heptads, namely, in C. 16; 14, 16 ('to gather together unto the war' &c.), and in C. 19; 17, 19 ('I saw the beast &c. gathered together to make war').

886-7. If any one will kill, &c. So in Mt. 26; 32; 'All they who take the sword, shall perish by the sword.'

885-7. Stuart supposes these sentences to have a retrospective aspect to the preceding context. He says, that there is in them 'a palpable allusion to Nero.' I cannot agree in limiting their reference to Nero's case, but must think, that they have also in part a prospective regard to Vespasian. Yet I deny not, that they relate primarily to Nero. For he sought to carry the Jews into captivity, and to kill
them with the sword: and there is doubtless in the clauses, into captivity he goeth, and, by the sword he must be killed, an allusion to the different opinions entertained, as to whether Nero was held in captivity by the Parthians, or had died by the sword. (Such an allusion, we may observe by the way, implies, that the Apocalypse was written after Nero’s time.) But Vespasian not only sought to carry the Jews into captivity, but he actually did so; and he also slew vast numbers of them in the war. I therefore think, that so far he may be included in the allusions of this verse. What, however, most inclines me to suppose, that the events of his reign are in part had in view is a very similar passage in our Lord’s prophecy in Lu. 21, viz., ver. 24; “They shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be carried captive into all nations, and Jerusalem shall be trodden down by the Gentiles.” As this relates to the conclusion of the Jewish war, it affords a strong presumption, I think, that the passage under consideration does so likewise.—These sentences may, however, be regarded as general declarations. Modelled after the Old Testament rule of ‘an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth,’ they lay down the principle of retribution in kind being consistent with the procedure of ‘Him, to whom vengeance belongeth;’ and thus hold out a warning to all oppressors, while they tend to sustain the oppressed by vindicating His justice in their eyes.—A double reference, backward to the past and forward to the future, will be very appropriate to the place, which I suppose this interlude to hold, as a break marking the present.

888. Here is the endurance, &c. This sentence, as I have said, connects with 884, and forms the conclusion of the break.—The term endurance occurs repeatedly in the epistles, and manifestly with reference to trials for ‘the faith.’ See, in particular, Col. 1: 9; “I, John, your fellow-partaker in the tribulation, . . . and endurance of Jesus &c.” See also Heb. 10; 32 ss.: 12; 1 ss.; “Ye have need of endurance.” “Let us run with endurance &c: . . . looking to Jesus who endured the cross. For consider him who endured &c.” This term specially connects this formula with the parallel one in Col. 14; 12, which serves the same purpose at the same epoch.—I understand the sentence to mean, that the events just alluded to by implication furnish occasion for, and will call forth in the highest degree, the enduring longsuffering of God’s servants, and their confidence in Him. This, as being the fourth of these technically formed sentences, attaches the idea of universality, and so of completeness and conclusion to the whole. It thus becomes equivalent to, ‘Here ends the history of the first beast.’

On the whole, the following may be received as the purport of this interlude. ‘In view of what has been said as to the profane and tyrannical character of this head of the beast, let special attention be
paid to what is now to be added; for it will serve to encourage and console those, who have been or are suffering at the hands of him or his vicegerent. He who seeketh to carry the Lord's people into captivity, or to put them to the sword, he himself goeth into captivity, or perisheth by the sword:—in plain terms, the case of Nero will furnish an example, showing how the enemies of the saints will meet with righteous retribution at the hands of the Lord, and how the faith and patience of the saints, which are at present sorely tried, will receive their avenging.'

DIV. 5. THE SECOND BEAST: DESCRIPTION OF. 

Vespasian and the Flavian dynasty. A.D. 67–70.

XIII; 11–12. 889–896. And I beheld another wild-beast coming up out of the earth. And he had two horns, like to a lamb, and he spake as a dragon. And he exerciseth all the authority of the first wild-beast before him. And he maketh the earth, and those that dwell in it, that they should worship the first wild-beast, the stroke of whose death was healed.

889. Another wild beast. Stuart takes this symbol to represent "the heathen idolatrous priesthood, and their coadjutors:"—Bp. Newton and Elliott the papal clergy, distinctively from the papacy itself:—Faber and Cuminghame the papacy and the papal clergy. So that some of the most esteemed expositors of modern days, even of the most opposite schools, have agreed in the general principle of regarding this symbol, as representative of an ecclesiastical power, wholly distinct from and independent of the first beast. If it be asked; On what grounds? the answers given are, that this beast is identical with the harlot, or with the false prophet, or with both. But if we require proof of these assertions, we can obtain none but what either arises out of the expositor's own system, or goes no further than to establish that generic reference to the same dominant power, which all admit. Stuart, indeed, says (p. 644), that 'the Apocalyptist gives the name of the false prophet to the second beast' in C. 16; 13: 19; 20: and 20; 10. And Elliott says the same, pp. 822, 903. But the truth is, that the places referred to are merely those, in which the false prophet is spoken of; and it is the expositor, not the apostle, who makes the two symbols to be identical. The apostle gives the name of 'the false prophet' to the same thing, viewed under one aspect, of which the second beast is a symbol, viewed under another. But the two symbols are not therefore identical. Indeed, they cannot be; for 'false prophet' is an appellation of a man, and cannot designate a beast.

The question is this, Admitting that all the first six out of the seven symbols (see Vol. I: p. 15) relate generically to the same power, and that some of them (to wit, the three beasts) are specifically iden-
tical with one another, are any two or more of them absolutely synon-
ymous, that is, do they represent the same power under precisely the
same aspects? If this had been the case, would different symbols or
designations have been adopted? Why should the author have re-
presented things in a diverse manner, when no difference whatever
existed between the things represented? Surely those who maintain,
that the same thing is symbolized under the same aspect are bound
to account for the diversity in the thing symbolizing. And if they
cannot do so (as I believe to be the case), their view has no just claim
to be received. — The principle of homogeneity is generally admitted
to be a sound one; and does it not involve that of heterogeneity? If
like symbols require like things, so also must diverse symbols require
diverse things. And on this ground alone we are warranted to con-
clude, that the beast from the earth, the harlot, and the false prophet
cannot all symbolize the same ecclesiastical power, viewed in the same
light; but, on the contrary, they must all differ in their significations
in some respect or other. Hence I have come to the conclusion, that
these are identical one with another as much as, but no more than,
the dragon and the three beasts are, the true view being, that all the
six symbols represent the same power, regarded under different aspects,
or as to different portions of it.

The more immediate question however, at present, is; Does the
beast from the earth in particular symbolize an ecclesiastical power,
properly so called? The only one of the texts referred to by Stuart,
which has any apparent weight to prove that it does, is C. 19; 20, in
which this beast seems to be alluded to in what is said of the false
prophet. But, suppose the false prophet to represent the heathen
ecclesiastical power, regarded as personified in Vespasian, and illus-
trated in his inculcating the worship of the beast (as symbolized here
in vv. 12–17); and no argument will be deductible from this text.
True, the beast from the earth and the false prophet symbolize the
same power and dynasty; but the former no more represents the
ecclesiastical element, than the latter does the civil.

But how does the supposition, that this beast represents a strictly
ecclesiastical power agree with the details of the symbolization?
Not at all. ‘Two horns’ must mean two kingly; ‘a draconic voice’ a
serpentine utterance. No ecclesiastical body was ever intrusted with
all the power of the civil ruler, to exercise it as the representative
of, and as accountable to the latter; nor did such a body ever cause
those who dwell on the earth to worship any power, civil or ecclesi-
astical, sole or corporate, which had received a deadly wound and
recovered from it. Again, on what grounds can it be asserted, that
either the pagan or the papal priesthood did, at the particular periods
to which the respective expositors refer this symbol, and in so un-
usual a degree as properly to be noted as a characteristic of them in particular, do great signs, so as to make in any sense fire to come down from heaven, at the same time telling men, that they ought to worship the individual or the corporate body (whichever the beast be supposed to represent), which had come to life again after having received a wound, which had caused his or its death? In particular, what authority is there for supposing, that the heathen priesthood promoted the worship of the hated tyrant Nero, and were so zealous in the cause as to work false miracles, and to make speaking images give oracular responses, in order to promote it? Or, what ecclesiastical power ever caused all classes to receive a mark in any sense, and suffered none to buy or sell, who had it not? After careful examination of the principal expositions, both on the pagan and on the papal hypothesis, I have come to the conclusion, that there is none, which fully meets any one of these details of the beast's history. And hence I have sought for some other solution, which may at least satisfy the greater part of them. To expect more,—to require to have every difficulty removed, and every statement fully explained, were unreasonable in reference to my view; because the single history which remains to us of the transactions is obviously one-sided, and little likely to contain such particulars, as would clash with the author's prepossessions.

Having now refuted the views, which, if valid, would stand in the way of my exposition, I will proceed with my interpretation of the details.—This was a wild beast; and therefore it signified a thing of the same general nature or kind, as the last symbol. But it was another; and therefore signified a different individual of the species. If, then, we have satisfactorily ascertained, that the kind of thing represented by the first beast was a kingdom under one dynasty or series of rulers, this beast, in the relation in which it stands to the first, must represent the same kingdom under another dynasty or series, it being fairly assumed, that identity of signification is intended in so far as diversity is not indicated by the introduction of different symbols. Now, diversity is indicated only in respect of the origin, the voice, and the horns of the beast. The last of these three proves regal distinctiveness. For the two horns show us, that the kingdom is now brought to view as being under two kings instead of ten. But how are we to determine, who are the two kings intended? Unquestionably the natural supposition will be, that they are kings, who immediately follow the ten. The general chronological consecutiveness of the Mystery is in favour of this hypothesis. So also is the symbolization of the two beasts alike, as being seen in the act of ascending, and not as having ascended,—a mode of symbolizing clearly designed to show (as compared with the general use of the past tense),
that both had reference to things then taking place, and to dynasties then in course of reigning. And again, the circumstance of the beast in C. 17 (which beast is generically identical with the first of C. 13) being represented as having seven heads, but spoken of in a way which implies, that he virtually possessed an eighth, seems to place the truth of the hypothesis beyond doubt; since the two-horned head of the beast from the earth will then form an eighth in relation to the seven of the beast from the sea. So that, on this view, there will be two chronologically consecutive beasts, having between them eight heads and twelve horns. And who can doubt, after what has been shown, that these twelve horns symbolize 'the twelve Caesars' of Suetonius? —This dynasty of Caesars, it will be well to recall to mind here, is separable into two divisions, the six Caesars-proper of the Julian dynasty, and the six who were not of that dynasty. The latter division, again, is divisible into two threes, 'the three rebels' of Suetonius, and the three emperors of the Flavian dynasty. The first beast is representative generically of the whole of the ten emperors, who come within this trumpet-period, the remaining two having been introduced into the symbolization merely in order to make the number twelve complete. But he is specially representative of the Julian dynasty. And hence we have had brought under notice, in the details relating to him, only the six emperors from Julius Caesar to Nero. 'The three rebels,' by an artifice of the mystical system to be hereafter explained, are omitted or included, as may suit the object immediately in view. In the details of this chapter they are altogether passed over, and a transition is made direct from the Julian to the Flavian dynasty. Vespasian will be the last of the ten. How it is, that he, being one of the ten, is yet specially symbolized under the second beast, I will show more fully in the exposition of C. 17; 10. Suffice it here to state, that, in order to make up the dynastic number ten for the first beast, it was necessary, that Vespasian should be reckoned in the number of his horns; while yet he belonged historically to the second. The mystical method has required, that Vespasian should be reckoned numerically to the first beast, though he belonged historically to the second. And the circumstance of the greater part of his operating against the saints having been carried on during the time of the first beast may have been thought to justify the former computation.

890. Coming up. The beast's being seen coming up after the preceding symbolization, that is, after Nero's time, shows, that the epoch of the thing signified becoming the beast is not earlier than A.D. 68. But, as the details relating to the Neronic head progress anticipatively so as to include that, which was only fully accomplished in Vespasian's time (namely, the conquest of the saints and the complete
establishment of the beast's power), so those relating to the Vespasianic head regress, in respect of the second beast's exercising all the power of the first beast before him, and making the inhabitants of the earth worship him. By this means Nero's history, as the persecuting beast, is first made complete, including not only what he did, but what he purposed to do in the destruction of God's people; and then, next, Vespasian's history, as the inculcator of idolatrous homage, is in like manner made complete. And thus the two overlapping lines of history (so to speak) are kept distinct.—Out of. Observe, that this beast comes not merely eπε, from, but ek, out of the earth, just as much as the first does out of the sea. He comes out of the ground, in order the more emphatically to connect him with the land, in contradistinction from the sea, whence the first emerges. Thus, he is shown to have for the place of his origin the earth-proper of the symbolical world, and not the earth in its widest sense. And so Judea is indicated, as being the place whence he proceeds to take the supreme authority.—Out of the earth. If (on 850) I have rightly determined the meanings of the correlative mystical terms sea and earth, the former denotes the Roman world,—the habitat of heathenism, and the latter the once holy land,—the seat of Judaism. But this is a point of so much importance to my scheme, that I think it advisable to supplement the general argument, which arises from the consistency and appositeness of the interpretations that follow from the adoption of this view, and the special arguments advanced on the passage just referred to, by exhibiting formally that which the clause before us affords. The argument may be stated thus. Earth must be in this place a symbolic term; because (as appears from ve. 1) it stands here in opposition to sea, which is universally allowed to be used symbolically; and because it is a place, whence a symbol proceeds. And, by the emergence of this beast from the earth, the intention must have been (as I have just shown) to represent the beast, as coming from that portion of the world, which was not included in what was symbolized by the sea (cp. 12; 12: 16; 2, 3). And since the sea is allowed to denote the territory of the Gentiles or heathen, and "Jews" is the correlative of "Gentiles," the earth must denote the territory of the Jews.—To put my argument in a different form. With respect to the symbols, my theory is, that the sea and the earth symbolize respectively the territories of the Gentiles and the Jews. Now, in this chapter two beasts are described, as coming up from the sea and the earth. If, then, my theory be well-founded, these beasts will represent respectively two powers rising out of heathendom and Judea. And in accordance herewith the two dynasties of Caesars, whom I take these beasts to represent, came from those territories. The theory and facts, therefore, agree in a way, that leaves no doubt,
I think, of the correctness of the interpretation.—I may add, that my interpretation is specially confirmed by the appositeness of meaning, which the terms, when so construed, will give in C. 10; 2. By the mighty angel’s putting “his right foot upon the sea and his left upon the earth,” will then be symbolized Christ’s ruling both Gentiles and Jews “with a rod of iron,” or the triumph of Christianity over heathenism and Judaism.—In using the term γῆ, its secondary meaning, land, and its common use in this sense to denote Judea, were doubtless had in view. So that the phrase ἐκ τῆς γῆς might be read either symbolically, ‘coming up out of the (symbolical) earth’ (that is Judea), or literally ‘coming up out of the land’ (sc. of Judea).

—It can scarcely be necessary to show, that the Flavian dynasty came up out of Palestine. Indeed, it may even in some sort be said, that Vespasian was indebted to the Jews for the throne of the world. For it was their rebellion, which occasioned him to be placed in a situation to obtain it. It was his being in command of the army of Palestine, that gave him the throne; and from Judea he and his son went to take possession of it.

891. He had two horns. In every other place horns are symbols of kings. It is, therefore, quite unwarrantable to interpret them here (as Stuart does) as being merely emblems of power. Besides, when the intention is only to denote power, a single horn is used. Why, then, ‘two horns’ to denote power?—The horns only of this beast being spoken of, we are left to conclude, that he was in bodily shape identical with the first beast.—“Like to a lamb.” It is singular, how commentators have misapplied this phrase. Elliot, for example, designates this beast “the two horned lamb-like beast.” He speaks of it, as having “the semblance of a lamb,” and says (p. 902), that it “seems to have been on a smaller scale than the former; having a covering skin and horns, apparently, like a lamb.” In fact, he rests all the show of argument he makes for his interpretation on the lamb-like character of the beast. He says; “Our Lord’s well known description of false teachers (Mt. 7; 15) almost precludes the possibility of error in interpreting it to signify a body of antichristian clergy . . . . in other words, as the Papal clergy, regular and secular.” Now, what is the fact? The beast is not described as “lamb-like.” The Greek is clear and explicit, and such as no scholar ought to have misinterpreted. It does not run, ‘a beast like a lamb,’ but “horns like a lamb.” The only question that can be raised is, whether we are to construe the phrase so strictly, as to understand the author to mean, that the beast’s horns were actually like a lamb. For the following reasons I think, that such is not his meaning. 1. Such a symbolization appears to be monstrous, and quite inexplicable. 2. In the two instances (9; 10, 19) in which similar phrases are used to
express (as I think) that sense, the substantives are put in the plural. Hence it is reasonable to expect, that the plural would also have been used here, if the intention had been to express the same sense; and we should have read 'horns like lambs.' If, then, the most literal construction be inadmissible, we must have recourse to that, which comes nearest to it. This will be; 'horns like to a lamb's horns.' Stuart adopts this construction, and accounts for the peculiarity of the Greek phrase as breviloqueness. If, then, such be the right view of the phrase, we must proceed to inquire, what is the real purport of the simile. Some may think, that weak and inoffensive horns are meant. But such a signification will by no means suit this beast. The only other solution, I think, that can be offered is, that the point of comparison lies in the horns being those of a young animal; and consequently undeveloped,—only just becoming visible. This solution will exactly suit my interpretation; not only because Titus and Domitian (whom I suppose to be symbolized by these horns) were, at the epoch to which this symbolization relates, only emperors in embryo (so to speak), but more especially because their reigns did not come within the proper period of this trumpet, and are not included in its symbolizations, horns for them being introduced merely to show the number of the Caesars complete. It will be pertinent, however, to notice here, that Titus, from the time that his father obtained the empire, is repeatedly styled 'king,' 'emperor,' and 'Caesar' by Josephus, and is reported to have said himself in addressing the Jews; "You were not ashamed to raise disturbances against us, when we were made emperors:" also, that Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian, are all particularly mentioned by Josephus, as partaking in the triumph decreed in consequence of the successes in Judea. So that, the two last might appropriately, on this account only, be glanced at in a symbolization relating mainly to the Jewish war.—Another flagrant error connected with this phrase is the making the lamb here to mean "the Lamb of God," the Lord Jesus Christ. Wordsworth argues from this unsound basis, that "this beast cannot be a heathen or infidel power, but represents some form of Christianity." And this construction is also involved in Elliott's view; for he represents the Pope and the papal clergy, as assuming the power of 'the Lamb that was slain.' Hengstenberg, in like manner, while taking the right view of the horns as being "small and imperceptible," errs in bringing forward the lamb of C. 5; 6 to guide his interpretation. But, if any reference had been intended to the slain lamb before spoken of, the definite article would have been used, as in the true text of C. 14; 1. So, also, I doubt not, that it would have been, if the Lord Jesus had been directly had in view, though in that case the apostle would in all probability have used the expression, which
he uses in his Gospel, namely, "the Lamb of God." But, indeed, it is quite clear, that our Lord cannot have been referred to, either symbolically or literally. Not symbolically; because, according to the showing of these expositors, *like to a lamb* is introduced emblematically to denote a quality, and therefore cannot denote a person. Not literally; because it could not be said, 'horns like to the Lamb of God.'—Yet another error is that of Bengel, who understands the horns being like a lamb's horns, of gentleness, goodness, meekness. In reference to this error, Hengstenberg rightly remarks; "According to what follows, such qualities had no place here."

892. *He spake as it were a dragon [speaking].* Stuart interprets this simile as denoting "subtilely, craftily:" Elliott, 'deceitfully and murderously.' Both suppose Satan to be meant by the 'dragon.' But the want of the article shows, that the dragon before spoken of is not had in view here. The meaning, then, must be, that this beast spoke in accordance with the nature of a dragon or crocodile, or as such a creature might be expected to speak, if speech were given to him, that is to say, cruelly and ferociously. And this would denote, that the thing signified issued cruel mandates in an imperious manner, or such commands and in such a way as military commanders are wont to issue. The result would be the same, even if the dragon of C. 12 were referred to.

XIII; 12. 893. *And all the [authority or] power of the first beast he exerciseth* [lit. *maketh*] *before him,* "that is" (to adopt Elliott's explanation) "as overseen by and responsible to the former," or (as Hengstenberg explains), 'as acting as his servant, and working in his interest.' Almost invariably, when one person is spoken of as *acting or standing before* another, the former is regarded as being in a position of inferiority to the latter, and commonly as acting in the capacity of his ministering servant or agent: see C. 1; 4; 3; 9; 4; 10; 7; 9, 15; 8; 2; 20; 12. The acts, which the second beast is subsequently represented as doing in reference to the first, clearly show, that such is the relative position of the two in this instance during their co-existence.—Strange indeed is it, that a *clerical* expositor (Keith) should have interpreted *before him* as meaning *before in point of time.* The veriest tyro in Greek would know, that the phrase could not have such a meaning. It signifies *before in place,* that is, in his presence.—*The power* is that spoken of in 857 and 877,—the power of the dragon or the military power.—This is an item which shows clearly, that the history of this beast is intended to be specially descriptive of the subversion of the Jewish polity; since it apparently goes back to the time of Vespasian's receiving from Nero the command of the army in Palestine. *The two beasts are here individualized or
represented by the prominent member of each. Vespasian, the
founder of the Flavian dynasty, and himself subsequently the second
beast (the 

\textit{two beasts despotic} of the \textit{Sibylline Oracles}), exercised all the
power of the Julian dynasty, "as overseen by and responsible to"
Nero, who intrusted that power to him.

894. \textit{And he maketh the earth, and those that dwell in it. Those who
dwell on the earth} are the parties of whom it was said in 880, that they
should worship the first beast. But observe, that the statement is not
identical with that in 880; for here \textit{the earth} is superadded. This
addition must import, that, not only should those hostile to Christ's
people,—the rulers and chief priests, the Pharisees and Sadducees,
but also the Jewish nation as a whole be reduced to subjection by the
second beast.—We should read; \textit{And by means of the power so dele-
gated to him he maketh, &c.}

895. \textit{To worship.} I have before observed, that, this term \textit{need be}
taken only in its most common sense in Scripture, namely, \textit{to do
homage, to yield obedience.} But, even in this restricted sense, those
Jews, who suffered themselves to be constrained to worship the beast,
would probably at that time be regarded as not true to their allegiance
to God. As, however, the emperors required Divine honours to be
paid to them, the word may well be taken in its theological sense. And
this would seem even to accord best with the tenor of Vespasian's
commission; for he was sent into Judea to enforce, not only civil
obedience to the emperor, but a degree of honour which the Jews
considered to be idolatrous. Consequently he might well be regarded,
as being in the position of a "\textit{Pontifex maximus}" or 'High Priest' to
a new God. And no doubt it was on account of Vespasian's incul-
cating and enforcing the worship of this new deity, that his dynasty
formally, but himself really, is represented subsequently by another
symbol,—that of the false prophet.—The worshipping of the beast
will be illustrated under 903.—\textit{The first beast, the wound [or stroke] of
whose death was healed.} This must refer to the beast generically, and
not individually. Every statement relating to a particular head must
necessarily be applicable to the beast, but not \textit{vice versá}. The last clause
may have been added to recall to mind the most remarkable feature
in the beast's previous history. Hengstenberg says; 'It cannot
possibly have been given as a mere note of distinction. The simple
epithet of "the first beast" would have been quite sufficient for that.
It points to what the second beast urged as the ground of his solicita-
tion, that men should worship the first.' But that ground mani-
ifestly was, not the beast's revivification, but the hopelessness of resist-
ance. The wonder and exclamations of 'all the earth' on the occa-
sion of the healing (see vv. 3–4) show this. And that such actually
was the argument, mainly relied on to induce the Jews to submit to
the Romans, may be seen abundantly in Josephus, e.g., in Agrippa's speech, Wars II. xvi.

We have now seen, that in this division is symbolized another dynasty of the same general character, as the one that preceded it. But this is characterized by the circumstance of its having gone up from Judea to take the throne of the Roman world. The symbolization of it is added as supplementary to that of the former, the principal king symbolized under it having, for a technical purpose, been numerically reckoned to the former, and his two sons and successors being only alluded to now for the purpose of elucidation and completeness. The party here symbolized is described, as issuing harsh and cruel mandates in the imperious manner of a military commander, and as having been sent by, and armed with the authority of the emperor Nero, to compel the Jews of every class to pay a degree of homage to the Roman emperor, which they deemed derogatory to Jehovah.


XIII; 13–14. 897–904. And he doeth great signs; and maketh fire to come down from the heaven unto the earth before the men. And he deceiveth those that dwell on the earth by the signs, which it was given him to do before the wild-beast, commanding those that dwell on the earth to make an image to the wild-beast, who hath the wound by the sword and did live.

897. And he doeth great signs. It is evident, that the word sign is used here and in ve. 14, more nearly in the sense in which it occurs in C. 16; 14, than in that in which it is used in C. 12; 1, 3: 15; 1. In the three latter places (in which the word is in the singular) it means a symbol: in the former (in which it is in the plural) a prodigy. Hence, 'prodigies of valour' (as we are wont to say) might satisfy the signification in this passage; and it would be a sense quite in congruity with the symbolization of a martial power. But, besides prodigies of this description, I am inclined to think, that the term is intended to include other prodigies. And perhaps 2 Th. 2; 3–12 may be thought to confirm this. At any rate, the reader will do well carefully to compare that passage, and especially ve. 9: "The appearing of that lawless one shall be in the strength of Satan's working, with all the might, and signs, and wonders of falsehood, and all the delusions of unrighteousness. . . . God will send upon them an inward working of delusion, making them give their faith to lies."

898. And [maketh] fire. Scholz omits this maketh, and transposes the words so as to alter the sense, as shown in the translation; but the difference is not material.—We are unquestionably to take the
term fire literally in respect of the symbolical scene. But, on this very account, it is not to be taken literally as to the real meaning. Real fire is no more to be understood here, than in the fire of the first, second, and sixth trumpets, or in that which proceeded out of the witnesses' mouths. It must not be forgotten, that it is the beast, that makes this fire to come down from the symbolical heaven to the symbolical earth. Now fire symbolically seems to be a term of very wide signification, denoting any means of destruction, provided it be of a very efficacious and disastrous nature. As widely different as the thing symbolized by the beast is from the beast, so widely diverse may the thing signified by the fire be from the fire. Stuart, by taking the terms in this passage literally, has entangled himself in needless difficulties.—Cp. 1 Pe. 4; 12 ("the fiery trial"); Lu. 9; 51 (Wilt thou, that we command fire to come down from heaven and consume them, even as Elias did): and see on 545: also see C. 20; 9, where in like manner fire comes down from heaven to destroy Gog and Magog.

899. To come down from the heaven to the earth. Heaven and earth appear to serve here, as in C. 12; 4, 7, 13, merely for the machinery of representation, that is, they have no second sense, denoting realities. Yet, from what follows, we ought to limit earth to the land of the symbolic world.—Before the men. As before, supposing a particular class of men, and not men in general, to be meant, I have inserted the article. The class intended is that of those technically designated (as in the next clause) 'those who dwell on the earth.'

Many such prodigies, as are spoken of in this verse, are related or alluded to in Josephus's account of the Jewish wars; and though they are not all directly connected with Vespasian and the Roman army, they would be regarded by the Jews as being due either to the agency of that evil spirit, whom they considered to be the author of the evils, which the Romans brought upon them, or as being signs given by God to foreshow that impending destruction, which He had appointed, and whose instrument for effecting it being Vespasian, the latter might be said in some sort to be the worker of the signs, that is, the signs accompanied and attested his mission, or his mission was the occasion and cause of the signs. The following is an abstract of one section in the Wars VI. v.

'A false prophet'—we cannot but be struck with the coincidence of this being the designation of a symbol specially representative of Vespasian,—'a false prophet occasioned the destruction of these people by making proclamation, that God commanded them to get upon the temple, and they should there receive miraculous signs of their deliverance. And there were then a great number of false prophets (cp. Mt. 24; 11, 24) suborned by the tyrants to impose upon
the people by giving out, that they should wait for deliverance from God. The miserable people were persuaded by these deceivers, while they did not attend to the signs, which plainly foretold their approaching desolation. Thus, there was a star resembling a sword, which stood over the city; and a comet, that continued a whole year. And before the commotions which preceded the war, when the people were assembled for the Passover, a light shone round the altar and the temple in the night, so great that the darkness was turned into brilliant daylight. This light was thought to be a good sign by the unskilful, but was interpreted by the scribes as portending the events which followed. At the same festival, a heifer, which was being led by the High Priest to be sacrificed, brought forth a lamb in the holy precincts. And the eastern gate of the inner court, which was so heavy, that twenty men had scarcely been able to close it, and which was fastened by massive bolts let into the stone floor, opened at midnight of its own accord. This also appeared to the common people to be a very happy omen. But the learned understood by it, that the security of their holy house was dissolved of its own accord, and that the gate was opened for the advantage of their enemies. So these publicly declared, that the signal foreshowed the desolation that was coming upon them. Moreover, a few days after that festival, a phenomenon occurred so prodigious and incredible, that the account of it might be regarded as being a fable, if it were not related by those who saw it, and if the events which followed were not of so remarkable a character as to deserve such signs. Before sunset, war-chariots and bodies of soldiers in battle array were seen marching in the clouds, and besieging cities. Again, at the feast of Pentecost, as the priests were performing their nocturnal duties in the temple, they felt a quaking, and heard a noise as of a great multitude saying; 'Let us remove hence.' But, what was still more terrible, there was one Jesus, who, at the feast of Tabernacles four years before the war began, and when the city was in great peace and prosperity, began to go about the city day and night, crying; 'A voice from the four winds, a voice against Jerusalem and the holy house, and a voice against this whole people.' And the cry of 'Woe, woe to Jerusalem' (although he was flogged by the Roman Procurator till his bones were laid bare, and daily maltreated by the people, in order to make him desist), he continued unceasingly for seven years and five months, until he saw it realized in our siege; and then, as he was going his round on the wall, and had just finished his cry with his utmost force, and added to it, 'Woe to myself,' he was struck by a stone from a Roman engine, and killed on the spot.'—'What most encouraged the Jews to undertake this war was an ambiguous oracle in their sacred writings, to the effect that, about this time, one from their country
should become ruler of the habitable world. They took this prediction to belong to themselves in particular; and many of the wise men were thereby deceived. *Now this oracle certainly denoted the government of Vespasian, who was appointed emperor in Judea. But these men interpreted some of these signs according to their own pleasure; and some of them they utterly despised, until their madness was demonstrated both by the taking of their city, and by their own destruction.*—'And now the Romans, upon the flight of the seditious into the city and the burning of the holy house, brought their ensigns to the temple, and set them over against its eastern gate; and there they offered sacrifices to them, and there they made Titus Imperator with the greatest manifestations of joy.'—The last sentence I have added from the next chapter; because it records the accomplishment of the object, for which the Romans undertook the war, namely, the virtual 'making the earth and all that dwelt therein to worship the beast, and his image' on the ensigns.

With the foregoing extract from Josephus, it will be interesting to compare the allusion, which Tacitus makes to the same occurrences. —But first let me quote two other extracts from Josephus, in which mention is made of other 'signs,' said to have occurred during the war.—In the pictorial representations of the war, which were carried in Vespasian's triumphal procession, were depicted 'fire sent upon temples, houses falling on their owners, and rivers, after rising out of a vast desert, running through a land on fire on every side; for the Jews affirmed that such a thing had happened to them during this war.'—Eleazar, in addressing his comrades, is reported to have said; 'We are manifestly deprived by God Himself of all hope of deliverance; for that fire, which was driven upon our enemies, did not of its own accord turn back upon the wall, which we had built: this was the effect of God's anger against us for our manifold sins.'

The following is the passage in Tacitus, which I alluded to.—"Prodigies had happened, which the [Jewish] nation, prone to superstition, and averse to religious ceremonies, thinks it not right to propitiate with vow or victim. There were seen armies engaged in battle in the sky, and arms of fiery red; and the temple was lighted up by sudden flashes from the clouds. All at once the doors of the temple were thrown open: and a voice was heard, saying in tones louder than human, that the gods were departing; and along with it was heard a rush, as of the departing deities. Some few viewed these omens with alarm: the greater part had a strong conviction, that it was written in the old sacerdotal books, that at this very time 'the East was to prevail, and some who came from Judea to attain empire,'—an equivocal prediction of Vespasian and Titus. But the populace, influenced as men usually are by their desires, interpreting to their own
advantage the rich promises of destiny, suffered not adversity even to lead them to the truth." (Hist. v. 13).

In the foregoing passages the 'signs' spoken of are said to have been occasioned by Vespasian's invasion of Judea. In the extracts from Tacitus which I proceed to cite, the power of working miracles will be seen to be attributed to Vespasian himself, and prophecies (miracula scientia) are said to have been given in Vespasian's early life of his successful career. "In his earliest youth the highest eminence was promised to Vespasian. At first, however, triumphal honours, and the consulate, and the glory of the Jewish conquest was deemed an adequate accomplishment of the omen. This gained, he began to believe, that what was portended was his accession to the empire."—"Between Judea and Syria is Carmel, as they name both a mountain and a deity. A deity with no image or temple (so our ancestors said); but an altar only, and worship. There, while Vespasian was sacrificing, and pondering over his secret hopes, the priest Basilides after repeated examination of the entrails, said; "Whatever thou art taking in hand, Vespasian, whether it be to build a house, to extend thy estate, or to increase the number of thy slaves, thy house will be large, thy limits wide, thy household numerous." This enigmatical reply fame had at once caught up, and at this time began to explain. Nor was anything more commonly talked about; and nowhere so much as in his presence; since men speak more plainly, when they speak what one hopes for." (Hist. ii. 78).—Once more:—

"During the months, when Vespasian was waiting at Alexandria for the periodical summer breezes and settled weather, many prodigies took place, indicative of the favour of heaven, and of some peculiar predisposition of Providence in Vespasian's favour. One of the Alexandrian populace, well-known for a disease in his eyes, at the instance of the god Serapis (to whom, among all its many superstitions, the nation pays peculiar homage), clasped the emperor by the knees, begging with groans a remedy for his blindness, and imploring the emperor to condescend to wet his cheeks and eyes with his spittle. Another, who had a bad hand, by the advice of the same god, prayed Cæsar to walk over him, and trample him under foot. Vespasian at first derided and despaired of him; then, when they urged him, he at one moment feared getting the reputation of being presumptuous, and at another, what with the entreaties of the suppliants, and the words of his flatterers, he began even to form hopes of success. Finally, he ordered the physicians to give their opinion, whether such blindness and ailment could be cured by any skill of man. The physicians spoke indecisively. 'The eyesight of the one,' they said, 'was not so entirely gone but that it might return, if the impediments were removed: the limbs of the other were disordered, but by the applica-
tion of a healing influence might be restored. It was, perhaps, the pleasure of the gods, and the emperor might have been chosen to perform their will. At all events, if the cure was achieved, the glory would be Caesar's: if it failed, the laugh would be against the sufferers.' Thus Vespasian, deeming that everything was within the reach of his good fortune, and that nothing now could be impossible to him, with a cheerful countenance, amid the anxious gaze of the crowd around, did as he was desired. At once, the hand recovered its use, and the blind man saw again the light of day. Both stories are even now told by eye-witnesses, when nothing is to be gained by falsehood."

(Hist. iv. 81).

To the same effect as the foregoing are the following extracts from Josephus (Wars IV: x; 7).—"So Vespasian's good fortune succeeded to his wishes everywhere; and the public affairs were, for the most part, already in his hands. Whereupon he considered, that he had not arrived at the government without divine Providence; but that a kind of righteous destiny had brought the empire under his power. For, as he called to mind the other signs, which had been a great many everywhere, that foretold he should obtain the government, so did he remember what Josephus had said to him, when he ventured to foretell (while Nero was yet alive) his coming to the empire."

XIII; 14. 900. And he deceiveth those that dwell on the earth. Those, namely, 'whose names are not written in the book of life,'—all, except 'the elect' (17; 14), of whom it was said (Mt. 24; 24), that they could not possibly be deceived: see on 880. The parallel place in C. 19; 20 (cp. 16; 2) will best show, who are meant:—"The false prophet, who did the signs, by which he deceived those that had received the mark of the beast, and those that worshipped his image."—By his deceiving them we may understand to be meant, that he deludes them into believing, that he possesses an irresistible power and superhuman aid. Then, by acting on their belief, he induces them to join, more or less, in making an image to the beast.

901. By means of the signs. The nature of the case would alone justify us in concluding, that the Roman commanders would endeavour to prevail on the Jews to yield submission to their authority, by setting before them the inutility and folly of resisting those, whose military prowess was so renowned, and on whose side the Deity was manifestly shown to be by the signs, which He had given in their favour. But, indeed, in the speech which Josephus made to his fellow-countrymen, when he was sent by Titus to endeavour to prevail on them to submit (see Wars V: ix; 3), we have positive evidence, that such was the case. He dwelt at some length on these topics, telling them, that "they must know, that the Roman power was invincible," and that "their forefathers, who were far superior to
them, both in their souls and their bodies, and in other advantages, did yet submit to the Romans, which they would not have done, if they had not known, that God was with them." He reviewed the past history of their nation, for the purpose of showing, that "there was no instance, wherein their fathers got any success by war, or failed of success, when without war they committed themselves to God." But they had now estranged God from them. "Indeed, what can it be that hath stirred up an army of Romans against our nation? Is it not the impiety of the people? Whence did our servitude commence? Was it not derived from the seditions, that were among our forefathers, when the madness of Aristobulus and Hyrcanus, and our mutual quarrels, brought Pompey upon this city, and when God reduced those under subjection to the Romans, who were unworthy of the liberty they had enjoyed (see Vol. I: pp. 351 sq.) But how much more impious are you, than those who were so quickly conquered! . . . And, after all this, do you expect Him, whom you have so impiously abused, to be your supporter? . . . Had He judged, that our nation was worthy of freedom, or the Romans of punishment, he would (as in the case of the Assyrians) have inflicted punishment on the Romans, when first Pompey began to meddle with our nation, or when Vespasian commenced the invasion of Galilee, or when Titus first came near this city: whereas Pompey, not only suffered nothing, but took the city by force; Vespasian went from the war he made against you, to receive the empire; and as for Titus, those springs that were formerly almost dried up, when they were under your power, since he is come, run more plentifully than they did before; accordingly, you know that Siloam, as well as all the other springs that were without the city, did so far fail, that water was sold by distinct measures; whereas they now give such a quantity of water for your enemies, as is sufficient not only for drink both for themselves and their cattle, but for watering their gardens also. The same wonderful stair you had also experience of formerly, when the forementioned king of Babylon made war against us, and when he took the city and burnt the temple; while yet I believe the Jews of that age were not so impious as you are. Wherefore I cannot but suppose, that God is fled out of his sanctuary, and stands on the side of those against whom you fight."—To the same effect, Titus, in encouraging his soldiers, is represented as saying; "As to the famine they (the Jews) are under, and the siege they now endure, and the fall of their walls without our engines, what can they all be but demonstrations of God's anger against them, and of His assistance afforded to us?"—Josephus again, in a second attempt which he made by command of Titus to induce the besieged to surrender, used this argument among many others. "Who is there, that does not know what the
writings of the ancient prophets contain in them, and particularly that oracle, which is just now going to be fulfilled upon this miserable city! For they foretold, that this city should be taken, when somebody shall begin the slaughter of his own countrymen. And are not both the city, and the entire temple, now full of the dead bodies of your countrymen? It is God, therefore,—it is God himself, who is bringing on this fire, to purge that city and temple by means of the Romans, and who is going to pluck up this city, which is full of your pollutions."—Which, &c. Why is this virtual repetition made? Hengstenberg answers; "The greatness of the danger has occasioned the copious, repetitory description of our section. Since the history of the deluge, Scripture has employed the method in describing great catastrophes, dangers, critical moments, and the like, of using frequent repetitions, which tend to bring the scene more vividly before the eye of the reader."—Before the wild beast means, of course (as in 893), as overlooked by and responsible to the reigning emperor.

902. Telling those that dwell on the earth. See on 900. "These," says Hengstenberg, "are mentioned so frequently, in order to bring distinctly into view the critical position of 'the little flock,' who have against them a whole deceived world, the huge mass of worldly-minded persons on the earth."

903. To make an image to the wild beast. This is an instance, in which I again deem it advisable to remind the reader, that nothing of the nature of making an image need be looked for in the reality. This must be the idea literally formed in respect of the symbolical picture; but in reference to what is symbolized anything, that might fitly be represented by the making of an image, would suffice.—Hengstenberg has "an image of:" Stuart, for. For seems to mean 'for his use,' which is certainly not the meaning. Of is differently expressed in the next sentence. To implies of, and means still more. A statue of Nero representing his person would be an image of him, as soon as it was made; but it would be an image to him, only when it was set up to be worshipped. An image to the beast, therefore, necessarily implies the rendering worship to the beast through his image. —Observe, that the term used is not 'idol,' as in C. 9; 20 (see on 651). It is 'an image,' a likeness of or counterpart to the beast, that is to be made. The term is that, which we shall presently see to be constantly used in statements, relating to the worship offered to the statues of the emperors, or to their likenesses on the Roman standards. Consequently, it will apply to such likenesses, equally as to such statues. Op. Mt. 22; 20: "Whose is this image?" namely, on the coin. The 'image' becomes an 'idol,' only when it is used in worship.—Two views may be taken in reference to the thing signified, according as the image is supposed to be an image of the beast in his
entirety, or as personified in a particular head. The most obvious construction would incline us to adopt the former hypothesis, while the contrast so manifestly made in vv. 11–17, which have reference almost exclusively to Vespasian, with vv. 5–10, which relate to Nero, lead us to the latter. The details, in like manner, conduct to a double interpretation. For some of them will be seen to be adapted to a generic reference, and unsuited to a personal application; while others will suit an individual, but not a generic reference. Hence, it seems to be most probable, that the author has here, as in other instances, availed himself of the capability of twofold signification, which symbolical representation possesses; and has gone on the principle of individualization. If so, it will necessarily follow, that some of the details will not be equally applicable to the beast as a whole, and others not to the particular head. And it will result, inasmuch as the essential feature in the symbolization by a beast is, that the thing signified must be a series or dynasty of kings,—that the abstract signification of the image will be such a dynasty: in which case there can be no doubt, that it must be the Flavian dynasty, that is the image of the Julian; and the inculcation of making an image to the beast must denote the setting up of the former dynasty to receive the same homage as lords of the world, that was claimed by the latter. As to the individualization, according to which one emperor in particular is had in view, it would seem, that the commanding to make an image to him can only denote the enforcing of homage to some representation of him personally,—such a representation, for example, as was depicted on the Roman ensigns, which Vespasian bore into Judea, when he marched thither with the view to compel the Jews to do homage to Nero.—In reference to this setting up of the image of the beast, Hengstenberg makes the following remarks. "The setting up of the likeness of the emperor was one of the most effectual means, which heathen despotism could employ, to place itself in the centre of the world. By means of this image the beast was rendered in a manner omnipresent. Its living representative, the Roman emperor, was confined to no particular place. In this way the choice was set before Christians between martyrdom for the true confession and apostasy."

In the introduction of an image in this place, 'the image which Nebuchadnezzar set up,' and required 'all peoples, nations, and languages to worship,' has perhaps been had in view as a precedent. Hengstenberg has remarked, that "in Nebuchadnezzar's personal history the fate of his kingdom was imaged." He might have gone further and said, that Nebuchadnezzar was himself a type of the quadruplicate kingdom, of which he is exhibited as being the founder, and his personal kingdom as 'the head.' ("Thou art—meaning really
(see Vol. I: p. 306), 'Thy kingdom is'—the head of gold.' Hence the composite image of which he dreamt had his own form, namely, that of a man. And in setting up "the golden image," he doubtless meant it to be a copy of "the great image," as he would have it to be, that is, entirely of gold. Thus, the golden image was an image primarily of Nebuchadnezzar himself, and secondarily of his kingdom. (Hence, by the way, we may derive from this precedent a confirmation of our doctrine of the individualization of a generic symbol.) And, consequently, in requiring worship to be rendered to it, Nebuchadnezzar demanded worship for a beast,—a tyrannical heathenish power—both in its individual and in its corporate signification. Indeed, the parallelism between the two cases extends to many of the details. The two images represent respectively the two kingdoms—the quadripartite Babylonian, and the mystical Babylonian: the former, too, as individualized in Nebuchadnezzar, and the latter in Vespasian, both of whom were 'destroyers of the pious.' The latter of these kingdoms is exhibited in C. 13: 1, as being equivalent to the four kingdoms of the former; and hence the two images of them are on a par. The "certain Jews," who refused to 'worship the golden image which Nebuchadnezzar set up,' have their counterpart in 'the saints, who worshipped not the beast, nor his image.' To the "burning fiery furnace" corresponds the killing by 'the image of the beast of as many as would not worship the image of the beast.' And with the "great signs" of the second beast are contrasted "the signs and wonders, that the high God wrought. How great are His signs! And how mighty His wonders!" As Nebuchadnezzar 'made his decree' (Da. 2: 3, 13: 3; 10, 29: 4; 6), so the second beast 'spake as a dragon' and issued his decree (13: 11, 14). And finally, so early as the time of Irenæus, a connexion was supposed to exist (in conjunction with the 600th year of Noah) between the height and breadth (60 cubits by 6) of Nebuchadnezzar's image and the number of the beast: 600 + 60 + 6 = 666.

Having now demonstrated, that the clause before us implies a requisition by the Roman emperors of a degree of homage, which can rightly be rendered to God alone, it will be proper to show, that such a requisition was actually made. This will fully appear from the following extracts and references.—'Statues were voted to Nero of equal size with those of Mars Ultor, and in the same temple' (Tacitus: Ann. xiii. 8. 'The statue of Tiberius (as being that of a god) was allowed to afford an asylum to miscreants' (Ann. iii. 36). 'The Senate decreed, that a temple (which implies a statue or image) should be erected to Nero at the public expense' (Ann. xv. 74). So, also, temples and divine honours were decreed to Caesar and to Augustus. Caligula ordered a temple to be built for himself at
Rome, and sacred rites to be performed to him as to a god: and we have seen how he insisted on his statue being placed in the temple at Jerusalem, to be worshipped on an equal footing with Jehovah. Suetonius says, speaking of Domitian; 'Neque in reducta, &c. Dominus et Deus noster hoc fieri jubet, &c. Statuas sibi in Cap. non nisi aureas et argentae poni permisit; ac ponderis certi.' On a gem of Augustus; 'Gemma divinos honores, Dom. & c.'—On the leading standards of the Roman army, the likeness or image of the reigning emperor was painted; and the Roman soldiery were taught to regard this as the symbol of their tutelary god, who was present with them, and would aid and protect them. Tertullian says, that 'the whole religion of the Roman camp almost consisted in worshipping the ensigns, in swearing by the ensigns, and in preferring the ensigns to all [other] gods.' And Suetonius (Tib. 48) speaks of Tiberius as rewarding some Syrian legions, because they had not displayed the image of his rival, Sejanus, on their standards, and had not worshipped it (non coluisse). Artabanus, king of the Parthians, adored (adoravit) the Roman standards, bearing the image of the Caesars (Suet. Calig. 14). Pliny's letter to Trajan shows, that in that emperor's reign the test to discover Christians was to require persons suspected to worship the images of the emperor and of the gods.

How such a requisition to worship the image of the emperor was received by Jews and Christians alike has already been copiously shown on pp. 28 ss. and elsewhere, and will further appear from the following extracts.—"No image," says Tacitus, "do they (the Jews) admit into their cities, much less into their temples. They render not this adulation to kings, this homage to the Caesars."—"When Vitellius was leading his army through Judea, the principal men met him, and desired that he would not thus march through their land; since the laws of their country would not permit them to look upon those images, which were brought into it, of which there were a great many on their ensigns" (Ant. XVIII: v; 3).—The erection of an image of any kind, though intended only to be an ornament to a public building, was enough to excite a popular tumult among the Jews. Josephus tells us, that, when Herod had erected over the great gate of the temple a large golden eagle of great value, and had dedicated it to the temple, two of the most esteemed interpreters of the Jewish laws taught their disciples, that it was contrary to the law of their fathers to erect images or representations of any living creature whatever, and that it was better to die than to tolerate them. In consequence a number of young men in the open day pulled down, and destroyed the eagle at the risk of their lives; and, when apprehended, they gloried in the act.—Again, "Apion," says Josephus, "uttered many blasphemies against the Jews, and among
other things he charged them with refusing to pay to Caesar the honours, that were due to him; for that, while all others, who were subject to the Roman empire, built altars and temples to Caius, and in other respects universally received him as they received the gods, these Jews alone thought it a dishonourable thing for them to erect statues in honour of him, or to swear by his name."

When such were the requisitions on the one side, and such the sentiments (based on the most powerful of motives) on the other, there could be no doubt what must be the result, when those requisitions were enforced by the sword. The Jews were at first civilly and religiously in the right: and, so long as their resistance was made against intolerable oppression, and their testimony given for the upholding of the truth,—"There is one God, and Him only shalt thou serve," the Christians could not but make common cause with them, and recognize them quoad hoc as brethren and 'saints.' But soon the Jewish people allowed themselves to be goaded by designing men into a state of frenzy and mad fanaticism, which led them to place themselves wholly in the wrong. They gratuitously insulted the emperor by refusing to receive his offerings to the temple, or to allow sacrifices to be offered for him, though such offerings and sacrifices had always been customary, and were fully sanctioned by those priests, that were most learned in the laws and customs of their country. The Roman generals, on their submission, would have re-dressed their grievances, and removed every just cause of complaint. To the very last Titus used every means in his power to save Jerusalem and the temple; but all in vain. During the last three months of the siege, the fanatical Jews perpetrated every imaginable impiety and crime within the precincts of their own temple: "yea," says the historian, "they proceeded to such enormous offences, that the very same indignation, which Jews would naturally have against Romans, if they had been guilty of such abuses against them, the Romans had now against Jews, for their impiety in regard to their own religious customs. Nay, there were none of the Roman soldiers, who did not look with a sacred awe upon the holy house; and adored it; and wished, that the insurgents would repent before their miseries became beyond remedy. Titus was deeply affected with this state of things, and reproached them, saying; 'Why do you pollute this holy house with the blood of both foreigners and Jews themselves? I appeal to every god, that ever had any regard to this place, that I do not force you to defile this sanctuary. Nay, I will endeavour to preserve your holy house to you, whether you will or not.' He declared, that he had offered peace and liberty to them, as well as an oblivion of all their former insolent practices; but that they, instead of concord, had chosen sedition; instead of peace, war; and instead of abundance,
famine: that his father had come into the country, not with a design to punish them for what they had done under Cestius, but to admonish them: that he himself had shown them every possible forbearance and clemency, and after every victory had persuaded them to peace, as though he had been himself conquered.” Remonstrances and offers of terms, however, were alike made in vain to the infatuated Jews. They would listen to no terms, but such as they themselves dictated. And the result was, that those wicked men were miserably destroyed through their own folly: their country desolated and exposed for sale: their holy city razed to the ground: their temple burnt: and the people that remained either slain or suffered to die of hunger, or else sold into slavery, thrown to wild beasts in the amphitheatres, or sent to work in the Egyptian mines. And thus were ‘the times of the Gentiles accomplished,’ when ‘the holy city had been trodden down by them forty-two months.’

904. **Who hath the wound by the sword, and did live.** Tregelles calls attention to ‘the change (as found in the ancient authorities) in the gender of the relative.’ The ancient reading indicates by a *consectio ad sensum*, that the beast revived in one of his members, who was a man. If this be the true reading, we have here another instance and proof of the principle of individualization, and an indication of a special reference to a particular king. Persecutors alone being explicitly brought into the symbolizations, and the revival being the salient point, the purport of this clause may be taken to be, that he who had received his death-stroke in Caligula still practically lived, that is, in respect of being a persecutor, in Nero.—*Hath* is the genuine reading, though some copies have *had*. It may be, that up to this time, that is, to the time when the image has life infused into it, the beast that was slain and revived (the Julian dynasty) is to be conceived of as present on the stage in the person of Nero, the beast from the earth (Vespasian) acting at the same time as his lieutenant, and the inculcator of worship to him. But henceforward the image is made to be and do everything; because Vespasian has attained to the place of the beast, having now obtained the throne.—This clause is substantially identical with that in 896. The only difference worthy of notice is the substitution of *did live* for *was healed*. And in reference to this it will be well to note, with a view to the bearing which the remark has on C. 20; 5, that, inasmuch as the beast was said in ve. 3 to have been slain, the term *lived* must be equivalent to entered on a new life.—But why, it is natural to ask, should the clause have been thus repeated, when, if it was not called for in the former place, still less was it here? Hengstenberg says; “In the beast’s return to life again lies the reason, for which an image behoved to be made for him.” But, when it is observed, that the fifth and sixth
divisions are terminated by these parallel clauses, it may be thought, that to mark the terminations of the two divisions was the object in making the parallelism: at any rate, this sufficiently accounts for the repetition. Another conjecture that may be made is, that, to mark the existence up to this time of the first beast, by using the present tense in the clause, was the object in view.

In this division, the Roman general for the time being is represented as appealing to the prodigies which attended his mission, as affording a proof, that the Deity was on his side; and that, consequently, it behoved the Jews to render to the emperor the homage, which he demanded.

DIV. 7. THE SECOND BEAST: HIS SUBJUGATING ALL TO THE BEAST. Vespasian's success in setting up his own dynasty, and reducing his opponents to servile submission: A.D. 69-70.

XIII; 15-18. 905-16. And it was given him to give a spirit to the image of the wild-beast, that the image of the wild-beast might both speak and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the wild-beast should be killed. And he maketh all, the small and the great, and the rich and the poor, and the free men and the servants, to give to themselves a mark on their right hand or on their forehead, in order that no one should buy or sell, but he who hath the mark, the name of the wild-beast, or the number of his name.

Here is wisdom. Let him who hath mind count the wild-beast's number; for it is a man's number; and the number of him is 666.

905. To give breath (i.e., life) may alone be meant; but, inasmuch as the spirit, in which the life inhered, was conceived of as a separate existence from the body, I think a portion of the idea is lost by rendering to give life.—See on 742, and cp. Vol. I: p. 275.

906-8. Hengstenberg renders "that the image should even speak; and that he should make, that whoso, &c." and he remarks; "We must not explain: and made; so that the image is the subject; but rather: and that it made; so that the beast is the subject." To this remark I reply, that the point is not one of explanation, but of right rendering; and the rendering ought to be made without reference to the explanation to be given. Hengstenberg, on the contrary, has done great violence to the plain grammatical construction of the Greek, in order to make the text say, what he has thought, that it ought to say. And there can be little doubt, from his evident wish to make this appear to be a matter of explanation, that the reason why he has done this violence to the text was, that he was unable on his scheme to give even a plausible interpretation on the grammatical rendering. It is true, indeed, that the threefold repetition of the image of the beast is peculiar; but we must be careful, how we draw
an inference from a peculiarity of so peculiar a work. It may also seem strange at first sight, that 'the image should cause, that whoever would not worship itself should be killed:' but on consideration it will be seen, that this representation will accord well with the reality, which is the prototype. For when heathen (or alas! it may be said, when so-called Christian) priests have wished to bring a particular image into especial repute and favour with the ignorant multitude, it has been a common trick to make the image itself appear to utter some words, or to give some sign equivalent thereto, which would promote their object. And so here, the conception may easily be, and I doubt not is, that of the image itself issuing a command, that those who refused to worship it should be slain. Such considerations as the above, however, even if there were more force in them than there really is, ought not to be allowed to contravene the relation established by the natural grammatical construction. As to this there can be no doubt, that, just as Hengstenberg himself is constrained to put in a that before he should make in order to give his sense, so there must have been its equivalent in the Greek, if his had been the sense intended by the author. The rendering which I have given is that of our A. V., and Stuart also adopts the same.—The character of the speaking-of the image here, together with the mandate of the beast in ve. 14, indicates what is meant by the beast's 'speaking like a dragon.'—While we conceive of the literal representation as being, that a beast caused an image or statue to be made to another beast (which image was a counterpart of that beast), and was moreover able to infuse vitality into that image, so as to give it power to speak and even to cause as many as would not fall down before it to be slain, we may regard the true meaning as being, that the Flavian dynasty, agente Vespasiano, set up a new Caesarian object of civil allegiance and religious worship,—that that object was itself, the counterpart of the Julian dynasty, and that it succeeded in giving to the Flavian image imperial vitality, by placing it in a position to issue royal decrees, and to put to death all who refused to yield the submission which it demanded.—In reference to the particular application, it may have been intended, that we should conceive of the second beast, as causing an image or likeness of the persecuting head of the first to be made, and then enforcing the worship of it on pain of death. Hereby it would be signified, that Vespasian caused the Roman ensigns on which the likeness of Nero was depicted, and Titus those on which Vespasian's image was portrayed, to be set up all over Judea, and compelled the Jews to do homage to them. Of course, to enforce the worship of a particular head would be to enforce the worship of the beast.
oft-repeated formula of universal comprehensiveness in respect of different classes: see on 772. Here the terms are manifestly arranged in three pairs. To these another term, making seven in all, may be added by reckoning (as Hengstenberg does) the all at the beginning as constituting a term. And the similar heptad in C. 6; 15 confirms this view. Possibly the six of the three pairs may have designed for appropriateness with the three sizes of the beast's number, 666.—We might render and it (the image) maketh all: but I do not think, that this would give the true meaning.

912. To give to themselves a mark. This is a more correct version than the to receive of our A. V., or the should be given of Hengstenberg's.—Idolaters consecrated themselves to a particular god by taking various marks, such as his name, or his emblem (e.g., the bolt of Jupiter or the ivy of Bacchus), or his number, that is, the numeral letters which were equivalent to the sum of the letters in his name. And Procopius states, that many Christians marked themselves with a cross or with the name of Christ: cp. 14; 1: 22; 4. In like manner, this beast, not content with having reduced his adversaries to a state of abject servitude, compels them to wear openly a badge of their servitude; and, to add to the degradation, he makes them stamp this mark on their persons with their own hands. The giving themselves a mark, and not being marked shows, that in the thing signified the act performed was performed by the parties themselves, as would be the case in doing homage and worship to the Roman emperor. See further on 915 infra.

913. On their right hand or on their forehead. See on C. 3; 12: 7; 3: 9; 4: 13; 1, and cp. Ex. 13; 9, 16: De. 6; 6–8. Martial, Seneca, and Plutarch state, that servants were branded in the forehead with their master's mark. In Le. 19; 28 the Israelites are forbidden to ' put any mark upon themselves.' Hengstenberg understands the parts here specified to be intended to denote, that the recipient of the mark was "in all his actions to show himself," and "before all the world to declare himself, a true servant of the beast." It may be doubted, whether or not, in respect of the thing signified, the meaning would extend so far as this; but there can be no doubt, that, in respect of the symbolization, the intention in the specification was to heighten the idea of the indignity, put upon the beast's humiliated opponents.

XIII; 17. 914. In order that no one should buy or sell. And that is a reading of about equal value. "He that cannot buy or sell is as one excluded from human society, and deprived of the necessary means of existence." Possibly there is an allusion here to some acts of Vespasian in particular, as he was of an avaricious disposition, and was accused of having recourse to the most dishonest and base means of obtaining money.
915–6. But he who hath the mark, the name of the beast, or the number of his name. The R. T. has erroneously or the name.—As the meaning of the three things here specified can be determined only from the beast’s number, it will be the most convenient method to postpone the consideration of them, till we come to that number.

XIII; 18. 917. Here is wisdom. This sentence may be thus paraphrased. ‘In what follows there will be found room and great occasion for that technical skill, which consists in solving mystical enigmas with readiness. Bagacity will be requisite to unravel the clew, about to be given to the secret of the beast.’—A sentence of similar form to this is introduced in three of the interludial passages, which mark the time present, namely in C. 13; 11: 14; 12: 17; 9; and that in the last-named text is nearly identical with the one before us. All the four are manifestly used to separate what follows them from what precedes; and, by making as it were a pause or break in the subject, to call especial attention to what comes next.

918. Let him who hath mind. In C. 17; 9; “Here is the mind which hath wisdom;” the two principal terms in 917 and 918 are brought together: from which it would appear, that the latter is an effect, fruit, or endowment of the former. We may read; Let him who hath an intelligent discerning mind. It is implied, that such a mind is absolutely necessary. Only he who hath rôç, “understanding,” can compute the beast’s number. And just so we read in Da. 12; 10, in reference to a similar case— that of “Ant. Epiphanes; “None of the wicked shall understand, but the [men of] understanding shall understand.”—The R. T. inserts the article, which in this case would have the effect of making ‘the mind’ par excellence, that is, a mind of the highest endowments in this respect, to be meant.—Count. Op. C. 2; 17; “I will give him a white counter.”—To count the beast’s number cannot mean to ascertain what the number is by counting; because the number itself is stated. The only alternative meaning would seem to be, to ascertain by help of the number given, what the thing signified by the number is. On this view of the meaning, to take the names of the most likely things, and to count up the sum of the numeral letters composing them, until one was found which gave the number 666, would be to count the number of the beast. And, in like manner, by help of the beast’s number must the marks, whereby the beast’s servants are known, be ascertained.—But, in order to be in a position thus to count the number of the beast, it may seem necessary, that we should be quite sure, which beast is meant, and what its generic signification is. With regard to the former point it may, indeed, be thought, that there is no room for a question to be raised. And in truth, so clear is the case, that if some had not been found to maintain, that the second beast is had in
view, I should not have thought of starting the question. The advocates of this opinion are, however, so few, that it may suffice to direct attention to the fact, that ‘the beast’ in the preceding context (vv. 14, 15, 17) can mean only the first beast (if one of the two mentioned in this passage must be understood in contradistinction from the other), it being the second that makes an image to ‘the beast,’ meaning necessarily on this view the first. Consequently the first is grammatically implied here. But, if I am not mistaken, it is intended, that the phrase ‘the beast’ should be taken in these verses in the abstract, or apart from the distinctions made in it, in one place as proceeding from the sea, in another from the earth, and in another from the abyss. Hence it is used here in its widest or most generic sense, that is, as applicable to and inclusive of the entire dynasty of the Caesars. I judge so from the remarkable change in the mode of expression at ve. 15. Previously a descriptive clause, or an epithet, or both, had been inserted, limiting emphatically the designation to the first beast; but subsequently these are dropped, and ‘the beast’ only is used. Now I think, that it may have been one object, in the insertion of the limiting clauses in the first instance, to obtain a basis for intimating a change in the signification of the phrase; so that, when the restricting terms were discontinued, an extension in the signification of ‘the beast,’ so as to take in ‘the twelve Caesars,’ should be understood. In taking this view, I am nearly in accord with Hengstenberg, who says; “The beast, being named unconditionally, is the first beast—not, however, in contrast to the second, which is rather to be regarded as its inseparable attendant.” I would rather say; ‘its essential complement.’ When, as in the beginning of this passage, the two beasts are mentioned together, they are undeniably spoken of in contradistinction from one another; but afterwards the contrast is dropped, though, inasmuch as the second beast is introduced as the agent of the first, it is natural to suppose, that, when ‘the beast’ is mentioned, the first is specially, though not exclusively, had in view. It should be borne in mind from first to last, that the circumstance of Vespasian’s having passed from being the agent who enforced the worship of the beast, to being the beast whose worship was enforced, has necessarily rendered this a very complicated symbolization. It was probably this circumstance, that led to the introduction of the image, Vespasian’s twofold capacity requiring two symbols.

919. For it is a man’s number. That is: since in the esoteric sense it is a man’s, and not a beast’s number (being the numerical equivalent for a man’s name, when the letters composing the true name are added together as numeral letters), it will, when regarded and computed by as such, show who the man intended is.—Stuart explains, “The number is to be computed *more humano*, not *more angelico,*” (Cp. C. 21; 17).
But this is not, I think, quite a correct view; for the implied contrast is with a beast's number.—Hengstenberg, again, argues against "the wide-spread supposition, that the number 666 is made up of the aggregate numerical value of the letters of a name." But his arguments are either so palpably weak and sophistical, or else equally valid against his own view, or wholly derived from his own scheme, that they are scarcely deserving of notice. The acknowledged "wide-spread," and it might have been said, 'almost universal' adoption of the view he rejects, is alone sufficient to outweigh all his arguments. And the facts, that the representation of proper names by numbers was the common practice under the mystical system,* and that the only method of solving such numbers, that was thought of in the early ages, was by finding a name, which would furnish a sum-total coinciding with the number given,—these facts leave no room for doubt, as it seems to me, respecting the true mode of procedure in the investigation. Hengstenberg maintains, that "that alone can be the right explanation of the number which, first, supplies a name; and, secondly, indicates a direct relation between the number and the nature of the beast:" and he arrives at the strange result, that Ezra 2; 13; "the sons of Adonikam 666," furnishes the name and the number of the beast. He argues thus against the view, which I maintain, "Against the explanation, 'for it is the number of the name of a man,'—a number which is made up of the numerical value of the letters of a name, we oppose, 1. The fact, that the beast is 'not a man, not an individual; 2. The fundamental and parallel passages (Is. 8; 1: Rev. 21; 17). To say nothing of other reasons—for example that the for in that case would be unsuitable. Rightly understood, these words overthrow the hypothesis, which would construct a number out of the numerical value of the letters of a name." My answer to these allegations is as follows. 1. I have shown, that the beast may and does represent an individual: but, even if this were not the case, the argument would not hold good against my view, as will presently appear.

* The practice was not limited to proper names. Seneca states, that Apion argued, that Homer was the author of the division of each of his works into 24 books, distinguished by the 24 letters of the alphabet, from the circumstance that the two first letters in the Iliad give numerically 48. "Leonidas, who flourished in the reigns of Nero, Vespasian, &c., carried the practice of computing the numbers in words so far as to construct equinumeral distichs, i.e., epigrams of four lines, whose first hexamer and pentameter contain the same number with the other two." Examples may be seen in A. Clarke’s Com. on C. 18; 18: as also of distichs in which the hexameter is made equinumeral with its pentameter. About the Apostolic age, also, some Greeks employed themselves in counting the numbers in Homer's verses, to find out what two consecutive lines were equinumeral; and the examples are said to be marked in Cod. 2216 in the Biblio. Royale.
2. The passages referred to do not make against the interpretation.
3. The for is not unsuitable. It is not equivalent to because. The sense is not, 'Count the number of the beast, because it is a man's number, and because the number is 666.' but, 'Count it; for, in order to give clews to the thing signified, I will add, that it is a man's number, and it is 666.' What is there unsuitable in the for here?—Let me add, that 'the number of the name of a man' was not the expression made use of; because, in the mystical science, 'the number of a thing,' and 'the number of the name' of that thing have different significations, as I shall show presently.—Hengstenberg goes on to say; 'Were the number not an ordinary, a common one, the call to compute it, or to reflect on it, would be to no purpose.' No doubt in one sense the number is a common one; but, what Hengstenberg means is shown by what he had said just before, namely, that "in the solution of the riddle we must seek for no mystery in the number itself." Now, one glance at the number may well suffice to make us hesitate to receive this assertion, and to satisfy us, that the number is a peculiar, an extra-ordinary one. Its homogeneous composition shows palpably at first sight, that it is a mystically formed number (see Vol. I: p. 40). Six, as being the number of the labour-days of creation, is the numerical representative of unrest, toil, affliction (see Vol. I: p. 33). And the threefold repetition of a figure magnifies the idea, which it represents when standing alone, to the superlative degree. Even Hengstenberg himself dwells on this view of the number at some length. He says: "The 666 is, as it were, the swollen, blown up six [In illustration of this I may notice, that 666 = 6 × 6 × 6 x ½ + (6 × ½)], the six in its highest potency... As the five only occurs as the half of the ten, the number of perfection broken, so the six appears either as the half of the twelve or as the preliminary step to the seven; therefore in a subordinate relation to the two numbers, which are formed by a similar combination of three and four, and which generally in the Scriptures, but especially in the Apocalypse, are consecrated to the church. By the six being carried through units, tens, and hundreds, the number marks the soaring pretensions and might of the beast; while, on the other side, the relation of the six to the seven and twelve implies, that in respect to the church he still after all came short. To the number 666 thus explained, corresponds the number three-and-a-half, which in the Apocalypse is the signature of the apparent victory of the world over the church,—merely on account of its relation to the number seven. Even Irenæus, in his early age, seeking in the number 666 an import by itself, brings it into connection with the nature of the beast. He supposes a connection between it and the image of sixty cubits high and six cubits broad, which Nebuchadnezzar caused to be set
up in the plain of Dura. And, indeed, if we look upon this image, not with our own, but with Israelitish eyes, if we consider the great attention which was paid to numbers in Old Testament times, as recent investigations have shown, nothing is more natural than to suppose, that the book notices the dimensions of that symbol of the ungodly power of the world (for such the image was), because it saw in these a shadowy representation of the nature of that power. So colossal, and yet indissolubly bound to the fatal six, the broken twelve, and the incomplete seven! The name of the valley, too, is ominous. It properly signifies the valley of the funeral pile. This is what we can maintain with certainty respecting the 666, as the number at once of the name of the beast, and of the beast himself. Perhaps, however, there is also an import in the mode of writing the number. It is expressed by the three letters ΧΞΣ. That this writing by letters was the original form, is certified by Irenæus. The first and the last of these three letters are the common abbreviation of the name of Christ. That which stands in the middle is like the serpent, under the name of which Satan appears in C. 12; 9: 20; 2. Through the whole, therefore, the Antichrist, that is raised up by Satan, is placed before our eyes.” On Hengstenberg’s own showing, then, the number is not ‘a common,’ but a mystical one; whatever may be its mystical signification. And hence the more probable supposition is, that the solution is not to be found (as Hengstenberg maintains that it is) in a merely literal use of the number. If the number were used in an ordinary way, there would be no occasion or room for computing, or for skill in the mystical art. So that, with much more reason we might say; ‘were the number a common one, the call to compute or to reflect on it would be idle.’—We may proceed, then, with our inquiry, how may such a number as the text presents to us furnish a reason for working out the computation? Now this it might do, as being a mystical number, and by reason of the mystical bearings, which it has been, and will hereafter be, shown to have. As a mystical number, it would call for technical skill in the Gematria of the mystical science, and would afford scope for the exhibition of superior tact and discernment. By means of its mystical connexions, it would throw light on the person and character of the particular beast, and on his relations to the saints and to the lamb.

920. And the number of him is 666. We ought not to read his number in the sense of ‘the number belonging to him,’ but in the sense of ‘the number assigned to, in order to be distinctive of, him.’ In the hope of causing this to be kept more distinctly in mind, I have deviated from the usual rendering, and followed the Greek more closely in reading the number of him.’—And here I may ask; In what other sense, than as being distinctive of the beast, can 666 be said to be his
number? And, if it has been assigned for the express purpose of distinguishing the beast, so as to leave no room for doubting who the party signified is, must it not follow, that, by the right use and application of this number, that party may with certainty be known?

666. Inasmuch as there is a rival reading, namely 616, the first question in reference to this number will be; Is 666 the genuine reading? The only answer that can be given with truth to this question is, that 666 has the balance of extant authorities in its favour. And Irenæus (circa A.D. 280) affirms, that it was found "in all the correct and old copies," and was vouched for by those who had known the Apostle,—"qui facie ad faciem Joannem viderunt." His testimony to a matter of fact may be allowed to be of great value, whatever we may think of his judgment, when we find him appearing to rely mainly on the following coincidence. "It was in the 600th year of Noah, that the flood destroyed the earth, on account of the peculiar wickedness of its inhabitants. Afterwards, in aid of idolatry, Nebuchadnezzar set up a golden image on the plain of Dura, which was 60 cubits high, and 6 cubits broad. Put these three numbers together, and we have 666: a representation or symbol of the extreme, and as it were, aggravated wickedness of Antichrist, whose name is concealed in the mysterious 666; for in him is all the wickedness of the antediluvians (destroyed in the 600th year of Noah) conjoined with all the wickedness of idolatry under Nebuchadnezzar, the most potent and impious of all idolaters." To the MSS. and oral authority as testified by Irenæus, it may be added, that the form and signification of χίλια, tend to give it probability. In respect of the form, however, it must be observed, that recently Lachmann and Tregelles have, on the authority of the most ancient Codices, exchanged the numeral letters for words at full length. In reference to the signification Vitringa has remarked, that "the three sixes placed together have something of an enigmatical appearance, which does not exist to the same degree in 616." If, now, we turn to the rival reading, we learn from the testimony of the same Irenæus, that it too had very ancient authorities in its favour, reaching back probably to not more, and perhaps much less, than 100 years after the apostle's death. And such was the weight of those authorities, that it was a controverted question, even in that early age, which was the genuine reading. "Irenæus, certainly, is of opinion, that the reading 616 was originally a slip of the pen; but, at the same time, he says expressly, that on the number 616 were raised calculations of names, and he himself offers in consequence grounds for an easier explanation. Then, as it is evident from Irenæus alone, that the number even in the earliest times had awakened much attention, it is scarcely to be imagined, that a deviation from the correct reading should have arisen from mere carelessness." To
these arguments of Hengstenberg I would add, that the letter supposed to have been substituted is so unlike to that, which is assumed to be the genuine one, that it is incredible, that a substitution could have arisen from a copyist's mistaking one for the other. Of MSS. now extant, 616 is found in C, which is supposed to be as old as the early part of the fifth century. A reading so authenticated is not lightly to be rejected. And for myself I am inclined to think, that both 666 and 616 may be genuine, not only on account of the evidence which supports both these numbers, but because I think strong reasons for the adoption of different numerical readings may be found in the mystical system, and because much evidence has been adduced in Palmoni in favour of the hypothesis of original Various readings. In respect of the case before us, I shall presently bring forward coincidences, tending to support both readings.

I now proceed to advert to the mystical character of the number 666. I have, indeed, already traced its origin and signification as such, but I would here further exemplify its use in this character by some miscellaneous examples. 1. In this very book there appears to be an esoteric use of this number, by which the generic identity of the whore with the beast is indicated. The first word,—the key-word as it were, of the inscription on the whore's forehead (17:5) is mystery. Now the letters composing the Hebrew equivalent for this word give as their sum-total 666. 2. The seven letters MDCLXVI form the only numerals in the Roman notation. But, as the whole seven would denote perfection, while, if one letter were taken away, there would remain six—the number which forms the basis of the beast's number, there existed manifestly two reasons for such a subtraction. And the first letter being withdrawn, the six which remain give the number 666. In this coincidence we may discover as origin of the beast's number, and also a reason for its adoption in a case, in which Rome was the object contemplated. 3. Many ancient chronological computations coincide with the number of the beast, as may be seen in Palmoni. Of these I will cite here only a few examples. Clemens made out 666 years between the Exodus and the building of Solomon's Temple. From Jehoiachin's captivity previous to the first destruction until the second destruction of Jerusalem was reckoned to be 666 years. Also, from the Return to the war which ended in the final desolation of Judea, a.d. 132, 666 years. In Ptolemy's Canon (which has been shown in Palmoni, p. 659, to have been framed on a mystical basis) the duration of its Roman division, that is, of the empire symbolized in the Apocalypse, is 333 years = $\frac{1}{3}$. Some similar coincidences will be brought forward presently. 4. Various stichoiatical coincidences with the number of the beast have been pointed out in the Guide; see especially 'The dichotomised number of the beast,'
p. 175; 'The signature of Jesus crucified obscures that of the beast,' p. 179; 'The number of the beast,' p. 191.

It must now, I think, have been made sufficiently evident, that the number 666 has a mystical character, independently of its use in the Apocalypse. But if so, it can scarcely have been derived simply from a name; though we cannot affirm with positive certainty, that it could not have been so derived, especially in the face of such examples as ἤπειρος = 888, ἐραμός, the cross = 777. Nevertheless, it is so highly improbable, that a name not selected at pleasure, but independently determined, should give a number so peculiar in itself, and of so highly mystical a character as 666, that such an hypothesis is scarcely credible. If, then, we do not adopt it, we are driven to the alternative of supposing, that the name has been arbitrarily selected, and adapted to the number, and not the number derived from the name. When I say this, I mean only, that out of the various designations, which the person or thing intended may have had, or by which he or it might be recognized, such one or more has been chosen, as would coincide with or come nearest to the predetermined number; and that, in the latter case, the spelling has been varied, so far as may have been requisite to produce coincidence, without wholly losing sight of the name. That it was the practice to vary the spelling of words, Elliott and Stuart have shown; and the necessity of the case would alone suffice to make evident. These considerations are suggested, with the view to show the reasonableness of anticipating such adaptations.

I now proceed to the application of the principles, that have been laid down for ascertaining, who and what are meant by the number of the beast. At the same time I shall apply those principles, in like manner, to the elucidation of the marks, which form the stigmata of the beast's slaves. These are four; and thus, with the beast and his image, seven means of identifying the thing signified are afforded.

In the first place, however, it will be proper, that I should show, that all the seven have different significations. In order to this, I must refer the reader to the following passages, in which they are mentioned distinctively: 13; 1 ss., 14–18: 14; 9, 11: 15; 2: 16; 2: 19; 20. In these texts there are ten variations, of which five are varied combinations. Now, if we allow some of these to denote different things, consistency requires, that we should allow all to do so. But no one will contend, that the beast, and his image, and his number, are identical in signification. Neither, then, should his name, his mark, the number of his name, and the mark of his name be assumed to be so. Even if we should be unable to show what was the distinction made between them, this would be no proof, that none was made. And granting (what is in itself very probable), that the
combining of terms together in different ways was the mystical method of emphasizing in such degrees as the occasions required, still each term might have nevertheless its own proper and distinct meaning. And the subjoined extract from Elliott’s *Horæ Apoc.*, p. 939, will show, that such was actually the case.*

1. **The number of the beast.** There is no occasion for inquiry in respect of this; since it is furnished as the *datum*, by the help of which the rest may be ascertained. The sentence which introduces the verse before us apprizes us, that a clew is about to be given, by the use of which, if we have the gift of penetrating into hidden mysteries, we may succeed in unravelling the whole enigma. The object of the explanation contained in this verse is, professedly, to show the number of the beast; yet this is, in reality, but a small part of that object. ‘Let the intelligent mind compute the number.’ How? Is it from enigmatical data given to find out the number? No; for the number is explicitly stated. The sentence, therefore, must be taken to be a mystical mode of saying, that, from the number given he must ascertain, by the help of a significant hint, the true and literal meanings or applications of the terms made use of.

2. **The name of the beast, when he is regarded as individualized, ought then to be readily ascertainable from these data.** A great difficulty, however, meets us at the outset, namely, that we know not in what language the name is to be composed. Elliott argues (P. IV. C. vi.) in favour of the Greek. Stuart thinks it more probable, that

* “It appears, that it was common at the time of St John, and indeed both long before and long after, for three classes of persons to have certain *stigmata* or marks of appropriation imprinted on them, viz. *slaves, soldiers,* and the *devotees* of one and another god,—that the impression was generally on the *forehead* or the *hand*;—and that the mark was sometimes the simple *name* or the *characteristic emblem* of the master or the god, sometimes (in the devotee’s case) the god’s particular hieroglyphic number. Thus,—as examples of the *mark* or *name,*—it was with the Sicilian emblem of a *horse,* that the enslaved Athenians were branded on the forehead in Sicily. It was with the *master’s name or mark,* that Roman slaves were stigmatised on their foreheads; and the *emperor’s name or mark,* that the Roman soldiers bore imprinted on their hands. Further, among devotees, those of the god Bacchus are specified as branding themselves at times with the ivy-leaf, sacred to him; to which I may add the example of the Hindoos, marked even to the present day on the forehead with the hieroglyphic of the god they are consecrated to. As to inscription with a particular *number,* as *sacred,* this was either some *simple* number, consecrated to the devotee’s god, according to the Pythagorean and Platonic mysteries of numbers;—or perhaps the *number of the letters in his name*;—or, it might be, the number made up of the *numeral value of the constituent letters of the name.*” (See also Kitto’s *Cyclop.* *Forehead,* and Ezek. 9; 4).—Such being the case, it will not be idle to proceed to inquire, what the meaning of the several designations which occur in the Apocalypse is.
John referred to "Hebrew words or letters, as indicative of his meaning here; because the partial concealment, obviously designed by him, would thus become more effectual." But, that a concealment, arising from such a motive as Stuart assigns, namely, from the wish to prevent the pagan persecutors from discovering, that the reigning emperor was intended,—that a concealment from such a motive was thus aimed at, I cannot think to be at all probable. For, what rational person, if he published such a book in the time of the sixth emperor, a book, in which 'the sixth king' is said to be then reigning, and in which, particularly in the 17th and 18th chapters, Rome is so unmistakably described (e.g., by its seven hills, and as "that great city, which is reigning over the kings of the earth")—what rational person, I say, could expect, that the place and person intended would not immediately be discerned by any intelligent heathen contemporary; or how could he think for a moment, that, after he had so plainly described the doings of the first persecutor of the Christians, as we find them depicted in C. 13; 5–10, the mere omission of the emperor's name, and still less the propounding it after the mystical manner in the form of an enigma, would suffice to secure concealment? For, let it not be supposed, that the mystical system was peculiar to the Jews. The heathens, as I have shown in Psalmoni, were at least as much initiated into it as the Jews. And hence no writer could expect to conceal his meaning by having recourse to so transparent an artifice, as that supposed by Stuart. But, while rejecting this method of making it appear probable, that Hebrew letters rather than Greek would be made use of, I have not the least doubt, that such may have been the case. The author's Greek abounds in Hebraisms; and, in particular, he manifests a partiality for Hebrew designations or proper names, of which in some instances he gives the Greek equivalent: see, e.g., Abaddon and Apollyon (9; 11), "the Devil and Satan" (12; 9), Harmagedon (16; 16). Hence it is as probable, that a Hebraized word would be adopted as a Greek, or a Greek as a Hebrew, or perhaps both, if they could be made to serve the purpose (See Jemer's Rat. Apoc. V. 2, p. 121). A Hebrew word would seem to have more affinity in the present place with the mystical system. But no opinion can be formed a priori, as to which would be used. The deciding consideration with the author would doubtless be capability of adaptation to afford that clew, which he desired to give in an enigmatical way; and consequently that language would be preferred, in which the name might be most readily made to give out the greatest number of mystically-numerical coincidences. Now, independently altogether of the context, and of any particular interpretation, I cannot imagine, that any name can be found, which will have better claims on this account to be received as
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the true one, than that which the solution of Prof. Benary of Berlin proposes. His view is thus briefly stated by Stuart (Exc. iv). "Benary remarks, that in the Talmud and other Rabbinical writings the name of Nero, in the form of "\(\tau\eta\ \gamma\), often occurs. This amounts numerically to the number of the beast; q.d. \(50 + 200 + 6 + 50\), and 100 + 60 + 200, added together equal 666. Nor is this all. There was another method of writing and pronouncing the name of Nero approaching nearer to the Roman method. This was "\(\tau\eta\ \gamma\) Nero Caesar, which amounts numerically to just 616, and thus gives us a good ground of the diverse reading, which Irenæus found in some Codices. This is surely a remarkable coincidence. The same name, pronounced after the Greek and Hebrew analogy, equals numerically the sum of 666; but spoken in the Latin way (which is also consonant with the Hebrew apocope form of \(\tau\eta\) — viz. \(\gamma\) —), it amounts to 616, which is the rival reading." Ewald has remarked, that the Hebrew for Caesar of Rome also gives 616.

Stuart goes on to express an opinion, that the diverse readings of the Codices may be accounted for by supposing, that "the discrepant modes of sounding Nero's name, whether fully in Hebrew or in an abridged way, gave rise to the different designations of the corresponding numbers." This is very questionable. I am more inclined to think, that variations in the numbers, and corresponding variations in writing the name, may have been adopted in order to give greater scope for mystical coincidences. Two such shall shortly be adduced. At present, I must observe, that the double coincidence shown by Benary appears to me to be alone sufficient to justify the assumption, that Nero's is the name intended. And when, in addition to this coincidence, the place in history and the circumstances, together with the additional and resulting coincidences which I am about to notice, are taken into account, I think no reasonable doubt can exist on the subject,—at any rate, none other, out of the many scores of solutions which have been offered, can show a tithe of the probabilities, which this has in its favour.

One of the three earliest solutions, and that which Irenæus (who has recorded them) considered had the best claims to be received was TEITAN. It has been supposed by Browne (Ordo. Seccl. p. 682), that this name 'originated in an attempt to make it appear, that Titus, in particular, the destroyer of Jerusalem and the eighth Caesar,' was pointed at as the beast. But we think it not improbable, that he (the Δωρυς της Βασιλείας και Δειμνον of the Sibylline Oracles) may have been had in view as well as Nero (the Νερός δύο, the very child of "the old serpent"), and that his name as well as Nero's was adapted by varying the spelling to make the number 666. There is a remarkable parallelism too, which strongly favours this opinion. It was con-
tended by Wetstein, that 616 is the true reading, and that Titus was the person intended, his name being written as above, excepting the omission of the final letter. And hence it seems very probable, that the same double adaptation may have been had in view in reference to Titus as to Nero. Another circumstance, which gives probability to the supposition, that Titus also may have been contemplated is, that, ‘the three rebels’ being omitted in accordance with a custom in mystical computations, he might be accounted the eighth king, who “goeth into perdition.” Indeed, he does actually appear as the eighth Cesar in Ptolemy’s Canon.—W. H. Scott by a very complicated process finds the number 666 to be mystically hidden under the ordinary way of writing Titus in Greek.

Further, it is possible, that Caligula also may have been comprehended in the mystical allusion; for Καισαρ Παύς=616. If he was included, then the three great enemies of God’s people,—he who first ordered his “image” to be placed in God’s temple, he who was “the first persecutor” of Christians, and he who was “the destroyer” of God’s temple and city (or Vespasian, as acting through him),—all three were included. And thus the beast in his entirety may be considered to have been also had in view; for, as I have before remarked, only the persecutors of God’s people are explicitly brought into the symbolizations, the rest of the Cessars being introduced merely for the purpose of indicating the dynasty symbolized.

I will now adduce some numerical coincidences with the number 666, which tend to show, that the number of the beast is rightly referred to the times of the Cessars, and to the three heads just mentioned, and Nero in particular.

In order to do so, I must first quote a passage from the Ascension Eoan. The writer says; “Berial will descend in the form of an atheistical king, the murderer of his mother, the ruler of the world; and he will persecute and oppress all the disciples of the Beloved [cp. Rev. 13: 7], claim divine honours [13: 6], fill the world with his signs and wonders [13; 13], be worshipped and served as God [13; 8, 12], erect his image everywhere [13; 14], and have power 3 y. 7 m. 27 d.” [13; 5]. “Only a few believers will be left, waiting for the coming of their Lord; which shall take place after 332 days. Berial and his powers shall be dragged into Gehenna [19; 20], and the saints shall enjoy the rest provided for them in their present bodily state [20; 1–3]. All the saints from heaven in their heavenly clothing shall descend with the Lord [14; 1–3: 19; 14], and dwell in this world; while the saints who had not died shall also be clothed in like manner with those who come from heaven [19; 8, cp. 1 Th. 4; 16, 17], and after a time leave their bodies here, in order to assume their heavenly station [20; 4]. The universal wreck of the material world will
follow; and this will be the forerunner of the general resurrection and the judgment [20; 11 ss]. The ungodly shall be devoured by fire, which issues from the Beloved [19; 15: 20; 9]."

The reader will see from the references I have inserted, that this passage has important bearings on several places in the Apocalypse. On this account I have quoted more than relates to the matter immediately in hand, with a view to call attention in the first instance to the following points in particular.---Assuming this passage to have been written within the year preceding Nero's death, the writer must have regarded the following as having been facts, which had occurred: ---that Nero had blasphemously laid claim to honours proper to the Deity; that he had made war on the saints, persecuted and oppressed them for the greater part of 42 months; that he had done great 'signs' (and what he had done by his agent may have been attributed to him); that he constrained the dwellers on the earth to worship and serve him as God; and that, by himself or his agents, he insisted on images to him being erected everywhere. Thus, this passage of contemporaneous date does in effect affirm, that all the occurrences, which I suppose to be symbolized in C. 15 in connexion with Nero's reign, were facts which did then actually occur. And as to the future it indicates, that the expectations of Christians of the writer's time were such, as the writings of the New Testament lead us to suppose that they must have been, that is to say, in accordance generally with the teaching of the apostles, but with an admixture of error on some points, arising from a misapprehension of that teaching: op. 2. Thess. 2.

I now proceed to the numerical coincidences, with a view to which I was led to quote the foregoing passage in this place.---The 3 y. 7 m. 27 d. of this passage at 365 days to a year, and 30 days to each of the odd months, would give 1332 days; or, allowing 31 days to three of the months, 1335 days; or again, reckoning 365½ days to a year, and 31 days to 5 of the months, 1337 days. And with each of these numbers a coincidence may be found. 1st. 1332 = 666 x 2, that is, twice "the number of the beast," would show in days the duration of Nero's persecution. 2dly. 1335 is the number found in Dan. 12; 12, and which I have shown, Vol. I: pp. 331 ss., to be composed of 21 + 3 + 21 + 1290. Of these items the 3 may be an intercalary quantity, that is, one which would be reckoned or left out in a mystical computation, as suited the computator's immediate purpose; and the circumstance that 1335 is one of the mystical numbers of Daniel, and 1332 twice 'the number of the beast' renders this probable. 3dly. In order to exhibit the coincidence connected with the number 1337, I must first advert to the 332 days mentioned in the above-cited passage. With regard to this period there is a difference of opinion among critics. Some (e.g. Browne,
Ordo Sacr. p. 686] have dogmatically asserted, that the same period of 8 y. 7 m. 27 d. (=1332 d.) is intended, but that by some accident '1000' has been left out of the text. Others have adopted the opinion of A bp. Laurence, the editor of the work, viz., that a period of 332 days reckoned from the death of Nero is meant. Now it must be observed, in the first place, that the author uses the future tense, not because he speaks with reference to the expected revival or return of Nero after his death or supposed death, but because he speaks in the character of Isaiah. Next, there can be no doubt, I think, that his meaning is, that Berial’s (i.e., Nero’s) ‘power,’ ‘reign,’ or ‘practising,’ would be terminated by his being ‘dragged into Gehenna.’ And it is clear that he means, that Berial would be dragged into Gehenna by the Lord at his coming. Consequently, the end of Berial’s power for 3 y. 7 m. 27 d. synchronizes with the Lord’s coming. But so, also, does the termination of the 332 days. And hence these two periods are conterminous. And, their end being placed at Nero's destruction, we may conclude, that the beginning of the former period has been dated from the commencement of Nero's persecution.—The two periods, too, being conterminous, the 332 days cannot have been reckoned from Nero’s death.—Again, seeing that the two periods are conterminous, and that the one is 332 days, and the other may consist of 1332 days, it were a much more probable supposition, that the author has separated from the latter the round number of 1000 days, than that this number has been accidentally omitted. Recourse ought never to be had to the hypothesis of error, when any other probable solution can be offered, as there may be in this case. But what shows most clearly, that there has not been an omission, is, that if the longer period first mentioned had been referred to afterwards, an article would have been found in the original Greek before '332 days.' So that, at any rate, the improbable hypothesis of an omission of two or three words must be made. Much more easy will it be to suppose, that the author, writing nearly three years after the commencement of Nero's persecution, took a round millenary of days as the period which had elapsed up to the time of writing, and then, having in view to make up the mystical number 1332, fixed the coming of the Lord, and the consequent destruction of Berial, at 332 days from the expiration of the 1000 days. But, instead of expressing the whole period in days, he stated it in years, months, and days, in order to allow of its adaptation to slightly differing mystical numbers, and perhaps in particular to cover the coincidence which I now proceed to lay before the reader. The numerical sum of the letters composing the word Καίσαρ, Cesar, is exactly 332. Consequently, it would represent the number of days in the shorter period. This coincidence may have suggested the
adaptation (if practicable) of the name Nero to represent the longer period. Now, if written thus, Ngm, it would stand for 1005. The two words together would then represent 1337,—a number to which I have shown, that the days in 3 y. 7 m. 27 d. might be made to correspond. It is possible indeed (to wit, by the omission of the second letter), that Nero's name may have been so abbreviated, as to give out exactly 1000; and this without ceasing to indicate (when conjoined with Caesar), who was meant.—The longer period then, when reduced to days, while being itself the double of 'the number of the beast,' would indicate, both who was intended, and what was the duration of his 'persecution and oppression of the disciples of the Beloved.'—I may notice here, that Vespasian's name, when written in the ordinary way, gives 1287; which number stands in the same relation to 1332, as the 1290 in ve. 11 of Dan. 12 does to the 1335 of ve. 12 (the former of which numbers I have shown, Vol. I: p. 331, to be a component item in the mystical period represented by the latter), that is to say, the difference between the two numbers is in each case 45. This coincidence may lead us to suppose, that by some artifice, Vespasian's name might be similarly made up to 1332. And it is a fact, that, by the omission of one letter and the insertion of another, this would be effected without making any material difference in the pronunciation of the name.—[N.B. The conclusion come to above, as to the date of the Ascensio Enaise, has been arrived at since the remarks in Vol. I: p. 212 were printed; and will require, that what was there said in reference to the time of writing be deleted.]

I may be permitted to notice here, that, under the mystic number 666, there may possibly be couched an allusion to the years lying between the Babylonian and the Roman destructions of Jerusalem, and desolations of the holy land. This is rendered the more probable by the circumstance, that these two destructions were unquestionably the grand events, between which it was a primary design to exhibit a parallelism. And hence, if they could be connected together by a mystical number, such a connexion would doubtless be made. Now, it has been shown in Palmoni, ¶ 407, No. 11, that Josephus has made the interval between the two destructions to be 660 years; and previous to the first, and subsequent to the second, there was reckoned in each case to have been a mystical half-week of desolation. Thus, from the beginning of the literal-Babylonian to the end of the mystical-Babylonian desolation, there might be computed to be 666 years.

3. The number of his name. It might reasonably be assumed beforehand, that this must be closely connected with, or arise out of the name of the beast. And this anticipation will, I think, not only be proved to be well-founded, but the number intended be clearly
indicated by the following extracts from the Sibylline Oracles as given by Stuart (with some remarks on them) in his Com. pp. 80, 772.—“In Bk. V. v. 11 sqq., the succession of Roman emperors down to Adrian is marked, by referring to the numerical value of the first letter in one of their leading names; e.g., “he whose name signifies twice ten stands at the head of the series,” meaning Καίος, or Julius Caesar, where Κ = 20. “Next follows he whose name is the first of the alphabet,” i.e. Augustus; “then he whose name marks 300,” i.e. Tiberius; “then he whose name marks 3,” i.e. Πνοες, Caius Caligula; then Κ = 20, i.e. Κλαύδιος, Claudius; next Ν = 50, i.e. Νόρμος, Nero; then Galba, Otho, and Vitellius are not specifically named, but adverted to as destroying each other; next comes Οδυσσεανος, ο = 70; then Τίτος, η = 300; then Δομετιανος, δ = 4; Νερβα, ν = 50; Trajan, η = 300; then “Adrian, who has the name of a sea” (the Adriatic). In his reign the writer in all probability lived; so that it could have been but a little while after the Apocalypse was written, when this mode of designation was employed.” “Now, as none of these reckonings (Stuart means the above and others, some of which I have quoted elsewhere)—as none appear to be grounded at all on the Apocalypse, they serve as independent testimony, to show what the taste of the early ages of Christianity was, when matters of this nature were to be designated in a prophetic way, and names were not intended to be plainly and directly spoken.”—Again, in the same book of the Oracles we read; “He who shall obtain the mark of fifty [i.e., whose name begins with Ν = 50, viz., Nero], will be lord; a horrid serpent breathing out grievous war; who will destroy the outstretched arms of her who bore him. . . . He shall be secretly destroyed. Then shall he return, making himself equal to a God. But He [God] will demonstrate that he is not one.”—These extracts show, that one mystical method of indicating persons was by the first letter of their name, or the number which it represented. What, then, is more probable, than that this numeral letter would be designated “the number of the name,” that is, the number which represented the name? In fact, “the number (or numeral letter) of his name is Γ = 3” would seem to be an expression equivalent to “he whose name marks Γ or 3.” If, then, this conjecture be well founded, and if, in supposing Nero to be the beast (that is, the particular head which is had specially in view), the right name has been fixed upon, the number of the name in the present instance will be Ν = 50.—This conclusion seems to be confirmed,—the names adopted verified,—and the view taken in Palmoi of the various readings borne out by the circumstance, that 50 is the difference between the two readings of “the number of the beast.” So that, in the case of Nero, the method of writing the name, which gives the reading 666, is numerically equal to that, which gives
the reading 616, increased by "the number of the name." The case of Titus will not be less striking, if it be supposed, that sometimes "the number of the name" was a letter added in order to make a mystical number. Then, TEITA = 616: TEITAN = 666. That the same letter, and that the one which represents the number constituting the difference between the two readings, should be found to enter into both names, and in a position in which it may be taken for "the number of the name," must at any rate be allowed to be singular coincidences.

4. The mark of the beast. The term is not ὀργία, a brand-mark (which was generally a stigmatizing hieroglyphic burnt in), but χαράγμα, which, in the connexion in which it stands in the Apocalypse, may probably be used in a sense nearly equivalent to ὀργία, —only, as the latter word was required to denote the proper name of one beast in particular, or more strictly of one head of the beast, this was probably introduced, for distinction's sake, to express the characterizing designation of the beast in his corporate capacity. If this was the case, we shall be at no loss to determine, what that designation must be. For if the number 666 has enabled us rightly to fix upon Neron Caesar as the name and title of the individual specially pointed at, we immediately perceive, that the body corporate, of which he was one head, was the kingdom of the Cæsars, the Roman empire, or (in Greek) ἡ Δυστατοῦ Βασιλεία. And this conclusion we find to be verified by the circumstance, that the sum of the letters composing the designation, considered as numerals, is 666. Moreover, it is remarkable and very confirmatory of this view, that the Hebrew equivalent for this phrase (i.e., Ha-malchuth ha-Latinain, the kingdom of the Latina) gives, as Jenour has pointed out, the same number. We may call to mind here, too, that πολὺ Ῥωμαῖα = 1332, or twice the number 666.

5. The mark of his name. It is evident, that an abbreviated form of the above characterizing mark would be more convenient for general use. Supposing such to have been adopted, how could it have been mystically described? The terms name and mark taken separately were, as we have seen, appropriated. And hence no better mode of expression could be framed than out of a combination of these terms. "The mark of his name" may, then, be a mystical expression equivalent to 'the designation of his name,' meaning some abbreviated representative of it. Such would be the word Λατινός, which, according to the substantive supplied, would mean either the Roman people or the Roman emperor; and consequently might be applied as a designation of the beast, either in his corporate or his individual capacity. Now this word also contains 'the number of the beast,' and thus answers to the key or test that has been furnished.
For it, too, a Hebrew equivalent, containing the number 666, may be found in the word אמש, Romith, adopted by some commentators. And it should be observed, that this was one of the three earliest solutions; and respecting it Irenæus says, that he thinks it a probable one, inasmuch as the word represents the name of the latest empire, i.e., the Roman. Early origin, indeed, is obviously not sufficient of itself to authenticate a solution; but it tends to give probability to one; since it is likely that a traditional remembrance of some of the true solutions of the various particulars might be preserved, even when others began to be introduced. Both læseus and Teræw have such an ancient origin in their favour. But, on the other hand, objections are taken to the spelling of both these words. Such objections, however, I have already obviated. And therefore I will only remark here, that the orthography of the former word has been fully vindicated by Stuart (p. 787) who does not adopt it, and by Elliott (p. 946) who does; and that Irenæus, who must have been well acquainted with the manner of spelling Greek words, and with the license which mystical computators may have been in the habit of taking, has not seen occasion, in discussing the relative claims of the three words he adduces, to object to either on this ground.

From what has now been shown in reference to all the various methods, by which it appears to be intimated that the followers of the beast might be marked in order to their identification, may it not be inferred, that the statement respecting the number of the beast was intended to convey some such idea, and to conduct to such results, as the following summary will exhibit?—"The number of the beast" is 666 or 616; and, a man's name having been found, the letters of which regarded as numerals will make this number, these (i.e., the name and the number) together will form a clue to the several marks, and afford a means of verifying them in the following manner.—Nero Caesar, according to the different ways in which it may be written in Hebrew letters, will give both 666 and 616. Hence this is "the name of the beast" in his most hateful development under his persecuting head.—Titus may be written in Greek letters with a sufficient approximation to accuracy to indicate the individual intended, and at the same time so as to make either 666 or 616. Caius Caesar, also, will give 616. Hence these, too, will bear the tests, and may be names of heads had specially in view, the one as having been the first Caesar that sought to force an idolatrous worship upon God's people, and the other as being the agent of 'the Destroyer of the pious,' by whom the once 'holy city' was reduced to ruins.—The initial letter (N) of the beast's principal name, viz., Nero, gives as the number of the name 50, which is the difference between
the two readings, 666 and 616. The final and moveable letter in
Tevita-n is the same.—From the names of the beast’s heads, it follows
that Rome under the Cæsars must be the beast, when he is regarded in
his entirety; and consequently its title, heb-Latinees basileia in Greek,
or the Hebrew equivalent thereof, ought to be the designative mark
of the beast. Accordingly, both phrases are found to give the number
666.—The mark of the name of the beast would seem to intend (like
the number of his name) some abbreviation, that might be used to re-
represent either his generic or his specific designation. Lateinos in
Greek letters, and Rōmīth in Hebrew would answer for either. And
each will satisfy the test by giving out 666.—On a review of these
coincidences can we rightly conclude, that they may be all and alto-
tgether fortuitous? Granting, that they are founded on conjecture,
and may be to some extent erroneous; can they be wholly fallacious,
and not worthy to be deemed proof of anything? If so, then a
fortiori all the popular expositions of the Apocalypse must be thrown
aside as nothing worth; for there is not one which does not depend
for its existence on a number of separate coincidences, not worthy to
be compared in an evidential point of view with those which have
now been exhibited,—a fact, which the different expositions mutually
establish against one another. But if, all things considered, the main
points, namely, that Rome under the Cæsars, and in particular Nero
acting by Vespasian, and Vespasian by Titus, are symbolized in
C. 13,—if these points are allowed to be established, everything that
is essential will be admitted, and a great step made towards the re-
ception of the whole scheme of interpretation.

Synoptical interpretation of the second heptadal tableau of the seventh
trumpet. XIII; I. By the numerical identity of their heads and
horns, the beast of this tableau is shown to be generically one with
the dragon of the first, that is, both symbolize substantially the same
thing, namely, the Roman world-power in the hands of the Cæsars.
The specific difference is, that the dragon represents the military
power, and this beast (with its companion and complement, the second
beast) the civil power of Rome, as erected into an imperial despotism
by the Cæsars. For completeness and identification, this first beast
exhibits that power from its rise under Julius Caesar; though, as the
intention is to limit the reference to the times of the persecuting
kings, the history is actually taken up only from a few years before
the epoch, to which it had been brought down in the former series,
that is, from Caligula’s time. Rome under the Cæsars is first repre-
sented generically, as being a ravaging and desolating power,—in-
satiable in its lust of conquest, even as a wild beast is for prey, and
as setting up a tyrannical despotism, and blasphemously arrogating
to itself titles which are proper to God alone, such as Roma dea, Dominus, Deus, and the like. 2. More particularly, the characteristics of this dynasty are represented to be stealthiness, cunning, and cruelty combined with irresistible might; vast power to crush those who should resist it; and strength and disposition to tear and grind them with unrelenting fury: and these qualities may be taken to be severally characteristic of the first three emperors, Julius, Augustus, and Tiberius. This dynasty acquired its great power, its regal dignity, and imperial authority by means of the army. 3. The first three kings not coming individually into the symbolization of this trumpet, because they were not persecutors on religious grounds, they are passed over with no further notice, than is given in the attributing of their characteristics to the beast as a whole. The first head, then, brought prominently and personally on the scene, and which may be taken to be identical here with the fourth horn, represents Caligula. In him, on his assassination, the imperial regime was for a time considered to have received its death-blow. The republican form of government was restored by those, who had conspired to put him to death; and great were the rejoicings, which took place on the occasion. But soon the hopes of the patriots were blasted; for the army again set up the Cesarian dynasty in the person of Claudius. And then great were the apprehensions and the amazement felt thereat, especially in Judea. 4. Submission was yielded, however, to the military power, and even thankfulness feigned for its having restored the empire. Loud, too, were the professions of admiration, and abject the laudations of the irresistible might of the Caesars. 5. Under Nero this dynasty became more boastful, and more hostile to God’s people in words and deeds, than it had ever been before: and it was permitted to manifest its hostility to the true servants of the Lamb for 3½ years, viz., from November 64 to June 68. 6. It even went to such a height of wickedness, as to utter blasphemy against God Himself, to blaspheme His name by arrogating to itself His title and attributes (that emperor styling himself God and Lord, and exhibiting himself in a temple of God as a god); and it uttered malicious calumnies against Christians and the Christian Church. 7. Nero also made war (A.D. 66) upon God’s ancient people, and speedily overran their country, and reduced to subjection every part of it, with the exception of Jerusalem. 8. If we except the faithful few, who had been enrolled in the Lamb’s list of the saved in consequence of their faith in him, whom God from the foundation of the world had appointed to become a sacrifice for the sins of men, and who, having been forewarned, had fled to Pella, all the inhabitants of the land were slain, or compelled to yield the most abject submission to the beast. 9. But mark well the retributive justice to be exe-
cuted on this savage beast (not only in his individual, but also in his corporate capacity), as an example to all powers, that wage war on the Lamb and his followers. 10. As surely as any one causeth captives to be carried away into slavery, so surely shall he go into slavery. As surely as any one slayeth with the sword, so surely shall he be slain by the sword. Of a truth, in order to pass unscathed through the fiery trial that is coming on the land, the people of God will 'have need of patience' and of faith in their highest exercise.

11. Hitherto we have traced the history of the beast, which rises out of the troubled territory of the heathen nations, and which, though adapted to represent the whole series of kings that come within this trumpet-period, is specially representative of the Julian dynasty. We now turn to one, which, while shown to represent substantially the same thing by its being an animal of the same description, is yet declared to be 'another,' and is also proved to be specifically diverse by certain variations in respect of it. One of these is, that, in contrast to the first beast's origin from the heathen 'sea,' it (that is, its reality) rises to the throne from the 'earth,' or 'land' of Judea. This beast symbolizes the Flavian dynasty of Cæsars. Its two horns in an incipient stage of development (and hence "like a lamb's") denote Vespasian's two sons, Titus and Domitian, who do not enter into the symbolic history, but whom it was necessary thus far to indicate in the symbolization, in order to make the number of the Cæsars complete. This dynasty, so far as it comes under notice here, is characterized by issuing its mandates under pain of military compulsion and martial law. 12. Nero having conferred on Vespasian full powers and sufficient means to reduce the refractory Jews to submission, and sent him to re-establish the imperial authority in Judea, Vespasian executed his instructions with so much skill and despatch, that he speedily reduced the Jews to subjection. 13. He exhibited, indeed, many signal acts of military prowess, and with such success did he prosecute the war, that it was superstition believed, that he was a special favourite of heaven, and had been enabled by the gods to work miracles. 14. Such an ascendancy did he gain over his soldiery, and especially his principal officers, by the prodigies of military skill and valour he achieved during Nero's reign, and while he was fighting to re-establish that emperor's authority, that he was able, when a state of anarchy ensued on Nero's death, to induce them to proclaim him emperor, and so to constitute his dynasty a second beast, the very image, counterpart, and facsimile of the first. 15. So completely did his enterprise succeed, that he attained the full object of his ambition; and his dynasty proved to be, not a premature abortion which perished as soon as it appeared in the world, like those of Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, but a living and abiding
reality. He ruled with vigour, issued his edicts as emperor, overcame his rivals, and put to death all who would not yield obedience to him. 16. He also compelled his enemies of every class to assume some token or badge of submission to him; and those who refused he deprived of the ordinary rights and privileges of citizens. 17. The stigmata, that were thus impressed on the slaves of the beast, serve to indicate what the beast is, and in what emperors’ reigns his savage nature was specially manifested. 18. Of these, ‘the number’ of him is the clew to the rest, and to the whole mystery; and it is therefore given in plain terms. There will, however, be scope and occasion for skill in the mystical art, to make it serve as a key to unlock the secret. Therefore, let him who desires to know the truth put forth his ingenuity. The number is 666: this being the sum of the letters in the Hebrew and in the Greek words for ‘the Latin kingdom’ and for ‘Latin’ or ‘Roman:’ also of those in the ‘Hebrew, Greek, and Latin’ for ‘Nero’ or ‘Nero Cesar,’ and in the Greek for ‘Titus.’ Vespasian, also, is marked with the double of the number of the beast.—In respect of the making an image, and the enforcing the worship of it, the following may be given as the interpretation of the personal application. There was thereby symbolized the planting of the Roman ensigns (which bore the likeness of the reigning emperor) in every part of Judea, and the enforcing homage to them on pain of death or deprivation of civil rights and privileges,—the very presence of such in their land being regarded by the Jews as a profanation, and the rendering of any respect to such representations of a creature as an impious insult to the Creator.

Mystery of God in a Seven-Seal Roll. [H. XIX.

Acts 8. Sæcule, in allusion to Luther's birth. Monopera [Massuet, Bp. Walmsley]. Ludovicus [a solution reproduced in 1860, and applied to Louis Napoleon]. Silvester secondus. Dux Cleri [Brute]. Linus secondus. Vicarius filii Dei [Ed. of Fleming, 1848, p. 48 n.]. D.F. Julianus Caesar Athenæus. Diocles Augustus [Bossuet]. Vicarius generalis Dei in terris, the title given to the Pope in the Council of Trent [Faber]. The Hebrew of Simon Stella filius rex meus, or of Rex Israel [Ordo Sac. p. 393 n.]. Adonikam and his 666 [Vitrina, Hengstenberg]. 666 talents was the revenue of Solomon, who was a type of the world [I. Williams]. Queen Victoria [Father Newman]. Lee supposes, that the number of the stich in the margin was introduced to supply an ellipsis. A.D. 627 to 1293 [Aureolus]. 606 to 1372 [Luther]. 666 years to be the duration of Mahometanism [Pope Innocent III.]. 666 may be typical of the time from the Creation to the Judgment [Joachim]. In a.D. 666 Pope Vitalian ordered prayers to be in Latin [Magdeburgh Centurion]. The time of the beast's supremacy, 1170 to 1836 [Bengel]. From the rise of Poperly in 533 to the rise of the Inquisition in 1198, 666 years [Croly].


Introductory remarks. This and the next heptad may be considered to be in some measure supplemental to the two which precede them, inasmuch as they relate to the period of crisis, namely, the Jewish war. While the two preceding heptads exhibited the heathen power as being on the whole in the ascendant, these show the judgments, which will sooner or later overtake all those, who side with the world against the Lamb and his elect. Of the two, the heptad before us seems to connect more closely with that in C. xiii, and the one in C. xv-xvi with that of C. xii. This and the next are distinguished by having preludes prefixed to them. See Guide, pp. 155-6.

Stuart considers, that, with the view 'to animate the courage of the noble little band of Christians, the author here arrests the action of the great drama in order to hold out the symbols of ultimate and certain victory,' and that 'the chapter before us is entirely occupied with these.' I can by no means concur in this view. It will clearly appear as we proceed, that, after a preludial scene exhibiting the redemption of the elect, the main features in the chapter are, first, the denunciation of judgments on the enemies of the lamb, heathen and Jewish; and, subsequently, their execution on the latter, together with the previous redemption of God's people from among them. No conflict is represented, nor even alluded to; and therefore no symbols
of victory can be brought to view, nor is there anything that resembles such. No doubt there is implied "an anticipatory administration of comfort," as Hengstenberg says, and there may have been also a design "to place in a flood of light the parenthesis in our Lord's word, 'that (if it were possible) they would deceive the very elect;'" for it was the very object for which the book was written to comfort and animate 'the Lord's called, and elect, and faithful ones,' under the persecution they were then enduring. The Lord is here symbolized, in accordance with the announcement in the prelude to the trumpet (see 11; 18), as coming to execute 'judgment,' and 'to give the reward to his servants.'

HEPTADAL PRELUDE. The lamb, his 144 chiliads, and the song of the redeemed.

This preludial scene is designed to indicate the principal feature in the heptad which it introduces, by exhibiting anticipatively the beatification of those, who are subsequently symbolized as being 'reaped from the earth:' and this fact shows the passage to be a prelude,—a heading as it were to the heptad. At the same time the characteristics of those, who will be found among the number of the redeemed, are indicated.

(1). The lamb and his 144 chiliads. XIV; 1. 921—926. And I beheld, and lo! the lamb standing on the Mount Zion; and with him a hundred [and] forty-four chiliads, having the name of him, and the name of his father, written on their foreheads.

921. I behold. Where we are to conceive of the seer as now standing to 'behold' does not very clearly appear. The general rule of assuming no change to be made in his Visional position, when none is mentioned, would lead us to assume, that he is to be regarded as still standing on the symbolical seashore (13; 1). But perhaps it is not intended, that we should form any definite idea on the point, there being now no significance in his locus stands.—The lo! calls attention to a spectacle more than ordinarily interesting.—The lamb. The R. T. most unhappily and erroneously has omitted the article. The A. V., however, has gone to an extreme in the opposite direction, by leading the reader to think directly of the Lord Jesus, through printing thus, the Lamb. The article clearly refers to, and ought to bring before our minds the animal of C. 5; 6, which is the symbol of the Lord Jesus in his mediatorial character. In connexion here with the 144 chiliads, it is essential, and indeed the very point of the symbolization, that Jesus should be brought to mind in this character. He comes to view here emphatically as the Saviour with his saved ones. Cp. 7; 14; "in the blood of the lamb;" and 12; 11; "by the blood of the lamb." The tender lamb, too, stands con-
trusted with the savage beast, to whom our thoughts have just been so forcibly directed, and will again be called in this heptad. Though the former is apparently no match for the latter; yet there is an efficacy in his blood, which can make his followers 'more than conquerors' over the beast, his terrors and his allurements, 'through him who hath loved them, and given himself for them.'

922. Standing on the Mount Zion. Is the earthly or the heavenly Zion meant;—the mount, where stood the earthly temple and city of God, and where the covenant made on 'the mount that might be touched' attained its fullest development and glory; or 'the mount Zion' that is above, where are 'the city of the living God, the heavenly,' 'the new Jerusalem,' 'the church of the first-born, and Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and the blood of sprinkling' (He. 12; 18 ss.)? 'The mount that might be touched' was 'the mount Sinai in Arabia, where the covenant was made which gendereth to bondage, and which mount answered to the Jerusalem that then was, and was in bondage with her children;' but 'the Zion of the city of the living God' answered to 'the Jerusalem above, which is the mother of us Christians' (Gal. 4; 22 ss.). Ewald and Hengstenberg consider, that 'the heavenly Zion' is meant: Stuart contends for the earthly. The arguments which the latter advances in support of his view are invalid, inasmuch as they either depend on the erroneous substitution of a literal for a figurative sense, or are reflexions from and wholly dependent on his own scheme of interpretation. On the other hand, I offer the following reasons for thinking, that the heavenly Zion is intended. 1. The article shows that it is. Its insertion must indicate (ct. Ga. 4; 24–25: He. 12; 18, 20, 22), either a reference to a previous mention made of the mount, or a mount of the name which may be so called in the highest sense. As there had been no previous mention, the latter alternative must be accepted; and then, of the two significations proposed, there can be no doubt, which ought to be adopted. 2. The voices, which are said to proceed 'from the heaven' (ve. 2), are also said by necessary implication (ve. 3) to be those of the 144 chiliads. Consequently, the 144 chiliads, who were standing on the mount, must have been in the heaven. 3. Also, the throne of God is on this mount (ve. 3); but it could not be represented as being on an earthly one. 4. The 144 chiliads of C. 7 were admitted into the temple in heaven (ve. 15); and assuredly this 144 chiliads, whether identical with that or not, cannot be in a less exalted position. 5. The parallel allegorical figurations in S. Paul's epistles, exhibiting (as I have just shown, that they do) a contrast between an earthly Legal mount and a heavenly Evangelical mount, present these two for our choice: and there can, I think, be no doubt, that the symbolization before us accords with
The angels of judgments.

the latter, and not with the former. 6. If the object be (as it is universally admitted that it is) to animate those engaged in conflict with the beast by a prospect of the bliss of those who prove victors, the earthy Zion would be a locality quite incongruous as the scene of the prospect: 'the joys that are above' would be the very point of the manifestation. 7. An earthly scene would involve an incongruous anachronism, which a heavenly does not. We can easily see the propriety of their own future bliss being symbolically set before living persons as a stimulus to zeal and devotedness; but not of that of an earthly state. On these grounds I hesitate not to conclude, that it is the heavenly Zion on which the 144 chilaidas stand. And I agree with Hengstenberg, that "the heavenly Zion appears as the local position of the heavenly temple, which stands related to the ancient tabernacle, 'the tent of meeting,' as the substance to the shadow."—And here let us notice an inference that may be drawn (if this conclusion is well founded) from the contrast, which is made in He. 12; 18 ss. between the mount Sinai and the mount Zion. 'If so much as a beast might not touch the former mount without being stoned or thrust through with a dart,' how much more shall sure and swift destruction overtake the beast that is now in question, when he shall gather together his armies (19; 19) to assault the mount Zion, and make war on the lamb and his followers!—If it be asked; Why does the lamb appear here on the mount Zion? it may be answered; To denote, that 'the Lord God will give unto him, who is 'the son of the Highest,' 'the throne of his father David,' and he shall 'reign on the mount Zion, and before his ancients gloriously.'—Some who recognize, that the scene before us is laid in the heaven, still contend, that it is the true church as militant here on earth, that is symbolized. No doubt, 'first fruits' from the Christian church on earth are brought to view here, even as those from the Jewish church are in C. 7. But no less certainly are they represented here (cp. ve. 5), as being in a triumphant state. And the description of the same parties in the parallel prelude in C. 15 as 'conquerors' leaves no doubt on the point.—In the book of Enoch, C. xxiv, there is a passage, which bears some resemblance to that before us. The prophet says; 'And I saw a mountain of fire, flashing both by day and night. I proceeded towards it; and perceived seven splendid mountains. . . . And the seventh was in the midst of them. In length they all resembled the seat of a throne. . . . Then Michael, one of the holy angels who were with me, and who presided over them' (cp. Rev. 12; 7), 'answered me, saying; That mountain which thou beholdest, the extent of whose head resembles the seat of the Lord, will be the seat on which shall sit the holy and great Lord of glory, the everlasting King, when he shall descend to visit the earth with goodness.'
923. *And with him a hundred and forty-four chilias.* I have shown on 468, that the word *chilias* has been used with the view to indicate, that the elect are to be regarded as being divided into 12 times 12 companies of 1000 each, and that by the square of the perfect dynastic number 12 absolute perfection and completeness is symbolized in the strongest manner possible. But, if the design be simply to represent the completeness of the predestined number, we must of course not form any idea of the actual number in the reality from the figures in the text. The reality may be to any extent greater or less than the symbolical number.—An important question is raised here, namely, whether this 144 chilias symbolizes the same parties as that in C. 7; 3? Before proceeding to consider it, I may be allowed to lay claim to not being biased by my own scheme; since a decision either way would be capable of reconciliation with that scheme. At the same time, I cannot concede this position for impartiality to those, whose scheme (like Stuart's and Hengstenberg's) appears to have constrained them to adopt the view they take. Indeed, it is only on this ground of imperative compulsion, that the adoption of one alternative, when the text appears clearly to indicate the other, can be accounted for. The ground on which I say, that the text plainly indicates one view, is the absence of the article. Unquestionably the Greek article would have been inserted for reference here, just as it is in ve. 3, if the same symbol that was brought to view in C. 7; 3 had been contemplated in this passage. So natural, not to say necessary is this, that Stuart has introduced the article into his translation, though he has not even a vestige of a Various reading to authorize him in doing so. He has discreetly passed *sub silentio* the question of the article. Not so Hengstenberg, who, having evidently felt strongly the force of the argument, has endeavoured to lessen it (to obviate it entirely was out of the question) by saying; “It might have stood: *the* hundred and forty and four thousand. Yet this was not necessary, as it is more customary for the groups formally to preserve their independence, than that they should definitely refer back to the earlier portions, Op. C. 17; 3, where a beast is the subject, although the same beast is meant, which was already spoken of in C. 13.” Observe, that he cannot deny, that this would have been the more natural and regular wording. The most, that even he can venture to say, is, that it was not necessary. But this assertion I must deny; unless he can prove an exception here to what is the general rule. This he cannot do. For he can produce no warranty for his next assertion as to the groups preserving their independence: unless, indeed, it be such as derives all its force from his own scheme. His so-called *groups* are formed, as I have shown in the *Guide*, P. II. C. III. on a wholly erroneous view of the structure of the Apocalypse. And as
to the beast of C. 17, I hold, that the article is not inserted for the very purpose of not identifying it with the beast of C. 13. The things signified by the two, though substantially, are yet not precisely the same. And even if they were identical, it would not necessarily follow, that the symbols must be so too. Indeed, the differences in the descriptions of the two beasts show, that they are not. And there would be no reference from one symbol to another, that was not wholly identical with it. Since, then, an exception cannot be proved, the general rule must be allowed to hold good in this instance, and the absence of the article be deemed sufficient to prove the diversity. To the contrary nothing can be advanced, beyond the correspondence between the numbers. But such a coincidence, in such a book, and in such a case, cannot rightly be allowed to have any weight whatever. A salient feature of the book, and of the mystical system, is to exhibit such correspondences. But these are merely parallelisms, which are far indeed from implying identity in the things signified; though there has not been a more fruitful source of error in the interpretation of the Apocalypse, than has arisen from mistaking parallelisms for identities.—All the concomitant circumstances tend to confirm the view, that the 144 chiliads here do not symbolize the same parties as the 144 chiliads of C. 7. 1. The localities are different and contrasted. The 144 chiliads of C. 7 are apparently placed on the earthly Zion (see on 454); while those of C. 14 stand on the heavenly Zion. And if the former belong to the Legal Dispensation, but the latter to the Evangelical, the contrast will be most appropriate, and exactly in accordance with those drawn in Galatians and Hebrews. 2. The former were simply sealed, while the latter had the names of the Father and the Son written on their foreheads,—a more special mark of distinction. 3. The former were taken 'out of all the tribes of Israel,' but the latter were 'brought from among men.' 4. Those had 'come out of the tribulation' of the fifth seal, but these were they 'who had not worshipped the beast nor his image.' 5. Those were 'servants of God,' but these 'followers of the lamb' (14; 4). 6. Finally, the description of the former in C. 7; 14–17 differs generally from that of the latter in C. 14; 4–5 (see Vol. I: pp. 282, 291). I do not overlook the fact, that some of these differences might be accounted for by supposing, that two appearances of the same company at different epochs, and under different circumstances, are represented. But I apprehend, that the scheme of those, who take the opposite view, precludes their adopting this hypothesis.—If, now, the two symbols represent two different companies, it is natural to inquire next; Of whom did these companies consist? The earlier has been shown (on 469, 482) to consist of those Jews, who were sufferers in or prior to the Babylonian invasion. If, then,
the later is made up of those Christians, who suffered ‘on account of their testifying for Jesus,’ prior to and during the last invasion of Judea, another parallelism between the Babylonian and the Roman destructions will be added to the many already exhibited; and, in particular, that drawn by S. Paul in his allegory of the two Mounts will be perfected. To say more here, in proof that this is the true view, would be to anticipate what follows. Suffice it, therefore, to observe, that everything will be found to accord with and to corroborate this view; as we have, indeed, been prepared to expect by that more intimate connexion of the later company with the lamb, which has already been made manifest.

924. Having the name of him. The R. T. wrongly omits this clause. —One of the promises made to Christian conquerors in the epistles was, “I (the Lamb) will give him a white counter with a new name written thereon, which none knoweth, but he who receiveth it;” and another was, “I will write on him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, New Jerusalem, and my new name.” This new name of the lamb was doubtless the one described in C. 19; 12 as “a name written which none knew but he himself;” for the parties and the epoch are the same, though the former are there exhibited under the symbol of the great Conqueror coming with his heavenly hosts. The name spoken of in this clause appears to have been the new name of the lamb, in correspondence with “the new song” which follows, and has an important connexion with it. And if so, this clause alone suffices to show, that the 144 chiliads are Christian conquerors. —Observe, that the Greek participle is not put in the masculine to agree with men or persons, but in the feminine to agree with chiliads. It is thus indicated, that the 144 chiliads are not to be regarded as individuals, but in their entirety as forming one symbol, the units composing which are the companies of 1000 each.

925. And the name of his father. The names ‘of God and the lamb’ (cp. ve. 4) are placed in contrast with the name and other marks of the beast, which have just been brought before us. Those were enforced on the slaves of the beast, but these must be earned by the followers of the lamb.—Observe, however, that the lamb’s name comes first, and then that of ‘his father,’ intimating that it is only through him, and in consequence of his relationship as “the son of God,” that the unspeakable honour of having the name of God in the inscription is obtained. —Hengstenberg says; “The name is not written on their foreheads as a reward, but it glitters there as the sacred insignia, which they had triumphantly maintained amid all the assaults of the world, that plied every effort to rob them of it.” Though I think, that this mode of putting the matter somewhat confounds the sign
with the thing signified, I should not much object to the representation, if it be qualified so far as to allow, that the names are a reward inasmuch as, by indicating ‘who the 144 chiliads are and whence they came’ (cp. 7; 13), and consequently why they received the names, they serve as a distinguished mark of honour, exalting them, and serving as an incentive to others to imitate them. Such an incentive would manifestly have far greater power, if the symbol included in its signification those, to whom it was primarily presented. And hence arises a further ground for thinking, that the then testifying people of God were included in the symbolization.

926. Written on their foreheads. So the servants of the beast: 13; 16. And on the same part were the former 144 chiliads “sealed:” see on 466.—Codex A has an article, which throws emphasis on the word written.

(2). The voice of the harp-singers. XIV; 2. 927-31. (And I heard a voice out of the heaven as it were a voice of many waters, and as it were a voice of loud thunder. And the voice which I heard [was] as it were [a voice] of harp-singers, harping with their harps.)

927. I heard a voice. Since none could learn the song which proceeded from this voice, save the 144 chiliads (see ve. 3), it is clear that this voice was theirs. Concord, even to oneness, is the soul of perfect harmony; and hence, though they were so many thousands, their voices sounded and became as one,—“a voice.” We may adapt and apply to this symbol the lines:

“Ten thousand thousand are their tongues,
But all their notes are one.”

Similarly, on the parallel occasion (7; 9) ‘the great multitude cried with a loud voice.’—Out of the heaven. Stuart observes; “This shows, that the station of John was now on earth, where also he sees the Lamb on mount Zion.” He evidently means the latter clause to be an inference from the former, though he has not worded it as such. But it is a non sequitur. John may have been stationed on the earth, and yet have seen the lamb on the Zion in heaven (cp. 14; 13). Indeed, assuming that the seer was on earth, this expression only becomes more emphatic in disproof of Stuart’s view; since it would seem to have been added to guard against the supposition, that those from whom the voice proceeded were likewise on earth. It is doubtless intended, that we should conceive of the seer, as first seeing the heaven open and disclose the 144 chiliads standing on Zion, and as then hearing the voice burst forth, and come pealing down from heaven’s vaulted roof.

928. As it were a voice of many waters. The same clause occurs in the corresponding prelude to Hep. XXIII. (19; 6), and is one of the indications of identity of reference in the two. So, also, it is said of
the great Head of the Church in C. 1; 15; "His voice was as it were a voice," i.e., a sound "of many waters." And in many passages of the Old Testament the voice of the Lord is compared to the sound of many waters. We must, however, be careful not to mistake the use of the terms here. 'Waters' symbolically mean peoples; but, as the word occurs here in a simile, it is obviously used in the literal sense. It is the grandeur and loudness of the sound of many waters, that forms the point of the simile. And, inasmuch as the sea is constantly used to represent the heathen nations, and, when regarded as lashed into fury by tempestuous winds, to denote the nations as being in a state of commotion and warfare, we doubtless ought not to conceive of the waters of the ocean as being those contemplated, but rather those of some mighty cataract, such as a Zambesi or a Niagara. Than the sound of such a waterfall there is nothing more grand and awe-inspiring in nature.

929. And as it were a voice of loud thunder. This clause also is found in the prelude in C. 19. It has the same general purport as the preceding one, being added to heighten the idea of depth and grandeur in the sound.—Thunder invariably occurs in the formula of political catastrophe (Guide, 199); and hence has a political bearing. Wherever it is found, it has a threatening aspect. Here it looks forward to the final catastrophe of this trumpet, which, in the symbolization parallel to that at the close of this heptad, is ushered in with 'lightnings, and voices, and thunders' (16; 18).

930. And the voice which I heard was as it were a voice of harp-singers. That is, of persons accompanying themselves on the harp; for such according to Ammonius is the meaning of the term, it being used in contradistinction from κιθαρίστης, a harper, one who only plays. —The difference made by the adoption of the true reading may be sufficiently seen by comparison of the A. V. The correction places beyond doubt the fact, that the same voice is spoken of here as in 927.

931. Harping with their harps. So, too, the representatives of the redeemed in C. 5; 8 have harps, with which they accompany their 'new song:' see on 359. So, also, the conquerors in the parallel prelude in C. 15. The song must be substantially the same in all three instances. And it is invariably, and indeed from its purport necessarily, sung by those to whom it relates: cp. 5; 9, 10: 14; 3: 15; 3, 4.—'A harp is constantly in the Scriptures an instrument of joy and praise.' For example. Is. 24; 8; "The joyful sound of the harp ceaseth:" Ps. 33; 2; "Praise Jehovah with the harp:" also 63; 4: 57; 8; &c. And to hang up the harp is emblematic of deep affliction: Ps. 137; 2. From the constant use of them at marriage feasts, harps would be specially appropriate to a nuptial
festivity; and to such this scene was virtually a prelude: cp. 19; 6, 7. Thus, the harps imply, that this ‘new song’ was a song of praise, suitable to the approaching marriage of the lamb. And further, inasmuch as the harp was esteemed the softest and sweetest of all instruments of music, these harps supply all sweet and soft notes. And thus the perfection of the song as such is made complete. It has solemn, grand, awe-inspiring notes, combined with the sweetest and most touching strains; and all so modulated, and keeping time in such perfect harmony, that they form as it were but one voice. To indicate this distinction between the deep and the soft notes may have been a reason, in respect of the song itself, for the striking difference, that is made in the wording of the preceding clause,—a difference, which has even given rise to the belief, that two distinct voices are intended. But this view is insufficient, I think, to account for so wide a difference being made. A deeper meaning must have been contemplated. And I doubt not, that the design was further to indicate the bearings of the coming judgments, in reference to the two parties concerned. The awful sounds of the rushing cataracts of waters, and of the pealing thunders, are emblematic of the fearful judgments, impending over the enemies of the Lord’s people; and the sweet tones of the joyous harps signify the pleasures at God’s right hand, which await the conquerors of the beast.

(3). Their new song. XIV; 3. 932–936. And they sing as it were a new song before the throne, and before the four living-creatures and the elders. And none could learn the song, but the hundred [and] forty-four chiliiads, who have been bought from the earth.

932. The preceding division should be read as being spoken parenthetically, in order that the they of this verse may connect with the 144 chiliiads; for that it refers to them is evident from the statement that follows, that none but they could learn the song. When this verse is thus closely connected with ve. 1, the special purport of the song will be better brought out by its more close connexion with the virtual description of its subject-matter in the inscription on the foreheads of the 144 chiliiads. The names, in conjunction with the harps, give as its title; ‘Praise to the lamb and to his father for our victory over the beast.’—Some Codices, but not the most ancient, omit as it were, probably owing to some copyist’s want of insight into the meaning. For, strictly speaking, the song is not a new one; since it is the song of praise for redemption, and has consequently been sung for substance from the beginning, even as often as new companies of the redeemed have been admitted into their incipient state of rest. Thus, it is ‘the song of Moses’ as well as ‘of the Lamb’ (15; 3): it was sung of old under the former Dispensation as well as now under the new. It is the song which the ‘great multitude’ of Jews sang
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'before the throne and before the lamb' (7; 9) after the Babylonian destruction, as now the great multitude of Christians after the Roman. Only, it is 'as it were a new song;' inasmuch as it bursts forth anew at the entrance of every fresh company into bliss, with new notes and variations, with new life and vigour, and in particular with adaptation to new circumstances and deliverances, furnishing new themes of thanksgiving and praise to God and to the lamb. The specialty on the former occasion was "the deliverance" from "the great tribulation" caused by the Babylonian beast (7; 10, 14): on this it is "the deliverance" (19; 1) from the Roman beast (15; 2).—Before the throne = "before the sacred Majesty of heaven."

933. And before the four living-creatures and the elders. That there is here only one before, in parallelism to the before which precedes the throne, indicates that, while the two members of the clause stand on an equal footing inter se, and have a certain unity in respect of signification existing between them, the clause as a whole does not stand on an equal footing with that which precedes it. The 144 chilias sing before the throne, as before their omniscient judge; but before the creatures and elders as before their fellows,—the representatives of that body, which includes the redeemed creation and the church, and of which they are themselves a 'first-fruit.'—On the parallel occasion, 'the multitude stood before the throne and before the lamb,' while 'the angels stood around the throne and the elders and the creatures:' before whom the 144 chilias stand here. In this instance before the lamb is necessarily omitted; because the lamb stands at the head of the 144 chilias (a special indication, by the bye, that these are Christians): and before the creatures and elders has been added probably to give pre-eminence to this occasion over that.

934-5. And none could learn the song, but the 144 chilias. As this was a song of praise for redemption, necessarily none could learn to sing it but those who had been redeemed. This is a parallelism with the name, which 'none knoweth but he who receiveth it.'—The learn is from De. 31; 19.

936. Who have been bought from the earth. I noticed on 924, that the participle was put there in the feminine to agree with chilias. Here, though chilias is the antecedent, it is in the masculine, agreeing with men understood. This is, because redemption is a work, which has reference to men in an individual, and not in a corporate capacity.

—As to the precise meaning of the Greek word which is here rendered in the A. V. redeemed, but everywhere else in the N. T. except in C. 5; 9, bought, see C. 3; 18: 13; 17: 18; 11. When the word is elsewhere rendered redeemed, as in Ga. 3; 13: 4; 5: Ep. 5; 16: Co. 4; 5, it has a preposition in composition with it, making it equivalent to bought off. But commonly another word is used to express
redemption. I am inclined to think, that, while redemption is necessarily implied, the terrestrial deliverance is more immediately contemplated; and on this account a less emphatic word is used.—*From the earth* shows plainly, if my view of the symbolical meaning of *the earth* be well-founded, that this symbol represents Christians of Judea. Cp. Acts 6; 7: 12; 24.

(4). *Their purity.* XIV; 4. 937. *These are they, who have not been defiled with women; for they are virgins.*

Probably there is not a passage, even in the Apocalypse, which has been more commonly misinterpreted, or from which more false and dangerous deductions have been drawn than this. The question is commonly put thus (e.g., by Stuart); Is the statement "to be understood literally or figuratively?" But this is not the right way of stating it; and it is in part owing to the question not being put in a right light, that doubt and misconception have arisen. We should rather ask; *Are we to rest here in the literal sense?* Looking at the matter in this point of view, the right answer must, as it seems to me, be given at once without any occasion for argument. Nevertheless, let the following considerations be well weighed. 1. The character and genius of the whole book, and the principle necessarily adopted in interpreting it, permit us not to rest in the literal sense. 2. In particular, the passage of which this sentence forms part, and the symbolical character of the 144 chilads to whom it relates, forbid our doing so. 3. The sentence is manifestly designed to exhibit the perfection of character. But, if it be taken exclusively in its literal sense, it will make that perfection to consist in the single virtue of chastity, to the exclusion of all other virtues,—nay, I should rather say, in that which is no virtue at all, namely, celibacy. 4. If the literal sense be rested in, all relevancy to the context and circumstances will be lost. Surely these are reasons sufficient to leave no room for doubt, that we are not to rest in the literal sense.—But in saying this I necessarily imply, that the statement is to be taken primarily, that is, in reference to the symbol, in its literal signification. And here we must take care, that we really do take it in the sense, which the terms import. For the common error with those, who contend for the literal sense, is to take the sentence in reference (not to the symbol, but to the thing symbolized) in what is not really its literal purport. They attach to it the idea of freedom from *illicit* sexual intercourse; whereas to this it has no reference. Its real reference is to one of the kinds of Legal impurity, which disqualified from the service of God and the communion of his people, I mean, sexual intercourse of any kind. *They are virgins* shows this; for it goes far beyond illicit intercourse, and comprehends that of the married as well as that of the unmarried state. The declaration
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before us has for its basis such passages as the following. Le. 15; 16–18; Both "the woman, with whom"... and "the man shall be unclean" (cp. Ju. 23). Ex. 19; 15; "Come not at your wives," that ye be not disqualified for appearing in the Lord's presence. 1 Sa. 21; 4; "There is hallowed bread, if at least the young men have kept themselves from women." Cp. 1 Co. 7; 1. Thus, under the Law the idea of defilement attached to all sexual intercourse, whether lawful or unlawful. And in saying, that the 144 chiliads were free from all defilement, since they were virgins, the perfection of character would be represented to the mind of a Jew. Substantially the same mode of representation is found elsewhere in such texts as, 'keeping the garments unsullied from the flesh,' 'hating the garments spotted with the flesh,' 'not defiling their garments,' and in particular, in the parallel heptad: 16; 15; 'watching and keeping his garments, lest he walk naked and they see his shame.'—Having now, as I trust, conveyed a clear and satisfactory notion of the literal meaning in reference to the symbol, the reader will be prepared to receive without hesitation the secondary and true sense in reference to the thing symbolized. These 144 chiliads of perfect Jews must needs represent persons without fault before the throne of God (as, indeed, they are described as being in ve. 5). These are believers in the Lamb, who have 'cleansed themselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, and perfected holiness in the fear of God,' yea, who have 'kept themselves unsullied from the world,' and been 'presented as chaste virgins to Christ.' In particular, these are they who have 'fought the good fight of faith,' and come off 'more than conquerors through him who loved them.' And here comes in all that is generally misplaced in reference to fornication in its figurative sense. We have seen under Nos. 102, 141, and 169, that the unlawful commerce of the sexes is made representative of idolatrous compliances and connexions with heathenism and heathens. Virginity then, on the other hand, will denote perfect freedom from all approaches to any transgressions of the like kind. And consequently, these 144 chiliads, as being virgins, have for the salient point of their symbolization to represent, that those whom they symbolize are removed in the remotest degree from having had criminal conversation with the whore Babylon. They have not 'drunk of the inflaming wine of her fornication,' nor 'waxed rich by the power of her luxury.' Neither the blandishments and seductions of the harlot have been able to entice them, nor the tremendous roarings of the savage beast on which she sits to terrify them, into illicit commerce with the former, nor into worshipping the latter. They have not 'gone whoring after other gods,' but have remained faithful to their allegiance 'to the Lord and to his Christ,' even 'unto death;' and hence they have had 'given to them a crown
of life. All the power, and riches, and lust-exciting pleasures of the world have been set before them by Rome, but in vain. They have not swerved from the narrow path of faith and duty; but have come off conquerors: and in consequence they have received Christ’s ‘new name,’ and been taught to sing the ‘new song.’—Here let us observe, that, when the true meaning is thus made self-evident, not an inch of ground is afforded by this text, on which to build up the doctrine of celibacy being the highest degree of human perfection. Any apparent countenance, that the text may seem to give to this doctrine, is derived from the Legal Dispensation, and proper to the primary meaning. To the Evangelical scheme the doctrine stands opposed (1 Co. 7: 1 Ti. 4: He. 13; 4); and with the real sense virginity, or anything of the kind, has nothing whatever to do.

(5). Their high honour. XIV; 4. 938. These are they who follow the lamb, whithersoever he goeth.

Op. John 10; 4; “When he putteth forth his own sheep, he goeth before them; and the sheep follow him, for they know his voice.”—Stuart has sadly perverted the meaning of this statement by rendering who have followed, and by interpreting ‘they have rushed into danger, when duty called, &c.’ To make this text refer to duty and to a past state, when the present tense shows plainly, that it relates to a privilege and a special honour, conferred on the 144 chil.iads in their present heavenly state, is but an adaptation to the expositor’s scheme. The 144 chil.iads are allowed the high distinction of being followers of the lamb,—his body-guard or train so to speak; because ‘they have not been defiled with women.’ The sentiment is, that those who have ‘suffered persecution for his name’s sake,’ and have ‘resisted unto blood,’ have a special reward and honour bestowed on them of his free grace. This accords well with the frequent connexion between the endurance of suffering and the following of Christ, which is found in the Gospels. For example, Mt. 10; 38; “Whosoever doth not take up his cross, and follow me, is not worthy of me.” Mk. 8; 38; “Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself.” Lu. 14; 33; “He who forsaketh not all that he hath cannot be my disciple.” Lu. 9; 57; “Lord, I will follow thee, whithersoever thou goest,” &c. Observe, that the taking up the cross, the self-denial, the forsaking all, must precede the following. The following on earth is a duty, the following in heaven a reward.—On the parallel occasion, the lamb is represented as leading his followers to ‘fountains of waters of life’ (7; 17).

(6). Their redemption. XIV; 4. 939. These have been bought from the men, a firstfruit to God and to the lamb.

As to bought see on 936.—The preposition is the same as in the parallel clause, No. 936,—‘bought from the earth,’ and not that
which is commonly translated from among or out of: cp. 5; 5: 6; 1: 7; 13; Ph. 3; 11.—The men. As so often elsewhere, so here also, I have not ignored the Greek article; because I think that it indicates a reference to a particular class of men, and that men in general are not meant. If we take the meaning to be, that the 144 chilias were bought from among or out of the number of these men, the class intended will be Jewish Christians,—the Christians of Judea, as the parallel clause shows. The great body of these may have fled to Pella, as the tradition goes; but the more devoted may from a sense of duty (like the apostles, when the rest were scattered abroad, Acts 8; 1) have voluntarily chosen to ‘suffer the loss of all things,’ even of life itself, rather than appear to desert the cause of the truth, or cease to ‘hold the word of their testifying.’ If this be the right view of this clause, it will be evident that, while redemption in the Christian sense will be necessarily involved in the statement before us, this is not primarily contemplated, but a particular redemption or ‘deliverance’ (19; 1) out of ‘the great tribulation,’ in which they had suffered as confessors. And this result will also be arrived at, if we should understand bought from the men to mean, that the 144 chilias had been delivered out of the hands of the men who were ‘destroying the land’ (11; 18). Only, in this case the symbol may denote all Jewish confessors of Christ. On this account, and also because it is based on a more exact construction of the terms, this view is in my opinion to be preferred.—A firstfruit. Hengstenberg foists in to be, making it appear, as though the object of their redemption was to be a firstfruit. It is scarcely necessary to say, that there is no ground for this construction. Firstfruit stands in apposition with these; and that the 144 chilias are such is the result, and not the object, of their having been redeemed.—It has been supposed, that the salient point in this representation is to exhibit the 144 chilias, as being the best of their kind; because the firstfruits of the harvest were set apart on this ground. Separation from the whole mass of the increases by consecration to God’s service,—“this,” again (Hengstenberg says), “is the point of comparison between the firstfruits and Christians,—the reason why Christians are here described as spiritual firstfruits.” As both of these will hold good on my view of the case, I do not think it worth while to discuss, whether or not they were meant to be included in the representation; though I consider, that neither view exhibits the prominent feature. That, I conceive, is indicated in the term itself—“ἀρχή, the beginning of a sacrifice, the first part of offerings, first-fruits” [Liddell]. Priority of time is the salient point; as clearly appears from the original institution, in which the first of everything prescribed was required. So say Grotius and Stuart. “They are called firstfruits, with reference to those who
shall come after them." "The writer refers to the 144,000 as being among the earliest Christians, inasmuch as they belonged to Palestine, where the Gospel was first spread." And that such a view as this was taken generally by the sacred writers appears from the following among other passages. Ro. 8; 23; "We who have the firstfruit of the Spirit." Ro. 16; 5; "Epenetus, who is a firstfruit of Asia unto Christ." 1 Co. 16; 15; "The house of Stephanas is a firstfruit of Achaia." 1 Co. 15; 20, 23; "Now is Christ . . . a firstfruit of them that slept. . . . So in Christ shall all be made alive. But each in his own order. Christ a firstfruit: then they who are Christ's at his appearing: then the end" (cp. Rev. 14; 1: 19; 14: 20; 4, 5 with 20; 12). Ja. 1; 18; "Of his own will begat he us . . ., that we might be a firstfruit of his creatures." While it is evident from these texts, that priority in point of time was the salient idea contemplated in the firstfruits, it also appears that the body, of which the firstfruits were as a sample or specimen, might be indefinitely varied; and hence of whom that body consisted can only be determined by the context and circumstances. In the case under consideration it is manifest, that the company in question must be limited to the redeemed. Yet this is but a remote approximation to the exact truth; since in a certain sense the redeemed will include 'the whole creation' (Ro. 8; 21, 22: Re. 5; 8, 9), or it may include the universal Church from the beginning to the end of time, or only a particular division of the Church. For the precise limitation, then, we must still depend on the passage itself. Now the context furnishes us with the five following limitations. 1. They have been 'bought,' or rescued from a state of great adversity: see on 932, 936. 2. They have been bought from 'the earth,' i.e., Judea. 3. They have been bought from 'the men,'—a particular class, their fellows. 4. They have not been contaminated by idolatrous compliances. 5. They have been admitted into heaven as the followers of 'the lamb.' I apprehend, that the following is the only solution, that will accord with these limitations. The 144 chilindae are said to be 'a firstfruit to God and to the lamb;' because they represent in the main those converted Jews, who, during the last commotions in Judea, having confessed God and Christ, would be delivered out of the troubles of earth, and be the first whom the lamb would present spotless before the throne, as the firstfruits of that great harvest, which he would ultimately gather into the heavenly garner.—The mention of a harvest suggests, that the same result may be arrived at in another way. Towards the end of the chapter, vv. 14-16, 'the gathering' of 'the harvest of the earth' is exhibited. If, then, it be hereafter made clear, that in those verses the ingathering of the saved during the contemporaneous testifying of the two Churches is represented,
then these 144 chilias, as the firstfruits thereof, must be the most distinguished members of the churches in Judea,—the confessors, as is signified in their being ‘virgins,’ and as appears from the parallel and other passages (see 15; 2: 19; 2: 17; 6: 20; 4). But how, it may be asked, can these be exhibited as firstfruits under the old Dispensation, when a company of redeemed persons has been exhibited (C. 7), as having entered into rest at an earlier period? What follows will furnish the answer.—To God and to the lamb. The former company were firstfruits to God, but these are ‘firstfruits to God and to the lamb.’ Not, of course, but that all alike were ‘made white in the blood of the lamb;’ but those never knew him, while these were believers in him, and were also the first who suffered for his name’s sake.

The commencement of the three last consecutive sentences with the same word,—these, seems to have been designed to indicate so many divisions.

(7.) Their blamelessness. XIV; 3. 940. And in their mouth was found no lie: they are blameless.

The better-authorized text substitutes lie for the guile of the R. T., and omits both for and before the throne of God.—No lie. Cp. C. 21; 8, 27: 22; 15. A special characteristic of all John’s writings is the manner in which he dwells on ‘the truth,’ and in contrast with it ‘a lie,’ meaning that which is opposed to the truth in his sense. “There is,” says Hengstenberg, “a peculiar depth in John’s idea of the truth, and so its sweep is with him very wide, and to be destitute of it is something very great. A liar, in his account, according to 1 John 2; 4, is one who does not confess Christ, nor exhibit his faith in his works. He notes it as the crowning point of lying, in 1 John 2; 22, to deny Christ, with which idolatry and the deification of men (described as a work of lies in Rom. 1; 25) goes hand in hand. What is here ascribed to the honour of Christians, they owe, according to 1 John 2; 27, to the anointing, to the Holy Spirit; it is a privilege of the Christian, of the anointed, as generally not to sin (1 John 3; 9), so in particular not to lie. All men are by nature liars, and freedom from lying, especially from that worst form of it, which withholds divine honour from him to whom alone it is due, and ascribes it to one to whom it does not belong, can be derived only from above; the rather so, as man’s natural inclination to lying has so powerful a coadjuvant in Satan, the father of lies (John 8; 44). Allusion is made to 1 Pet. 2; 22; “Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth.” The allusion is especially seen in the expression “was found,” which does not occur in the original passage, Isa. 53; 9, and leaves little room to doubt, that John had the passage of Peter in his eye.” As the Gospel is styled by John “the truth,”
so heathenism, as being in the strongest opposition to it, is preeminently 'a lie' (cp. 1 Jo. 2; 18, 21, 22). On this view, the text will import, that the 144 chilias represent those, who have been wholly free from heathenish compliances.—*They are blameless*, in part follows from, and in part is exegetical of, the preceding statement. This clause crowns the fourth (and therefore all-comprehensive) commendation of the 144 chilias; for, when the apostle Peter (1: 1; 19) would apply the strongest epithet to him, the symbol of whom stands here at the head of the 144 chilias, he styles him "a lamb without blemish," or "a blameless lamb" (the epithet is the same in both passages). The clause sets forth, that they who are symbolized are 'unblameable before God,' or (as Stuart says) 'have lived without any just cause of reproach; but particularly as to the matter of defection from the Christian cause, just as those kings of the Jews, who never inclined to idolatry, were said to be perfect or blameless in regard to their highest allegiance.'

In 4 Ezra 2 there is a passage, which bears a strong resemblance to that which we have been considering; and to the summary of which in Vol. I: p. 226, I would beg to refer the reader. The extract from the *Asc. Esaiae* in Vol. I: p. 289, should also be compared: and another from 4 Ezra on p. 233.

**THE HEPTAD OF THE PROCLAMATION-ANGELS.**

*Introductory remarks.* This heptad may be designated as that of the proclamation-angels, in consequence of the office of the first three angels being to make proclamations; or as that of the angels of judgments, on account of the business of the angels in general being either to announce or to execute judgments.—Perhaps it is intended, that the lamb and his 144 chilias should be conceived of, as standing in the character of spectators of the events depicted in this heptad, with the view to bring home to those contending with the beast the exhortation; "Seeing ye are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses [lit. martyrs], . . . run with patience the race that is set before you, looking unto Jesus, . . . who, for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, &c.;" and in particular to suggest to them, that they should look upon their trials now in the same light, in which they would contemplate them, when they should have been admitted into the number of the 144 chilias.—Every scene that follows furnishes either an encouragement to 'content earnestly for the faith delivered to the saints,' or a warning of the sad consequences, that will ensue to those who desert from 'the Lord's side.'

**DIV. 1. THE FIRST ANGEL: brings good news.**

XIV; 6-7. 941-6. *And I beheld another angel flying in midheaven,*
having an οἶκος gospel, to publish good news over those seated on the
earth, and over every nation and tribe and tongue and people, saying
with a loud voice; 'Fear God, and give Him glory, because the hour of
his judging hath come; and worship Him who made the heaven, and the
earth, and sea, and fountains of waters.'

941. Another angel. Some copies omit another. But, that it is a
genuine reading appears not only from the most ancient authorities,
but also from the manifest reference to the eagle-shaped angel, who
(like this one) is seen flying in midheaven (8; 13), and with whom it
is designed by the use of the word another to connect this angel.—
The connexion indicated between the two is probably meant to intimate,
that Rome is had in view in this angel’s proclamation (see on 569): and further, inasmuch as the former angel was the herald of
the three woes on the dwellers on the earth (that is, on Judea),—the
first two of which woes were accomplished in the fifth and sixth
trumpets, the appearance of this angel in midheaven seems to indi-
cate, that the third woe,—the woe of the seventh trumpet, is about
to be exhibited in this heptad; and with this the sequel will be seen
fully to accord.—Many Protestant expositors have, most inconsist-
ently, interpreted this and the two angels that follow as representing
individuals: this, for example, Luther. I of course consider the
angel to be here as elsewhere (I might perhaps say, in one point of
view, merely a part of the machinery of the symbolization, since it
does not represent any material being, but is only) a symbol of the
Mediator in his Providential acting or appointment.—Having an οἶκος
gospel. Several of the older expositors have thought, that we should
conceive of the angel as carrying in his hand a roll, the symbolic
import of which is indicated by the descriptive designation of it.
The introduction of such a symbol would undeniably be very appro-
priate, to indicate the nature of this angel’s mission.—No doubt
always carries it with the signification of eternal. But it has this
meaning only secondarily. Its primary sense is of or belonging to an
οἰκῶν or age; and to sink this sense is in the present instance to lose
altogether the purport of the passage. The οἰκῶν alluded to is the
seventh or sabbatical οἰκῶν, the millennium of C. 20; 4. Cp. Mk. 10;
30; “He shall receive an hundredfold now in this present time, . . .
and in the οἰκῶν which is coming an οἶκος (and therefore an eternal)
life:” also He. 6; 2; “an οἶκος judgment,” that is, a judgment which
is to precede, and lead to admission into this οἰκῶν: and see further in
my Guide, p. 73 ss., and on No. 25 supra.—The Gospel is not meant,
but a gospel; not the gospel in the ordinary sense of the phrase, that
is, “the doctrine of the true ground of righteousness for sinful men
before God,” but the good news (for Christ’s people), that the judg-
ment, which is to introduce the millennial οἰκῶν (and which is there-
fore virtually 'the gospel of the kingdom'), is at hand. Both the construction of the sentence, and the purport of the proclamation that the angel makes show, that this is the meaning. He has a gospel to publish, but he does not publish or preach the Gospel of Christ, nor its "eternal truths" (as Stuart says), nor anything relating thereto. The gospel he proclaims is, that 'the hour of God's judging is come,' and in consequence he calls upon those, to whom his proclamation is addressed, to fall down before the Creator and the Judge. The real New Testament sense of 'preaching the Gospel' is proclaiming the good news, that "the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (cp. Mk. 1; 14: Lu. 8; 22; 29, 30: 23; 51): and it is this, that the angel does indirectly. A gospel, a piece of good news, cannot with any propriety, any more than a 'judging' or 'judgment' can, be said to be 'eternal:' nor is the Gospel ever spoken of as being so.

942. To publish. This verb may be taken as depending on flying, especially if we understand the intermediate clause as meaning carrying an aonic gospel. The connexion will then be, flying in midheaven to publish good news.—Those seated on the earth I have shown on 571 to be a technical phrase denoting, in contradistinction to 'those who dwell on the earth' (that is, persons in Judea hostile to Christianity), and to 'those who tabernacle in the heaven' (that is, converts to Christianity), persons in Judea, who might be disposed to welcome the god's-spel or good news of the coming kingdom.—Some copies read to those that dwell, to which others add and are seated. If the former reading were adopted, the meaning would be that, which is first indicated above. But it is not easy to see how the news of a coming judgment can be 'good tidings' to the enemies of Christ, though Hengstenberg endeavours to make it appear that it may be. Both readings may, however, be unhesitatingly rejected. According to Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles, the same Greek preposition should be inserted before those seated, that is found before the earth, and before every nation; and the meaning of which has been fully shown on 699. Stuart renders it here by among. I have followed Fairbairn's translation of Hengstenberg in using over and on.—And over every nation, &c. Some copies omit the preposition in this clause; but it is a genuine reading.—The over in both places has primarily in view the angel's position in midheaven, the idea being, that he makes proclamation, while winging his flight over the heads of the peoples. And to this effect writes Hengstenberg; "The Greek preposition, which from the parallel place alone, C. 13; 7, must be taken in the sense of over, is explained by the position of the angel in the heaven." Hengstenberg further remarks; "The angel's proclamation 'over every nation, &c.' forms the counterpoise to the beast's power 'over every tribe and people and tongue and nation' in
13; 7. Perhaps there is a design in beginning here with the same word, with which there the enumeration is closed: as also in 5; 13 the same word intentionally stands at the beginning of the whole enumeration, which in ve. 12 was placed at the end. The over is not to be taken altogether locally; but it denotes at the same time the authority. The local relation of the angel to those, whom the message respects, images at the same time the real relation."—We should mentally read, and also to publish good news over every nation, &c.—

The fourfold formula denotes universality: see Guide, p. 197. And the meaning of the statement as a whole is this:—"I saw a symbolic angel (who carried in his hand a symbol of the mission on which he was sent) winging his flight to publish to Christ's disciples in Judea, and also over the whole world (for the benefit of any, who might be disposed to welcome the tidings) the good news, that the premillennial judgment, which would introduce Christ's kingdom, was at hand."

XIV; 7. 943. Saying with a loud voice. The best authorized reading makes the participle agree with the nominative of the verb beheld, namely, I, &c. John. But it is manifest, that John cannot be the speaker. We ought not, however, to reject the reading on this account, but rather to conclude, that this is one of the many grammatical solecisms of the Apocalypse.—The loud voice is, as usual, to give emphasis to the words uttered.—Fear God. Some read Fear the Lord.—The sentiment is antithetic. 'Reverence Jehovah, and let the fear of Him exclude the fear of the beast and his image.' "Fear not, little flock, it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom. I will forewarn you whom you shall fear; Fear Him, &c.'—And give Him glory, &c. by taking up the cross, fighting the good fight of faith, and 'glorifying God in the fire' of persecution. So also, in the prelude to the parallel heptad, 19; 7; "Give Him glory; because the marriage of the lamb hath come."

944. Because the hour of his judging hath come. Comparison of this clause with that just cited shows us, that 'the hour of God's judging,' and 'the marriage of the lamb,' are synchronous. And so we find them represented as being in Cs. 19 and 20. Therein the beast and his armies are judged: the saints also are judged, and given 'to sit on thrones with God and Christ,' Christ thus espousing his Church to himself, at least in one respect, or as to a part thereof.—Though hour is used in the Apocalypse with a relative indefiniteness, and not with horal exactness, yet its indefiniteness is limited within small bounds, say, within a few years at the most. See on 749.—Judging. Two Greek words are used in the Apocalypse to denote this idea; and, to make a corresponding distinction, I have uniformly translated the one judging, and the other judgment. Their precise significations will be elucidated on No. 1380.—In the judging here spoken of both the
saints of Christ, and the slaves of the beast are included, as will appear on vv. 14–20, where the occurrence of one part of it is symbolized. Its object is to do that, which was pre-intimated in the prelude to this trumpet,—‘to give the reward to the saints, and to destroy those who destroy the earth’ (11; 18).—‘The expression hath come is used by way of anticipation:’ Hengstenberg. It must, however, denote close sequence to the time present of the symbolization.—If we compare ‘thy wrath hath come’ (11; 18), ‘thy judging hath come’ (14; 7), ‘thy righteous judgments are made manifest’ (15; 4), ‘because thou hast judged thus,...true and righteous are thy judgings’ (16; 5, 7), ‘I will show thee the judgment of the great whore’ (17; 1), ‘God hath judged your judgment on her’ (18; 20), ‘true and righteous are His judgings; because He hath judged the great whore, which destroyed the earth’ (19; 2), ‘in righteousness doth He judge:....and He seized the beast, &c.’ (19; 11, 20), can we doubt, that there is an intimate connexion between the several passages?

945. And worship him who made, &c. This call stands contrasted with the threat, that follows in ve. 9: ‘If any one worship the beast, &c.’ It says in effect; ‘Render religious homage to Christ, not to the beast,—to the Creator, not to the creature.’

946. The heaven, &c. Scholz and other critics receive the article before sea. Elsewhere it is usually inserted before each term.—This quadripartite formula seems to be used for correspondence with that, which closes the preceding verse. Its four terms imply as usual the idea of universality; and to convey this idea may have been the object in the insertion of the fourth term: op. 336, 378, 677–9.—
‘Those,’ says Hengstenberg, ‘who understand by the beast the Papacy, are thrown into great perplexity by these words. The confession respecting God, as the maker of heaven and earth, has never been abandoned in the Papacy; for it has always been held by the apostles’ creed.’—Possibly, besides its primary meaning in reference to the symbolical universe, there may have been an application to ‘Christians and Jews, the heathen world-power and its tributaries,’ intended. If so, the argument would run thus. ‘Since Jehovah is the Creator of all, all must be absolutely at His disposal: therefore let the heathen “repent of the works of their hands, and worship not the idols of gold, &c.” (9; 20); and let all worship their Creator and their coming Judge.’ The answer, as practically given by the heathen world-power, may be found in the parallel heptad, 16; 9, 10; ‘They repented not to give Him glory:’ “they repented not of their works.”—With this text compare the call actually made by the apostles, and the similar fourfold formula in Acts 14; 15; “We preach unto you, that ye should turn from these vanities to the living
God, who made the heaven, and the earth, and the sea, and all things that are in them." Must not the two calls be addressed to the same parties in the main, that is, to heathens?

The text last quoted suggests, that I should cite here some of the statements in the New Testament, which show, that there was an actual fulfilment, at the time to which I refer this symbolization, of that which the angel's mission symbolizes. And, first, we find our Lord declaring in his prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem, Mt. 24; 14; "that the good news of the kingdom (i.e., of its being at hand) shall be proclaimed in the whole world, for a testimony to all the nations, and then the end will come." Next, in a.d. 60 St Paul says (Ro. 15; 19); "From Jerusalem and round about unto Illyricum I have fulfilled my task in bearing the glad tidings of Christ:" and again (16; 26); 'Now hath the evangelic mystery been made known to all the Gentiles through inspired writings.' And in a.d. 64 he wrote (Co. 1; 6); "The truthful word of the glad tidings, which is come . . . into all the world." So that the good news, on which was based the call to 'repentance towards God the Creator, and faith towards Jesus as the Mediator,' was at this time, in the apostle's view, fully preached in accordance with the symbolization before us.

DIV. 2. THE SECOND ANGEL: announces Rome's fall.

XIV; 8. 947-50. And another, a second angel followed, saying; "Fallen, fallen, is Babylon the great, who hath made all the nations drink from the wine of the wrath of her fornication."

947. A second angel. Some copies omit second, but it is found in the most ancient.—With a loud voice is said of the first and third angels, but not of this. So great earnestness was not needed in the announcement of an event decreed, as in calls to avoid 'the wrath that was about to come.'

948. Fallen, fallen is the Babylon the great. The second fallen and the city are not found in some authorities; but the former word is well accredited, and its use twice in the repetition of this declaration in the parallel heptad, C. 18; 2, tends to establish its genuineness.—The declaration itself is taken verbatim from the prophecy in Is. C. 21, entitled "The burden of the desert of the sea," in which the destruction of the literal Babylon by the Medes and Persians is predicted. With this prophecy the reader may profitably compare Jer. Cs. 50-51, which contain many points of resemblance with the Apocalypse, e. g., "Babylon is taken," "Babylon is suddenly fallen."—That is fallen could not mean, that the event had actually taken place at the time of writing, or (more properly) at the epoch at which the Vision has arrived, though these in the present instance are virtually the same,
is clear from what follows, and in particular from C. 17; 18, where
the whore Babylon is explained as symbolizing 'the city, which is
reigning over the kings of the earth.' Since, then, the expression
cannot be taken in its strict literality, it becomes a question of degree,
what latitude is to be given to it. And there can be no doubt, that
this is one of the many instances in the prophetical writings, in
which, when it is desired to express the absolute certainty with
which a thing has been decreed, and the near approach of the be-
ginning of the accomplishment, the present or even the past tense
is for emphasis used instead of the future. To this effect writes
Stuart; "Fallen, while it denotes absolute certainty, does not de-
ote complete and instantaneous excision. The predictions respect-
ing ancient Babylon were fulfilled only in the lapes of several cen-
turies; but they were at last fully accomplished. And so of the
tropical Babylon." On this point I will speak more fully after C. 16;
21. At present, I would only remind the reader, that, as the destruction
of the symbolical Babylon, described in C. 18, may be conceived of
as holding a place chronologically prior to the epoch, at which the
symbolization before us is placed, the statement under consideration
will hold good, in the letter of it, in respect of the Vision.—Here, for
the first time, Babylon is mentioned. Hence this will be a proper
place to show what is, and what is not meant by the term.—And, first,
in respect of it as a symbol. As in C. 17; 9, 10, we meet with a
symbol, by which two things are signified, so here on the contrary
two symbols are used to represent one thing, but in different aspects
of it. For Babylon is a name given sometimes to a woman (17; 5),
and sometimes to a city, according as it is designed to bring to view
generally the lust of sensuality (symbolizing commerce with false
gods) and the lust of wealth and power, or specially the latter only.
It is with the latter, that we are immediately concerned here. And
when the name is used in reference to a city it may be doubted,
whether we should think primarily (that is, in respect of the
symbolical universe) of the ancient Babylon, or of the city, which is
allowed by all to be ultimately contemplated, viz., Rome. Perhaps
the circumstance, that Babylon would appear from 1 Pe. 5; 13 to
have been among the Jews a common and recognized name for Rome,
may be thought to favour the latter view. But symbolical congruity
decides for the former.—In respect, secondly, of the thing signified
by Babylon, there can be no doubt, that it is the city of Rome; yet
not as a city merely, but as the metropolis, the head-quarters of the
state, the seat of the power and glory of the state, that, in short, of
which it might be said, 'it reigneth over the kings of the earth.'
This can be nothing less than the body politic, civil and ecclesiastical,
as a whole. ['Ipsa Babylonia quasi prima Roma, Roma quasi secunda
Babylonia est” (Aug. _De Civ. Dei_, l. 18, c. 2). So _Tert. adv. Mar._, l. 3, c. 13: and _adv. Jud._ l. 3. Also the Scholiast on 1 Pet. 5; 13. And the ancients generally.) So far there is a general agreement; but at this point the two chief schools of interpretation widely diverge. And, having these in view, I will briefly show, that _heathen_ Rome must necessarily be meant, and that _papal_ Rome cannot be. 1. The abrupt manner, in which Babylon is here for the first time introduced, shows this. It is manifestly assumed, that the readers of John’s time would have no difficulty in recognizing what power, what body politic was meant. Now they could recognize the Rome of the Cæsars, the then ruling power in heathendom; but not the Rome of the popes, the long subsequent hierarchy in Christendom. If, then, we suppose the latter to have been really meant, we must necessarily charge the apostle with practising a gross imposition on his contemporaries; for they would inevitably receive a very different impression. 2. The conclusion of the sentence, “because she hath made all nations (of the heathen) &c.” is quite unsuitable to papal Rome: see further on 1107. 3. We are told in C. 18; 20, that God hath avenged his apostles and prophets (i.e. inspired teachers) on Babylon. Now, it was heathen Rome alone, that persecuted these. Heathen Rome, therefore, must be the subject of the vengeance. 4. “Babylon,” says Hengstenberg, “is only a particular aspect, under which the beast manifestes itself; and the beast cannot possibly be the papacy.” —“The designation _great_,” says Hengstenberg, “is taken from Dan. 4; 27, where Nebuchadnezzar speaks of ‘Babylon the great.’ But the permanence of the designation, as if it formed a component part of the proper name, cannot but appear somewhat strange. It is to be explained from an allusion to the name Rome, _strength_, which still plainly discovers itself in C. 18; 2. That it is not called the _strong_, but the _great_, was on account of the fundamental passage of Daniel.”—Another mystery connected with the name _Rome_ may be adduced here. To prepare the way, however, for its due appreciation, it will be expedient to cite first a few lines from Stuart’s _Com._ p. 76. Speaking of the _Sibyline Oracles_, Bk. VIII. he says; “_Ve._ 148 speaks of 948 years [i.e. _A.U.C._ = _A.D._ 194] as the time of Rome’s duration. But this verse appears to me to be adscititious, being later than the surrounding context.” Stuart has evidently not perceived, that the duration has been assigned, not from the near expiration of 948 years, but from the circumstance of the amount of the numeral letters composing the name _Rome_ in Greek (the language of the _Sibyline Oracles_): being 948. Now this use of the word may well dispose us to think, that a similar mystical coincidence has been had in view in the clause before us. It cannot surely have been by accident, that Babylon (standing for Rome) has been introduced for the
first time under the No. 948: and it certainly has not been by any 
adjustment of mine, that the coincidence has been brought about; 
for the stichóical distribution was made long before I had ascertained 
the numerical value of the word Rome, or seen the passage in Stuart. 
And if neither has been the case, must not the coincidence be allowed 
to give strong confirmation, both to the accuracy on the whole of my 
stichóical distribution, and to the interpretation, that Rome is meant 
by Babylon?

949. Who hath made, etc. For who Scholz reads because, and some 
omit both words. Some also omit of the wrath.

950. From the wine, etc. From or out of, i.e., some of.—"The wine 
of the wrath" says Hengstenberg, "is the wine, which consists of 
wrath. As wine makes the drinkers helpless, so does her wrath the 
nations. The making the nations drunk with wine is a very common 
image in the Old Testament. The point of comparison is always the 
impotence, helplessness, misery, degradation, shamefulness of the con-
dition." See Ps. 60; 3: Is. 23; 15: Je. 51; 7: Zec. 12; 2: Ha. 2; 
15, 16: Na. 3; 4, 11: Ob. 16.—Of her fornication shows, that Rome 
is now regarded under the symbol of a woman. "This female," says 
Stuart, "is a heathen, practising idol rites, and therefore in the 
language of the Hebrews committing fornication. Here she is repre-
sented as attracting lovers by the usual arts. She proffers to them 
heating, i.e., inebriating wine for the purpose of exciting passion, 
and leading to uncleanness. The general meaning is, that Rome 
employed all her arts, devices, excitements, and allurements, to bring 
all nations to the worship of the beast and his image." Hengstenberg 
gives a different turn to the symbolization. Referring to Is. 23; 15 ss.: 
Na. 3; 1, 4, he explains fornication to mean selfishness, disguising 
itself under the appearance of love, in order to the gratification of its 
own lust, the particular form of lust here being that of conquest and 
acquisition of territory. And in reference to the interpretation, which 
makes fornication to mean seduction to the service of idolatry, he 
says; "This interpretation makes shipwreck on the circumstance, 
that the subject is the wine of the wrath, or the wrath-wine of her 
fornication. It is impossible to show, in regard to fornication of that 
sort, how it proceeds from the principle of wrath. The different ways, 
in which commentators have tried to meet this argument, only show 
how invincible it is." If it were necessary to choose between these 
two interpretations (which I do not consider that it is; for the figure 
made use of is capable of including both) I should say, that Hengsten-
berg is nearer the truth than Stuart. And I think, that this will 
be made sufficiently evident, if, in the first place, the specific act of 
fornication be resolved into the general idea, which it serves to place 
prominently before the mind, namely, lust. Now lust, viewed politi-
cally or in reference to a corporate body (in which point of view alone can the Apocalypse be concerned with it), can have only three objects, honour, power, wealth. Lust of honour is more immediately chargeable on the beast and his image; for it is he alone that claims the honour which is due to God only. Lust of power and lust of wealth are the offences, which are more especially proper to, and which are charged on (17; 2:18; 3 ss.) the whore; and to gratify which she is represented as having recourse to inflaming and poisonous philters in a gilded cup, to 'wrath' and feigned love, arms and bedizenments, threats and promises, force and guile, armed legions and cunning diplomacy. True, she might be charged with being a particeps criminis with the beast, inasmuch as she joined in the persecuting acts of the Caesars; and on this account she actually has the 'blood of the saints,' and 'of the testifiers of Jesus,' laid to her charge (17; 6:18; 24). But it is not altogether the same thing to be a conniving accessory, and an acting principal in a crime. Rome indirectly assisted in the persecution of God's saints; but she did not do it with the view to promote this particular form of idolatry,—the religious worship of the beast as such. If any distinction can be drawn between the two, promoting idolatry is the crime which would seem to be more appropriately chargeable on the beast: unjust self-aggrandizement in power and riches that on Babylon. But the two are so intimately connected (as may be learned from the text, “Covetousness is idolatry”), that the one will be found more or less running into the other; and it may after all be practically useless to draw a distinction between the whore and the beast in this respect. All that I can say is, that, if Stuart’s interpretation be preferred, Hengstenberg’s objections may be obviated by exhibiting the points of comparison as follows. As wine excites to wrath and lust, so the influence of Rome has been exerted in stirring up the nations to promote the cause of heathenish idolatry by persecution. But, if Hengstenberg’s view be adopted, the statement may be expressed in plain terms thus: Rome hath given the nations a taste of the bitter portion of her ambition and her covetousness.

On the whole, we shall not be far from the truth, if we understand the purport of this angel’s proclamation to be as follows. The mighty Rome, whose lust after wealth and power has impelled her to lay all nations prostrate at her feet, as it were in a state of helpless and degrading intoxication, and which has by this means led them to become partakers in her sins, shall be cast down from her present high position.

DIV. 3. THE THIRD ANGEL: warns the worshippers of the beast.

XIV; 9–11. 951–64. And another, a third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice; 'If any one worship the wild-beast and his
The angels of judgments.

image, and receive a mark upon his forehead or upon his hand, he also shall drink from the wine of the wrath of God, which hath been mixed unmixed in the cup of his anger; and shall be tormented in fire and brimstone before the holy angels and before the lamb. And the smoke of their torment goeth up unto the ages of ages; and they have no rest day and night, who worship the wild-beast and his image, and who receiveth the mark of his name.'

951. And another, &c. Some copies omit another: some a third.—Followed them. See on 413.

952. Saying, &c. See on 943, 947.

953. If any one, &c.: that is, If any one comply with the require-
ment, which was made by the second beast, as stated in C. 13; 12, 15–17. Here comes in more immediately the lust for undue honour, that is, for idolatrous homage, as the lust of wealth and power did in the verse preceding.—The beast and his image. This wording of the clause seems to show, that the two symbols were regarded as being on a par, and representative of things diverse, though substantially identical; for if the image had meant only a statue or likeness of the beast, the conjunction used to connect them would have been or, just as it is in Stuart's statement of his view of the passage:—'If any one pay divine honours to the impious king directly or indirectly, either to his person or to his representative or statue.' The expression, then, would on my view stand either for the Julian and Flavian dynasties, or for Nero and Vespasian. But I deny not, that the other may be the right interpretation.—See on 903.

954–5. And receive, &c. See on 920, and cp. 15; 2: 20; 4.

XIV; 10. 956. He. The pronoun is inserted in the Greek with
the view to throw emphasis on the subject of the verb: and thus a contrast with some other parties is indicated.—The also may be accounted for in two ways; and, in stating them, the contrast implied in the emphasis on the pronoun will be brought to light. We may either read: 'If any one, in consequence of drinking of the wrath-wine of Babylon, be led to worship the beast, he shall also drink of the wrath-wine of God.' or; 'If any one worship the beast, he too, like the nations whom Babylon hath made to drink, shall be made to drink, but it shall be from the wrath-wine of God.'—Cp. Ps. 60; 3; "Thou hast made us to drink the wine of astonishment," or (as in the P. B. V.), "of deadly wine."

957. Which hath been mixed unmixed in the cup of His anger. This is founded on Ps. 75; 8; "In the hand of the Lord there is a cup, and it foams with wine. It is full of mixture, and he poureth out of the same; and yet its dregs all the wicked of the earth must sip, [yea] drink." This precedent is not servilely copied, but varied so as to give greater intensity. The intention is to represent the wrath-
wine of God, as being compounded of every bitter ingredient, undiluted by any that might tend to make it palatable. It thus stands contrasted with the wrath-wine of the whore just mentioned, which, while bitter in the stomach, was made sweet to the mouth, her wrath being accompanied with feigned love, her anger mixed with lust, her terrors with blandishments. A similar contrast comes out strongly in the parallel heptad relating to Babylon, 18:6, "in the cup which she hath mixed, mix to her double." And we may observe by the way, that the use of the word mix in this text shows, that it cannot be used in the passage before us (as is commonly said) in the sense of pouring out.—That which answers in the reality to the mixed is the fire and brimstone, which stand for all the torments of hell: that which corresponds to the unmixed is the element of mercy. So that this symbolical declaration is equivalent to he shall be consigned without mercy to the unalleviated torments of hell, where not so much as 'a drop of water shall be allowed him to cool his tongue.' As the beast in the day of his power persecuted without pity the followers of the lamb, so will the lamb show no clemency towards any, who become followers of the beast. A distinct heptad is allotted to the symbolization of the actual giving to drink of the wrath-wine of God to the beast's followers on earth. It is therein described as consisting of the seven last plagues; and is represented as being poured out from the seven bowls of the wrath of God.—With this clause should be compared Is. 51:17, 22; Awake, O Jerusalem, which hast drunk at the hand of the Lord the cup of his fury, &c.' Also Je. 49:12 and 25:15–29; 'Thus saith the Lord unto me; Take the wine-cup of this fury at my hand, and cause all the nations to drink it,' through the instrumentality of the literal Babylon. 'And say; Drink ye, and be drunken, and spue, and fall, and rise no more; because of the sword, which I will send among you.' Observe (with reference to what was said on 950), that it is 'the sword,' not 'idolatry,' that comes to view as being meant by the wine-cup: and note the virtual explanation given of 'drinking.'

958. And shall be tormented, &c. Fire and brimstone is the final torment, the ne plus ultra of misery, into which as such the beast (19:20), the devil (20:10), and all his children (20:15:21:8) are finally cast. The imagery was probably derived originally from the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah; and it is frequently used in the Scriptures and apocryphal works: see Is. 34:9:66:24: Mk. 9:44–48: Lu. 12:4: Sir. 7:17: Jud. 16:17: En. 10:9, 16.

969. Before the holy angels, &c. Some MSS. omit holy. It is an epithet similar to those, which are frequently applied to God, and given specially to the angels of God in contradistinction to that, which characterizes the angels of Satan. Cp. 2 Th. 1:6–9.—This
addition appears to be made simply as an aggravation of the punishment. Still, Hengstenberg's assertion, that the angels "are to be regarded as the executors of the judgment," may be well-founded, seeing that it is said; "At the consummation of the æon, the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the just, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire:" Mt. 13; 49: cp. Re. 19; 20. Similarly it is said in Enoch 48; 9; "Thus shall they (the persecuting kings of the earth) burn in the presence of the righteous, and sink [into the abyss] in the presence of the holy ones."

XIV; 11. 960. And the smoke, &c. This is another item of aggravation. It may have had its origin in 'the smoke of Sodom going up as the smoke of a furnace.' Of Babylon in like manner it is said in C. 19; 3; "her smoke goeth up, &c."

961. Goeth up, &c.—Unio the æona, &c. =for ever, &c. See on 25. Possibly the terms of the phrase may have been meant here to heighten the idea by suggesting in contrast the æonic bliss, which the lamb's followers are enjoying during these ages without end. As, however, the articles are omitted in this instance only, it may perhaps be thought, that the difference has been made in order to indicate, that the same strictly eternal duration is not here intended.

962. And they have no rest, &c. So the four creatures 'have no rest day and night' from praise; but theirs is a non-intermission from that, which constitutes their highest honour and happiness; while the state of the beast's worshippers will be one of unrest from continual torment. Thus it stands contrasted with the state of the redeemed, whose condition is emphatically described as one of 'rest' in ve. 13, as also before in 6; 11.

963. Who worship, &c. See on 920.

964. And whom, &c. The change to the singular is peculiar, especially as the sentence is left unfinished, and must be completed from the words (in ve. 10) at the commencement of the proclamation. Thus, 'the end of the message returns by a sort of refrain to its beginning.'

In this division the unspeakable and endless torments of those, who are led through fear of the Roman beast to apostatize from the faith, are set forth in strong terms.

TECHNICAL BREAK AND INTERLUDE, marking the time present.

XIV; 12–13. 965–70. Here is the endurance of the saints,—they who keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus. (And I heard a voice from the heaven, saying; 'Write: Blessed the dead, who die henceforth in the Lord: yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; for their works accompany them.')
There is a manifest correspondence between this break, and that which divides the preceding heptad. The sentence, with which this commences, is nearly identical with that, with which the other concludes. The interlude in the one sets forth the retribution on the beast; that in the other the preferential reward of those who become his victims, and yet his victors. Both indicate that persecution existed or might be apprehended at the time to which this interlude refers.—The break here parts this heptad into three and four divisions: the former was parted into four and three.

965. Here is the endurance, &c. The Greek article is wrongly omitted in some editions.—From the form of this clause it might be supposed, that this sentence was connected in the closest manner with the preceding context: yet there is no obvious connexion between the saints' enemies suffering torments, and the saints themselves entering a state of blessedness; and such can be made out only in a round-about and uncertain way. Thus, for example, Stuart is driven to have recourse to an alternative of meanings. "The meaning is either thus, Here then, in the dreadful punishment of the wicked, every Christian may see of what avail his patience and obedient spirit and faith in Christ are; or, Here is a disclosure respecting the wicked, which is adapted to encourage a patient endurance of the evils of persecution, and a constancy in obedience to the divine commands and to the Christian faith. Ewald adopts the first method; I prefer the latter." For myself I feel persuaded, that there is no reference to the preceding context. The third angel's proclamation ended with ve. 11; and each proclamation is complete in itself, and independent of any other. This sentence I take to contain a remark thrown in by the seer himself, without any reference to what the angel had said, but having for its object to mark the time present by an allusion to the then existing circumstances,—an allusion similar and parallel to that in the preceding heptad, and from which its reference is to be learnt. Thus, he says in effect; "Here,"—at the epoch at which my Vision has now arrived,—in the afflictive circumstances under which the saints are at present placed, is pre-eminently an occasion and a call for long-suffering endurance on their part, in order to maintain their allegiance to their God, and their faith in the Lamb.—See on 888.

966. They who keep. The R. T. wrongly repeats, Here are. This has been done to avoid the grammatical solecism, in the participle not agreeing in case with its antecedent. But there can be no doubt, that what follows saints is epexegetical of it, that is, it shows wherein being saints consists, namely, in keeping, &c. —Instead of keep the usual term in this connexion is hold, as in C. 6; 9. But the appropriate use of the terms is shown in C. 12; 17; "keep the commandments... hold the testifying."—The commandments of God,
&c. Cp. Jo. 15; 10, &c.; "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love." "Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you." "If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you." The commandments more especially had in view are such as these. "Thou shalt have none other gods but me." "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." "This is his commandment, that we believe in the name of His son Jesus Christ."

XIV; 13. 967. And I heard a voice, &c. This voice is doubtless nothing more than a part of the symbolical machinery. And hence it is idle to speculate, as it is common for expositors to do, as to the person from whom the voice proceeded, whether God, or Christ, or one of the redeemed.—Saying. The R. T. adds to me; but the best Codices do not authorize it.

968. Write. Berleb. Bible: "This command to write is repeated twelve times in the Revelation, to indicate, that all the things it refers to are matters of importance, which must not be forgotten by the church of Christ."—Blessed the dead. Hengstenberg affirms, that the blessedness spoken of is that of a future state, and "does not refer to the great distress of the world, which the persons in question have escaped." But, though those who have died must necessarily be in another state, I apprehend, that "the sphere of their blessedness" is not a point, which comes directly into consideration; and the reason assigned for their being blessed has an aspect towards both earth and heaven,—to deliverance 'from their labours' in the former, and to their 'rest' in the latter.—Another question here is; Are we to connect the henceforth with blessed or with who die? For the sense which Eichhorn gives to the word rendered henceforth, viz., up to this time, and Vitringa’s mode of connecting it with the following sentence, so as to make it read, that they may henceforth rest, may both be put out of the question, as not deserving a moment's consideration; since the Greek will not tolerate either. Every consideration seems to me to favour the latter alternative. It is not said; 'They who have died;' but "the dead," "they who do die," that is, who are about to die. And those, who had not yet died, could not be said to be blessed henceforth in the state of the dead. The most that could be said would be, that they should be blessed from the time of their deaths. The arrangement of the words is opposed, too, to the former mode of connecting them. It is true, that the construction which Hengstenberg puts on the passage gives a sense quite admissible, and one in perfect accordance with my general scheme. He says; "This from henceforth does not form a contrast with an earlier time, during which the dead who die in the Lord were not blessed. But the expression forms a contrast in respect to a distant future, in respect to the com-
pletion of the kingdom of God." I might say, therefore, that this blessedness is the bliss of confessors in heaven, which is described as being now about to commence, and to continue for 1000 years previous to the admission, at the final judgment, of the general body of the faithful to a participation in it (20; 4, 5, 12). And I might allege Hengstenberg's authority in support of the basis of this view. For he goes on to say; "In this book a distinction is drawn in C. 6; 11 between a glorious inheritance, which is obtained immediately after departure, and another which is to accrue at some period in the remote future; and the former, the heavenly blessedness which begins immediately when life here has ceased, is portrayed at considerable length in C. 7; 9–17; cp. also C. 14; 1–5." But, though I hold what I have just stated to be a doctrine of the Apocalypse, and indeed to be virtually contained in the next sentence, yet I do not think, that it is what is primarily referred to here. The meaning of the term is not exactly (as Hengstenberg asserts) "even now." It is from now, expressing not only commencement now, but also a continuance to an undefined extent. The same word is translated in Jo. 1; 52, hereafter. On the whole, I would give the following as the view I take of this passage: 'Happy may those Israelites indeed be accounted, who, being in Christ, shall die before they see the judgments which are coming upon their native land, and which are now about to be symbolized:—happy, inasmuch as their earthly troubles cease: and, in consequence of the speedy coming of their Lord, they will at once enter upon the full glory and bliss of heaven, without having, as others (6; 11), to remain for a time in a state of rest.' Stuart takes substantially the view I advocate. He says; "That there is a reference in the henceforth to the then existing state of things under the reign of the beast, seems to be plain. Violence and cruelty and slaughter were seen on every side. In circumstances such as these, the voice from heaven proclaims, that ex aper, i.e. from this time forth, until the beast shall cease to persecute or be destroyed, blessed, i.e. peculiarly blessed or happy are they who, dying in the Lord and for his cause, escape the troubles and miseries of life, and obtain eternal rest from all their toils."—Here I cannot but express my astonishment, that any expositor of note, such as Bengel, should have attributed a spiritual meaning to the dead here; for, as Hengstenberg says, "the faithful, who alone are spoken of in the context, are never described in Scripture as dead."—In the Lord. 'The dead in the Lord' must be equivalent to "the dead in Christ" (1 Th. 4; 16: 1 Co. 15; 18). And, despite Hengstenberg's argument to the contrary, I cannot but conclude from the context and circumstances, that this phrase is used here to denote martyrs. He allows, that the 144 chilindials are had in view; and this is, on my interpretation, to
grant the point in dispute; since I have shown, that these constitute a symbol of the martyrs.

969. *Yea, saith the Spirit.* Bengal says; "The Spirit catches up the words, that were uttered by the voice from heaven." I think not. I consider, that the voice is to be regarded, as reporting the affirmation of the Spirit. Otherwise this affirmation will not be included under the *Write*, which it is clearly intended, that it should be. The spirit is doubtless that, which in C. 1; 4 is symbolized by 'the seven spirits,' and in C. 4; 5 by the 'seven burning lamps,' namely, the Holy Spirit, by whom also John was inspired. He is doubtless introduced here, as being He who 'worketh all their works in them.'—We should mentally supply, *Happy they who die thus, that they may obtain rest.* The rest here is contrasted with the *no rest* of the beast's worshippers in ve. 11.—*From their labours.* Three kindred terms occur in the Apocalypse, which are severally translated labour, work, pain (lit. toil, taskwork). The word before us means literally a beating, trouble; and its cognate verb is translated in C. 2; 3, wearied out. The term has manifest reference here to being worn out by persecution; and *labours* is doubtless only a mystical word for sufferings even unto death. Parallel passages, such as C. 2; 2: 1 Co. 15; 58: 1 Th. 1; 3, tend to confirm this. And Hengstenberg writes to the same effect; "We must the rather think here only of labours in the Lord (in particular of such as were undergone in the conflict with the beast) as the following *works* are manifestly to be regarded as the *product* of the *labours.*"

970. *For their works.* For, and not *but* or *and* is the reading of the most ancient authorities.—*Works* commonly occurs in the Apocalypse in a bad sense, as in 'they repented not from their works.' But here the works are not such, as will ever need to be repented of; but 'each will receive his own reward according to his own labour.'—*Accompany them.* It is said, not *will* follow after them, but *do* follow with them: they go along with, and keep them company as it were to another world: see on 413. And for what purpose, if not to have an effect there, and to prove to them a crown of rejoicing by procuring for them a special reward? How they may do so, without giving a claim to a reward as of debt, may be gathered from the description of the judgment in Mt. 25. It is, because they were done in and for Christ's name's sake, that they are acceptable in his sight.—So that we may understand this clause thus; For the sacrifices they have made, and the sufferings they have endured will not have been thrown away; but the odour of their "former works" for his name's sake will accompany them, and be crowned with a glorious reward, even a millennium of preferential bliss.—The Rabbins have many passages to the same effect: *e.g.,* "If a man perform a righteous
action, it goes before him into the world to come:" "If any man observe a precept, that work ascends to God, and says; Such an one performed me:" "In the hour, in which a man passes from this life, all his works precede him, and say to him; This and that thou hast done in such a place on such a day." See further in Clarke's Com. in loco.

General remarks in reference to the four last angels. There is a manifest difference observable between these, and the three which precede them. The first three are but introductory to the last four, and serve chiefly to announce the judgment, the actual occurrence of which is symbolized under the latter. The three are independent one of another, and each is to be conceived of as passing from the scene before the next appears. But not so the four. They make their appearance in pairs; and, as the first pair remains after the second has appeared, the conjoint appearance of the four carries with it the idea of universality. Without perceiving this, Hengstenberg has remarked; "Both representations (sc. of the harvest and of the vintage) possess a comprehensive character. What in history is realized in a whole series of judicial acts, which at last run out into the final judgment, is here brought together in one great harvest, one great vintage and pressing of the grapes." How far this is a correct representation of its comprehensiveness, the reader will be in a better position to judge, when we have examined the symbolizations. Suffice it here to say, that the idea of universality will be satisfied, if all the objects within the sphere contemplated are comprehended.

DIV. 4. THE FOURTH ANGEL: the Son of man come to judgment.
XIV; 14. 971-4. And I beheld, and lo! a white cloud, and upon the cloud—one sitting like to a son of man,—having upon his head a golden crown, and in his hand a sharp sickle.

971. The lo! as usual calls attention to something of more than ordinary interest.—White signifies that which is bright, splendid, dazzling; and symbolizes what is pure, righteous.—The coming of the Judge on a white cloud indicates, that the judging is either one of grace exclusively, or one which specially requires the quality of righteousness or justice, that is, one in which both the righteous and the wicked are to be tried; for on such occasions he always comes on a white cloud or is seated on a white throne (cp. 20 ; 11), whereas, when he comes merely to execute judgment on his enemies, it is on 'a cloud' or 'clouds,' which are to be conceived of as perfectly appalling through their portentous blackness (see Vol. I: p. 17, and on 26, 658).

972-3. —One sitting —having. The best authorized readings are
attended with two grammatical solecisms. Probably the others have arisen from emendations.—Like to a (not the) son of man, that is, having a human form. The angel is represented as having the human form, because "the Father hath given authority to the Son to execute judgment on account of his being a son of man" (Jo. 5; 22, 27): and he is described here as a son of man (as another symbol of the same personage was in C. 1; 13), in order to show clearly who is symbolized, Christ having constantly spoken of himself under this appellation. The title was taken originally from Da. 7; 13; "Behold upon the clouds of heaven came one, like a son of man,"—a text after which that before us has evidently been modelled. Cp. Mt. 24; 30; Lu. 21; 27; 1 Th. 4; 17: and see on 55.—The symbolic person, who comes to view here, is unquestionably intended to be regarded as an angel, equally with the rest, as appears from the epithet another applied to the next angel. We must not, then, be led by the apparent designation, Son of man, to suppose, that Christ appeared in proprium persona.—But why, it may reasonably be asked, is this angel in particular exhibited so emphatically, as being specially a representative of Christ? This question may be satisfactorily answered, if the object of this angel's mission be to rescue and bless Christ's elect; but only, I apprehend, on this hypothesis.

973. A golden crown. "The crown," says Hengstenberg, "is everywhere in the Revelation the sign of royal dignity." This is true of the diadem, but not of the crown; for the latter is an emblem, not of royalty, but of victory. The crown was given to the Mediator at the beginning (6; 2), in token that 'he was going forth conquering, and in order that he might conquer' completely in the end; and he now wears it, as having spiritually conquered in his death, and being about to reap the fruits of his conquest, in seeing the felicity of his chosen, and the annihilation of his enemies. His is not the sham tinsel crown of the locusts, but the golden crown, even such an one as he has bestowed on his church (4; 4),—a "crown of life," like to that which he promises to those, who are 'faithful unto death' (2; 10: 8; 10). See Guide, p. 184. His wearing the golden crown on this occasion may be regarded as an indication, that his mission is one of beneficence, and has for its object to bestow 'the crown of life.'

974. In his hand a sharp sickle. "To bear in the hand a sharp sickle," says Hengstenberg, "means to be prepared for the execution of a frightful judgment against the enemies of the Church." Stuart writes to the same effect. But this is a great mistake, arising as usual by reflection from the writer's scheme. A sickle is simply an implement for gathering in the fruits of the earth. It is not, like the sword, an instrument of slaughter: still less, like the axe, one proper for inflicting punishment. And hence this sickle represents nothing
more than an ingathering. It is a necessary part of the symbolical machinery; but there is nothing, either in the customary use of the implement, or in the place in which this one occurs, to justify the assigning to it a signification, which would prejudice and settle without investigation the purport of the following symbolizations. Christ no doubt bears the sickle, as "the Lord of the harvest" (Mt. 9:38; Mk. 4:29); and we may reasonably expect, that the harvest here represented is identical with that spoken of in Mt. 13:39 Gk.—This sickle is sharp merely to denote, that it is one adapted and made ready for the use, to which it is to be applied.

DIV. 5. THE FIFTH ANGEL: from the temple.

XIV; 15, 16. 975-83. And another angel came forth from the temple, crying in a loud voice to him who sat upon the cloud; 'Thrust in thy sickle, and harvest; because the hour to harvest hath come; because the harvest of the earth is dead-ripe.' And he who sat upon the cloud cast his sickle upon the earth, and the earth was harvested.

975. Is this angel another in reference to the fourth, or to one who had previously come from the temple? Undoubtedly the former; because no angel had previously come from the temple.—The ordinal numbers were introduced in respect of the second and third angels, doubtless to indicate a more immediate connexion between the three first, and thus to form them into a distinct triad. But the numbers are not continued subsequently; because, if they had been, that object would have been defeated, and the independent position of the four last, as a distinct quartet, would not have been made so manifest.—From the temple. This clause is omitted in some copies, but it is a genuine reading.—The first question in reference to it is, Which of the symbolical temples is meant, the earthly or the heavenly? Stuart and Hengstenberg say the heavenly. And this opinion may be thought to receive some little support from the 144 chilias appearing on the heavenly Zion. Yet, if what is said in introducing the next angel be compared, little doubt will exist, I think, that it is the earthly temple, that is meant. That angel is expressly said to come out of the temple in the heaven; and the omission of the three last words in this instance would seem to have arisen from the earthly temple having been had in view. 'The temple' would be that, which was most familiarly known; and the contrast within so small a space between the descriptive phrases clearly indicates a diversity in the things spoken of. See on 418, 702.—The next question is; Why does the angel come out of this temple? The temple of the Jews would most suitably represent the Jewish polity and religious system. If, then, the final and complete abrogation of the Jewish Dispensation be indirectly symbolized by the action of these four angels, the
coming forth of this angel from the temple, to call for the ingathering in the first instance of those placed specially under his care,—'the wheat' of the harvest, will be very appropriate, and quite in accordance with the representation in the parable of the wheat and the tares. The angel is doubtless to be regarded as the guardian-angel of the temple. Then, his egress from his temple may denote, that the Dispensation is at an end. And the call, as proceeding from him who is the guardian-angel of the Jews, will import the final act of his protectorship.

976. Crying in a loud voice: for emphasis and urgency.

977. To him who sat, &c. Stuart, Hengstenberg, and others, through not taking a consistent and uniform view of the symbolic angels, have found themselves entangled here in a difficulty, and have laboured, not with complete success, to account for an angel's addressing a command to Christ. If they had recognized, that all the *dramatis persona* in this heptad are alike angels, and that all are alike symbols of Christ in his Providential actings, no difficulty would have seemed to need removal.

978. Thrust in thy sickle, and harvest. In using the word *harvest* I have sought to preserve the same uniformity in the terms, that exists in the original.

979. Because the hour, i.e., the very moment (Lu. 10; 21). The *hour of harvesting* is the same with the *hour of judging* in ve. 7. Cp. Mt. 13; 39; "The harvest is the end of the son." See on 749, 944.—For thee is wrongly inserted in the R. T.—*Hath come.* "The hour hath come occurs in no part of Scripture so often as in John's Gospel," in which it occurs seven times or more. Cp. Je. 51; 83; "In a little while the time of Babylon's harvest shall come."

980. Because, &c. Are we to consider, with Hengstenberg, that this reason is subordinate to the former one; or, with Bengel, that the two are distinct and independent reasons for putting in the sickle? The parallel or repetitive manner in which the two are introduced leads me to think, that, while there can be no doubt, that the hour for harvesting can be come only because the harvest is ripe, still it is the writer's intention to assign the two as independent reasons for reaping:—'Reap, because the time appointed in the divine counsels is come; and reap, because the number of the confessors is made complete.'—*The harvest of the earth.* The term *earth* fixes the sphere of the harvest. Not only the general rule, which requires, that in such a work as this a symboical meaning be adopted, if the context will admit of it; but, in particular, the undeniably symboical use of all the accompanying terms,—both of these considerations require, that the *earth* be taken in its mystical sense. Judea, then, is the reality contemplated. And by the phrase before us 'the saints' in
Judea must be denoted, as will more fully be shown presently.—Is
dead-ripe. The Greek verb means withered, “dried up” as in C. 16;
12. Cp. Joel 3; 13: Mk. 4; 29; “Put ye in the sickle; for the
harvest is ripe.”

978–80. These words of the angel have a remarkable similarity to
the words of Christ in Mk. 4; 29; “When the fruit is brought forth,
immediately he putteth in the sickle, because the harvest hath come.”
—The final judgment is similarly spoken of under the figure of a har-

XIV; 16. 981–83. And he who sat, &c. The instantaneousness
of the work appears to be signified. He needed to do no more than
to cast his sickle on the earth; and, as with one stroke, the work was
accomplished. This is equivalent to, ‘He spake the word, and it was
done.’—The earth was harvested may symbolize the preservation of the
converted Jews amid the general destruction, which befell their fellow-
countrymen. But more than this is, I think, intended, as I will show
presently.

DIV. 6. THE SIXTH ANGEL: FROM THE TEMPLE IN THE HEAVEN.

XIV; 17. 984–86. And another angel came forth from the temple
which is in the heaven, he also having a sharp sickle.

984. Another, it may be, in reference to the one who immediately
preceded him; but rather,—as I am inclined to think from the cir-
cumstance of both the fourth and sixth angels coming from the heaven,
while the intermediate one came from the earth,—in reference to him
who was ‘like a son of man.’ Thus a very appropriate parallelism
will be made between the two, that discharge similar functions.—
Cp. 19; 15. Also Is. 63; 1–6; “Who is this that cometh from Edom,
with dyed garments from Bozrah? this, that is glorious in his apparel,
travelling in the greatness of his strength? I that speak in righteous-
ness, mighty to save. Wherefore art thou red in thine apparel, and
thy garments like him that treadeth in the winepress? I have trodden
the wine-press alone; and of the people there was none with me: for
I will tread them in my anger, and trample them in my fury; and
their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments, and I will stain all
my raiment. For the day of vengeance is in mine heart, and the
year of my redeemed is come.”

985. From the temple in the heaven. He may be represented as
coming thence to denote, either that the vengeance he is about to
execute is in consequence of the special fit of the Almighty, or (this
temple being representative of Christianity) that the judgment is
made special for the avenging of the persecuted saints. “That the
angel proceeds out of the temple shows,” says Hengstenberg, “that
Christ appears for the good of his persecuted church with the sickle.”
986. He also. The he is made emphatic by the insertion of the pronoun. The object appears to have been to connect this angel in a special manner with the fourth. The circumstance of both bearing precisely the same implement is another indication to the same effect. And thus by both indications what was said on 984 is confirmed.—Stuart, indeed, would make it appear, that a different implement is meant, rendering the same Greek word in the former place sickle and in this pruning-knife, for adaptation to the harvest and the vintage respectively. But Hengstenberg has (in principle rightly) remarked; “The small agricultural interest is overbalanced by the higher design of indicating, through the oneness of the instrument, the internal connexion that subsists between the harvest and the vintage.” If he had said ‘between the bearers of the instruments,’ I should have had no exception to take to any detail.

DIV. 7. THE SEVENTH ANGEL: FROM THE ALTAR.

XIV; 18–20. 987–1000. And another angel came forth from the altar, having power over the fire; and he shouted with a loud cry to him who had the sharp sickle, saying; ‘Thrust in thy sharp sickle, and gather in the clusters of the vine of the earth; because her grapes are fully ripe.’ And the angel cast his sickle into the earth, and gathered in the vine of the earth, and cast [it] into the great vat of the wrath of God. And the vat was trodden without the city. And blood came out from the vat, even unto the bridles of the horses, as far as a thousand six hundred stadia.

987. Another: doubtless in reference to the one who discharged a similar office in the preceding pair.—From, lit. out of, which is to be understood, according to Hengstenberg, of his ascending from the base of the altar; because the souls of the martyred saints lay there: see 6: 9.—The altar. We are led to suppose, from the office of this angel being parallel to that of the fifth, and the fifth having come forth from the earthly temple, that the altar of the earthly temple is intended; and ‘the altar,’ without the epithet ‘golden,’ must mean the altar of burnt-offerings.—The angel’s coming from the earthly temple will denote, that he appears as an avenger in connexion with the Jewish Dispensation; and his coming out of the altar of atonement, that his mission is to exact satisfaction for offences committed against God and his true people under that Dispensation.—This is supported by Amos 9: 1; ‘I saw the Lord standing upon the altar, and he said; . . . Cut them (‘the children of Israel’) on the head all of them; and the remnant of them I will slay with the sword, &c.’—See also Eze. ix., where six ministers of the Lord (Himself being accounted a seventh), who have charge over Jerusalem to destroy it, are beheld standing beside the brazen altar. After a mark has been
set on the foreheads of the righteous (as here on the 144 chiliads),
the Lord directs his servants to 'go through the city and smite: let
not your eye spare, neither have pity: slay utterly old and young; . . .
but come not near any man upon whom is the mark; and begin at
my sanctuary. . . . And he said unto them; Defile the house, and
fill the courts with the slain. . . . And as for me also, mine eye shall
not spare, neither will I have pity.' This symbolization had reference
to the destruction by the literal Babylon; and the one before us is
perfectly parallel to it in reference to that by the mystical Babylon.—
Hengstenberg, referring to Am. 9; 1, says; "So, now, we might sup-
pose here also, that the angel comes from the altar on account of the
foul gifts, which had been presented on it,—on account of the brim-
stone-fire of the hellish wickedness, which had been burning there
instead of the holy fire of God's sacrifice." And doubtless this is a part
of the truth, though he has unfortunately,—through taking the
altar to represent the church, and assuming the subjects of the judg-
ment to be the heathen,—been led away from the truth.—The sym-
bolization in this book of the parallel events, in the case of the literal
Babylon, further tends to confirm the view I have propounded. In
C. 6; 9 the souls of those, who had been slain for the testimony which
they held, are represented as crying to the Lord, from beneath the
altar, for vengeance on their persecutors, and as receiving an implied
promise of it, when the number of their fellow-servants and their
brethren, who were to be slain as they had been, should have been
made complete (see on 418). And in accordance herewith, we have
in C. 8; 3 an angel standing on the altar, who takes the chief part
in a symbolization of the destruction, which under the seven trumpets
should come upon "the earth,"—a phrase, that must at any rate in-
clude Judea: see on 527, 538. What was there, in the prelude to
the trumpets, symbolized summarily, and as from a distance, is here
symbolized as going out into immediate realization. There, the
seven presence-angels who have the seven trumpets, after their com-
mission has been given to them as it were by the angel of the altar,
go forth to execute the vengeance. Here, again, the angel of the
altar gives (it may be said) to the seventh angel under the seventh
trumpet his commission to accomplish the consummation of the
vengeance.—Once more, in the next heptad (16; 7), the angel of
the altar according to the R. T., but according to the preferable reading
the altar itself, as the place where the blood of saints and prophets
had been shed, is represented as testifying to the righteousness of the
Lord's judgings.—Surely all these concurring indications must suffice
to recommend the view I have propounded.

988. Having power over the fire. Not over fire in general, as the
A. V., Hengstenberg, and others represent; but over the fire, sc. that
The angels of judgments.

of the altar,—the means by which the symbolic souls in C. 6; 9 are supposed to have been reduced to ashes, and which perhaps is here to be conceived of, as being converted into an instrument of destruction of the martyrs' enemies. This angel is thus represented as being the guardian-angel of the sacrificial fire, by which, not only was atonement made, but the intercessory incense consumed, so as to send up fragrant clouds of perfume to the heaven. His invoking in this character the vengeance of the Lord must import, that the time for 'putting on incense, and making an atonement for the people,' has for ever passed away, and that 'there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which will devour the adversaries' of the Lord.—And this, too, is exactly in accordance with the symbolization in the prelude to the trumpets. Therein (8; 3–5) the angel applies incenses to the prayers of the saints, in order to make them enter with acceptance into the ears of the Lord of Sabboth; and then, filling his censer from the fire of the altar, symbolizes the issuing of the decree of excision and extermination, which is here carried into execution.—Again, the blast of the sixth trumpet ushers in a voice from the four horns of the golden altar; and this voice commands the loosing of that great power, which had been expressly prepared from of old to accomplish that work of destruction, which is in part what I suppose to be here symbolized: see on 627–630.—Doubtless these symbolizations are connected with the altar of incense for the same reason, that the clause before us has been introduced, namely, to signify the arrival of a time, when there shall be no more place for intercession.

989. And he shouted with a loud cry. It will be most important, that we should carefully note the points of agreement and of diversity between the symbolizations of this pair of angels and the former, in order that we may be able to form an opinion on the much controverted question, whether both the harvest and the vintage-gathering symbolize a judgment of the wicked, or only the vintage, the harvest being representative of a redemption of the righteous.—In the clause before us, as compared with the parallel one in 976, we may notice two indications. Instead of cried, the expression here is shouted. A verb is used, which is not found elsewhere in the Apocalypse, and which signifies to call loudly, clearly, vociferously. By this great urgency is denoted. Again, cry is here substituted for voice, giving to the call a more harsh, vehement, threatening aspect.

990. To him who had the sharp sickle. In the parallel clause in 977, the call is said to be addressed to him who sat upon the cloud, although he too had a sharp sickle. Surely this substitution of the instrument of excision, in place of the emblem of justice and grace, furnishes a strong indication of a difference in the objects of the two
angels’ missions.—It should further be observed, that emphasis is thrown on the word sharp by the use of two articles.

991. Thrust in thy sharp sickle. The remark just made applies with greatly augmented force here. In the corresponding clause the word sharp is not used, while here it is inserted with two articles. It seems to me impossible to doubt, that this difference has been made, with the design to intimate a severity in the judgment in this instance, which has no place in the former. A sharp and severe excision is indicated here, which is not in the parallel case.

992. And gather in the clusters of the vine of the earth. The Greek verb means to gather in ripe or dried fruit. The corresponding term in vs. 15 is harvest.—It may be observed, that the harvest of grain is gathered in for preservation for a time, but that of grapes for immediate destruction. Hence there would be an appropriateness, as far as circumstances admitted, in assigning the former to represent the preservation of the righteous, and the latter the destruction of the wicked.—The term earth shows, as compared with 980, that the same locality, namely Judea, is contemplated in both instances.

993. Because her grapes are fully ripe. The corresponding clause is because the harvest of the earth is dead-ripe; the other reason, because the hour to harvest hath come, being omitted here. As certainly as the entry of the saints’ names in the lamb’s book of life was made before the foundation of the world, so certainly the hour to give them their reward is an appointed hour, which only awaits the completion of their number. The judgment of the wicked is but a consequence of, and therefore dependent on, that appointment.—Two Various readings give the grape of the earth instead of her grapes.—Fully ripe. The Greek word is not the same, that was used before. It means literally to have attained full growth or maturity.

XIV; 19. 994. And the angel cast his sickle into the earth. Upon the earth in the corresponding clause, 982. This difference, though a slight one, is not, I am persuaded, without a meaning; and I conceive that it can have no other object than to mark a difference between the two cases. And this opinion seems to receive support from the similar mode of expression in the prelude to the trumpets. In C. 8; 5, in order to symbolize anticipatively the judgment, of which the realization is here represented, the angel in like manner casts his censer containing coals of fire ‘into the earth;’ and a catastrophe immediately ensues. Upon and into or unto, probably indicate different modes of ingathering. Upon implies a superficial excision: into a cutting up root and branch by striking beneath the surface. In the former case the reaping would be to be effected with care, and out of kindness; in the latter with an unsparing hand. If so, the former
will be suitable to 'the children of the kingdom;' the latter to 'the children of the wicked one.'

995. And gathered in the vine of the earth. Stuart says; "\textit{\textit{\textalpha\pi\nu\rho\lambda\omega} here of course designates the fruits of the vineyard; for they only are cut off, and cast into the winepress.}" But the word does not mean the fruit, but the vine itself; and if the former had been meant, why should not the word clusters, which had just been used, have been repeated? I cannot, then, but believe, that the writer means to say what the words he uses literally import, namely, that the vine itself was cut up. And this view is placed beyond doubt by the remarks I have just made on the use of into. Stuart has been led to put a non-natural construction on the term in question from want of a clearer insight into the meaning; and he has sacrificed the very point of the symbolization to 'the small agricultural interest.' The salient point is, that, not merely the grapes, but the vine itself was in this instance gathered, having attained its full growth, and fallen into a state of hopeless decay.—A vine or vineyard is frequently used in Scripture, as an emblem of the house of Israel. For example. Ps. 80 contains a beautiful allegory under this figure. 'Thou hast brought a vine out of Egypt. . . . Why hast thou, then, broken down her hedges? . . . It is burned with fire: it is cut down.' Another is in Is. 5. 'My well-beloved hath a vineyard in a very fruitful hill. . . . And he looked, that it should bring forth grapes, and it brought forth wild grapes. . . . I will take away the hedge thereof, and it shall be eaten up; and break down the wall thereof, and it shall be trodden down; and I will lay it waste. . . . For the vineyard of the Lord is the house of Israel, &c.' Again, in Is. 27; 2, 6; 'A vineyard of red wine. I the Lord do keep it. . . . Jacob shall take root. Israel shall blossom.' Je. 2; 21; 'I had planted thee a noble vine. How then art thou turned into the degenerate plant of a strange vine?' Eze. 19; 10 ss.; 'Thy mother (Jerusalem) is like a vine. . . . But she was plucked up in fury, &c.' Eze. 17; 6 ss.; 'It grew and became a spreading vine. . . . Shall it prosper? Shall it not utterly wither?' Ho. 10; 1; 'Israel is a fruit-casting vine.' In Mt. 20 the parable of the labourers in the vineyard represents the call of the apostles at the last hour of the Jewish series of ages, the twelve hours being the six terrestrial ages divided into halves: see Guide, p. 106. In Mt. 21 are two parables, representing under the figure of a vineyard the call of the Gentiles, and the rejection of the Jews. In Lu. 13 is another, exhibiting the casting off of the Jewish Church: "Cut it down; why cumbereth it the ground?" In view of these precedents, of which almost all of those from the Old Testament have reference to the desolation of Judea and Jerusalem under the literal Babylon, and those from the New Testament are connected with the
final rejection of the Jews, there can be no hesitation in supposing, that the cutting down of the vine here symbolizes the same rejection, and that not merely the clusters are represented as being cut off, but the entire vine rooted out, in order to signify, that this is not only a judgment on the wicked Jews, but a final abrogation of the Legal Covenant, and termination of the whole Mosaic polity.—To the clause before us corresponds in the parallel case and the earth was reaped. With these words that symbolization terminates, while the one under our consideration is protracted; and every additional clause goes to augment the idea of the completeness and fearfulness of the judgment.

996. And cast [it], i.e. the vine: see on 530.—Into the great vat. Probably neither a vat nor a press is meant, but a treading-floor sunk in the ground, with pits on the sides deeper still, in which the juice might be caught in vessels or skins: cp. Is. 5 : 2 ; 63 ; 3 : La. 1 ; 15 : Mk. 12 ; 1 ; “He digged a place for the wine-vat.” Weymys says; “The winepress among the Israelites was like a threshing floor; and therefore we read, that Gideon was threshing in one of them, Ju. 6 ; 11, where the LXX. have, βαλλων στομον εν λαγω.” “To tread a wine-floor the Indian Onomacritic explains of much slaughter.”—In this instance, the valley of Jehoshaphat is probably the symbol had in view in ‘the great vat’ cp. Jo. 3 ; 12.—Two articles are used, throwing strong emphasis on the adjective; but it is remarkable, that one is put in the masculine and the other in the feminine. It is true, that the R. T. has both the article and the adjective in the feminine to agree with the substantive; but this reading is generally rejected.—Of the wrath of God. This treading-floor is thus designated; because it is the instrument by which, and the place where the wrath of God is manifested. Cp. ve. 10.

XIV ; 20. 997. And the vat was trodden. If it be asked; By whom? we may refer to C. 19 ; 13–15, where he who ‘in righteousness doth judge and war’ appears on a white horse, attended by the armies of heaven on white horses; and it is said of him, “He was clothed in a garment dipt in blood,” and “He treadeth the vat of the wine of the wrath of the anger of God the almighty;” and with this passage should be compared that cited in 984 from Is. 63 : also Ps. 68 ; 23; “That thy foot may be dipped [or red] in the blood of thine enemies;” and La. 1 ; 15; “The Lord hath trodden under foot all my mighty ones in the midst of me (Jerusalem is personified as representative of the Jewish nation, and speaks in reference to the desolation caused by the literal Babylon): he hath called a host against me to crush my young men: the Lord hath trodden the virgin, the daughter of Judah, as in a winepress:” cp. Ne. 13 ; 15. A comparison of C. 19 ; 11–21 with the symbolization before us can
leave no doubt, I think, that the two passages are parts of parallel heptads, and relate substantially, more or less, to the same or intimately connected events. The 'treading' in the valley of Jehoshaphat here, the 'battle of Harmagedon' referred to in the next heptad (16:16), and the same symbolized as 'the great supper of God' in C. 19; 17 ss. may all be put in one category; for Judea, now cast off by God, is to be regarded in this matter as a part of Babylon.—

Without [or outside] the city. What city? 1. If I am right in taking the earth symbolically as meaning Judea (and this phrase may of itself alone suffice to verify the symbolical construction; for what writer would abruptly introduce a city as "the city," with no other clue to his meaning than would be afforded by the earth taken literally?), then "the city" must unquestionably refer to Jerusalem. 2. A comparison of C. 11; 2 will tend to confirm this. There it was said, that 'the holy city should be trodden by the Gentiles for 42 months;' while here we read, that 'the vine of the earth was trodden' in a suitable place contiguous to 'the city.' Must not the places and the events referred to in the two texts be in the main identical? 3. Another confirmation may be derived from the passage, on which these symbolizations of a harvest and a vintage are founded, namely, Joel 3; 9 ss.; 'Proclaim ye this among the Gentiles; . . . Let the heathen . . . come to the valley of Jehoshaphat; for there will I judge the heathen. . . . Put ye in the sickle, for the harvest is ripe; . . . for the press is full, the vats overflow; for their wickedness is great.' The valley of Jehoshaphat was 'without the city' of Jerusalem; and hence it is made the more probable, that this harvest and 'treading of the wine-vat without the city' were connected with the same city Jerusalem. 4. Two cities only can come in question here, Babylon or Rome, and Sodom or Jerusalem (see Vol. I: p. 16). Many contend, that the epithet great is invariably applied to the former as its distinctive appellation. If there be any truth in this (which, however, in my opinion there is not; cp. on 731), the absence of that epithet here shows, that Jerusalem is had in view. [This is, of course, only an argumentum ad hominem.] 5. That the name of the city is not mentioned may be accounted for by the circumstance, that the city intended (assuming it to be Jerusalem) would not have been more clearly pointed out by the insertion of the symbolic name; and of course the use of the literal one would be out of the question in this book. 6. The want of the epithet holy, which is used in C. 11; 2, is explained by the fact, that Jerusalem at this epoch had forfeited that distinguishing title (see on 731). Hengstenberg says; "The city, without any accompanying epithet, can only be the city, which was the city by way of eminence in the strictly biblical territory, the holy city, Jerusalem." In this opinion, for the reasons
above given, I unhesitatingly concur; and reject Stuart’s, that “the city of the beast” is meant.—But why outside the city? Stuart observes; “Grapes were usually trodden by the feet of men; and the press, for convenience’ sake, was set up in the vineyard. So that outside the city means in the country or field.” This is all very well in respect of the symbol and the primary sense; but it does not answer the question in respect of the thing signified. As to this, an answer may be thus deduced. To cast out a thing in mystical language would be to reject or destroy it, in relation to that from which it was cast out. See C. 11; 2; “The court outside cast out, &c.”: and 3; 12; “He shall no more go out.” Again, in He. 13; 11-13 it is written; “The bodies of those creatures, whose blood is brought into the Holy place by the high priest for sin, are burnt outside the camp [or city]: wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people through his own blood, suffered outside the gate.” From this last text in particular we may infer, that ‘to be trodden outside the city’ would be a technical phrase, denoting the being destroyed with the greatest ignominy. And in this connexion the treading of the vine and its fruit would represent the utter and final rejection of the chosen people and their polity, and in particular, the ignominious perdition of ‘the wicked’ among them, the fundamentals on which their polity had been framed being alone preserved. Moreover, much the same result might be obtained from a somewhat different way of viewing the matter, as thus. A symbol is necessarily per se generical in its meaning, and can only derive its particular application in each instance from the relation, in which it stands in the context. Thus, for example, the city in C. 11; 2 stands contrasted with the sanctuary, the altar, and the inner court of the temple: but here with that which is without the city, which may be taken to represent the country at large. Hence, what is there signified by the sanctuary, &c., namely, the fundamentals of the Jewish religion, is here denoted by the city. And consequently this symbolization would import, that everything in the Jewish polity, save the essential and eternal truths of the religion, would be involved in the treading down of the nation in general, and the destruction of ‘the reprobates’ in particular.—Hengstenberg says; “The city is a designation of the church” of Christ. And he adds; “that the winepress was trodden out of the city indicates, that the members of the church are not the object of the judicial agency of God,—that this has respect to the execution of judgment on the world as opposed to the church.” But the vine, and not ‘the winepress’ is, in point of fact, the subject of the treading; and a vine is always a symbol of the Jewish Church and nation, as the precedents above-cited have fully shown. It must at any rate mean the Church as opposed to the world. Hence this interpretation breaks
down in toto. Stuart's, too, in reference to Rome, is wrecked in a similar way.

998. And blood came out from the vat. Wine might have been expected to proceed from the grapes, but instead thereof came out blood. It is true, that the designating the juice of grapes blood may be justified by Ge. 49; 11 and De. 32; 14, where it is called 'the blood of grapes;' but I incline to agree with Stuart, that 'the natural congruity of the imagery is here dropped, and the thing signified is substituted for the thing signifying' (blood for wine), in order to convey a more enlarged idea of the vast effusion of blood. This blood, then, is equivalent to or the visible manifestation of, 'the wine of the wrath of God, of which it was declared in ve. 10, that those who should worship the beast should be made to drink; and of which it is said in the next heptad, 16; 6; 'Thou hast given them blood to drink.' What is announced generally, as commencing at the epoch of the third proclamation and the third bowl, goes out into fulfilment in respect of the Jews under the symbolization of this seventh angel.

999. Even unto or as far as; cp. 12; 11: 18; 5: lit. until or as long as; see 2; 10, 25, 26, &c.—The horses' bridles. Hengstenberg seems to think, that the horses alluded to may be the 200,000,000 of C. 9; 16. But how can a symbol of the sixth trumpet be alluded to as coming under the seventh. If any horses in particular are meant, and this be not (as is very likely) a mere simile or façon de parler, they are unquestionably those of the armies, which accompany the Captain of the host of the Lord in C. 19; 14, 15, in 'his treading of the wine-press:' and, if they are so, then the vintage of this heptad must be virtually synchronous with the battle of that.—By this clause the depth of the stream of blood is indicated, as the distance is by the next.—It is probable, that this figure was in common use among the Jews to express an immense slaughter; for the Jerusalem Talmud, in speaking of the siege of Bithoor by Adrian, says, that 'he slew so many, that the horses waded in blood up to their bridles.'

1000. As far as: lit. from, i.e., the distance from the city was, &c. There is nothing whatever to justify Hengstenberg's saying, that the blood 'begins from the gates of the city, and completes a circle of 1600 stadia' around it, thus making 'a sea' and not 'a stream' to be meant. If such had been the meaning, εκ χωλη or some similar phrase would have been used.—1600 stadia. Stuart in his translation, and also twice in his commentary, has "1200 furlongs," which, he states, is equivalent to "150 miles." I presume, that he arrives at the number 1200 by converting the stadia into furlongs; for there is no Various reading. Yet I have not met with any rate of commutation, that would give this number: and if he does so commute it, he is not consistent with himself; since he.
calls the 12,000 *stadia* in C. 21; 16 "12,000 furlongs." One table gives 700 English feet or 233½ yards to a Jewish *stadium*; and at this rate, seeing that the Jewish mile contained 7000 feet, 1600 *stadia* would give 160 Jewish miles, and 212 English. Another table attributes about 244 yards to a Jewish *stadium*. Stuart's number would give only 165 yards. But there is no occasion to determine with accuracy what distance is spoken of; since no conversion into English measure ought to be made. The number is clearly a symbolical one, and symbolically derived. And if so, to convert it into a foreign measure must be to destroy all chance of seeing the true meaning; for this will be in the number itself, rather than in the distance it may represent. To deduce the true signification, we must resolve the 1600 into its component parts in the same way, that we did the 144 chilias in 468. These are 16 and 100,—the square of 4 and the square of 10 multiplied together. The former number as the square of 4, will denote universality in the highest degree in respect of that, over which the stream of blood extends (see Vol. I: p. 31). The conversion into hundreds may be interpreted on the same principle, in the way indicated in Vol. I: p. 37: or it may be explained by the suitableness of the resulting number to convey a general idea of the extent of the thing signified. Thus, the 16 converted into hundreds will represent the extent, to which the stream of blood flowed. Now, the 1600 *stadia* must be allowed on all hands to be as near an approximation to the length of Palestine, as can reasonably be expected in the case of a number so formed. Ewald and many other commentators have held, that the length of Palestine is had in view.

The result of our examination of this symbolization is, that it represents immense armies as encompassing Jerusalem, and causing a slaughter of the inhabitants of the land so vast, that it might be compared to a stream of blood, as high as a man's head, reaching from one extremity of the land to the other. How forcible a figure is this to represent an immense slaughter! Yet, that it is not too strong in respect of the last Jewish war, if in any case, may be judged from such statements as the following, derived from Josephus. There perished in the siege of Jerusalem 1,100,000, in 7 years preceding the destruction of that city 1,337,490 souls, besides 97,000 carried captive to be sold as slaves. But even this does not go to the full extent of the symbolization. Besides the grapes, from the treading of which all this blood flowed, the vine itself was cut up, crushed, pounded, and annihilated, that is, the whole Jewish polity, civil and ecclesiastical, was abolished, the Covenant abrogated, and the last vestige of Jewish preference or precedence in God's sight taken away. Perhaps, too, the punishment of the wicked Jews in a future state may be included in the symbolization; though it would appear from
C. 20; 4–5 cpd. with vv. 12–14, that the judging of all, save confessors, is reserved for the post-millennial judgment.

So important a point is it to establish beyond all doubt, that 'the harvest' does not, like 'the vintage-gathering,' symbolize a judgment on the wicked, that it will be expedient, before proceeding to take a summary view of the whole, to recapitulate the arguments and indications in support of this view, and to notice what has been advanced to the contrary. And first we may observe, that there is a strong antecedent probability against such a repetition as the contrary hypothesis supposes. No other instance can, I believe, be found in which a second and similar scene is introduced, merely repeating what had just been symbolized. Next, parallelism with the case of the literal Babylon in C. 7, leads us to anticipate an ingathering of the righteous in connexion with the mystical Babylon. Then, in the harvest scene there is nothing that at all favours the supposition, that it represents a judgment of punishment; while every particular that would admit of indication being given, as the white cloud and the golden crown, goes in the opposite direction. On the other hand, in the vintage scene there is no room for doubt, that it represents such a judgment: while a number of indications appear, which may be thought to have been expressly introduced to intimate by the contrast they present, that this scene is of an opposite character to the former. The shouting with a loud cry as compared with crying with a loud voice,—the address to him who had the sharp sickle instead of to him who sat on the cloud,—the repetition of the word sharp, and the stress so strongly thrown on it, while it is not used in the parallel place,—the angel's hurling his sickle into instead of upon the earth, are all indications tending to show, that the sixth angel's mission is of a beneficent character, in contrast to that of the seventh, which is clearly of a punitive. Again, it may be observed, that, while the treading of grapes ordinarily and almost necessarily represents the punishment of the wicked, a harvest may be appropriately used to symbolize an ingathering of the righteous, more especially as being a time of joyousness (Is. 9; 3: 23; 3). In the parable of the wheat and tares the harvest is designed to be a gathering of the wheat alone: the tares come in only incidentally; because an enemy has been doing mischief. And so in 4 Ezra 4 the harvest has respect to 'the souls of the just.' Once more, if I have rightly described C. 11; 15–19 as a prelude, which indicates the general purport of this and the parallel heptads, the case will be clear. For in vs. 18 it is said; 'The time of judging the dead,—giving the reward to thy servants, and destroying those who destroy the earth, hath come.' To make the heptad under consideration correspond herewith it is necessary, that we should see in the harvest the giving of the reward to
the servants of the Lord. Further, we had brought before us in vv. 1 to 5 'the firstfruits' of this harvest, and from the firstfruits we may form an opinion of what the bulk is; for, 'if the firstfruits be holy, the lump also will be holy.' Now, these firstfruits have been shown to be Jewish martyrs for Christ's sake. And hence we may safely conclude, that the general harvest represents the deliverance of the confessors of Christ in Judea,—as to this earth (it may be) by the escape of the Christians to Pella, and as to a future state by their admission after death into a preferential state of bliss. As, however, Hengstenberg contends, that this is 'a harvest of wrath,' it will be proper to examine what he advances in support of this view. Referring to the fundamental passage, Jo. 3; 12 (cited on 997), he says; "The ripeness of the harvest, the fulness of the vats, indicates the fulness of the guilt. . . . In like manner in Isa. 27; 11 the harvest is the harvest of punishment: it is said there of the world's strong ones, 'when their harvest has become dry, they shall be broken off. And in Je. 51; 33, it is said of Babylon, 'Yet a little while, and the time of her harvest comes.' There can be no doubt, that here also the figure denotes the harvest of punishment, and that we are to reject the interpretation of Bengel, who remarks, 'The vintage is expressive only of punishment, the harvest is entirely of a gracious character.'" This is all (except what has been incidentally refuted already), that Hengstenberg has to advance. And what does it amount to? Merely to this, that in certain passages a harvest is used figuratively to denote wrath or punishment. But does it thence at all follow, that it must be so used in every place, or in this in particular? Unquestionably not. Not even a presumption arises thence. It is mere matter of conjecture, that the writer had either of the passages in view. But, granting that he had, might he not follow the precedent only in part? His general custom leaves no room to doubt, that he would do so. In following the ancient precedents, he never copies them slavishly. Nor, indeed, would the necessary difference of circumstances allow of his doing so (even if he had been so disposed), without sacrificing all meaning and intelligibility, and merging the thing signified in the sign. Let me add, that it is not true, that 'the ripeness of the harvest, &c. indicates the fulness of the guilt.' It simply indicates a fit state for gathering, but whether this arises from the number of the righteous being made complete, or from the wicked having filled up the measure of their iniquities, can be determined only from the context and circumstances. Hengstenberg's arguments, then, being insufficient to serve his purpose, I feel justified in concluding, that there are none of sufficient weight to countervail what I have advanced in favour of regarding the harvest, as an ingathering of the righteous.
Synoptical interpretation.

Summary of the prelude to the judgment-angels. XIV; 1. The 144,000 represent the perfected company of those 'called, and chosen, and faithful' followers of the Lamb, who had been converted from among his ancient people, and had suffered for his name's sake during the preferential and conjoint existence of 'the old covenant' with his 'new covenant,'—say in the first 70 years of the Christian era, but chiefly about the epoch of the last war on the Jews. They appear on the heavenly Zion with the Lamb at their head to denote, that through his precious bloodshedding they have entered into a state of bliss,—this scene being introduced anticipatively at the epoch of the commencement of the Jewish war, with the view to animate those, who were minded to suffer for conscience' sake, by exhibiting to them the bliss and glory into which they would enter, if they remained 'faithful unto death.' Thus they form a parallel to that blessed company of their brethren, who, previous to the Babylonian, as they before the Roman desolation of their city, received a special reward through grace. But these are pre-eminent above those in some respects. Those have the Lamb's name and his Father's written at full length on their foreheads, as a mark of honour, and in token that they have proved conquerors of the beast: while those had been simply made secure by having the seal of God put on their foreheads. 2—3. These are enabled to sing before God, and before all creation and the church in particular, not only a song celebrating their deliverance from a cruel persecutor, but the sweetest and most solemn of all hymns,—the hymn of a known and accomplished redemption, which none but the redeemed of God's people can as yet sing: while those can only join a great multitude in ascribing their deliverance from the great tribulation to God and to the Lamb. And these are also pre-eminently distinguished in the following respects. 4. They have 'watched and kept their garments,' so that none have seen them shamelessly polluting themselves by unlawful commerce with the unclean things of the heathen idolatries; for the enticements of the great whore of Babylon, and the threats and persecutions of the Roman beast have alike proved ineffectual to lead them into any compromises of their faith, or any wavering in their allegiance to the King of kings. They have the high privilege of being the constant attendants on the Lamb, as a reward for their 'following Him faithfully' even unto death, while on earth. They have been 'purchased by Him to Himself' from among their unbelieving fellow-countrymen, as 'a peculiar people,' that they may be 'a first-fruit' of the rich and glorious harvest, which he is about to reap. 5. And they are distinguished from others in being wholly free from those equivocations and evasions, which are characteristic of the rest of men, and from which even their brethren have not kept themselves
wholly clear under the pressure of persecution. So that they have not in one iota denied "the truth;" but, even in God's sight, are free from reproach on that account.

*Synoptical interpretation of the third heptadal tableau of the seventh trumpet.* The chronological epoch to which this series relates is in general that of the Jewish war, A.D. 67–70; but the seven parts do not admit of being each separately assigned. There is, however, a wide distinction observable (and which is further marked by an interlude) between the first three and the last four parts. The former, which are merely general annunciantory proclamations, may with some probability be assigned to the commencement of the war, though the accomplishment of them all is not necessarily to be looked for at that epoch, or, if at all, only partially and as an earnest of what was to come. The latter, which are evidently symbolizations of events occurring at the epoch at which the Vision has arrived, may with more certainty be referred, so far as they relate to this world, to the siege of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. XIV; 6. The first angel symbolizes and proclaims far and wide, that now is 'the good news of the sonic kingdom' published to all the world, primarily and specially to the Jews: and just so the apostle had said not long before, that 'the gospel had come into all the world.' This gospel made known to all who were disposed to receive it, that 'the kingdom of the heavens' was at hand,—that the preferential reign with Christ for 1000 years, and thenceforward throughout the ages of ages, of those who should have confessed him during the existence of the old Dispensation, was about to commence. And the better to signify the wide reach of this message, the angel is beheld aloft, proclaiming it midway between heaven and earth. 7. In earnest accents he calls upon all to reverence the God of Christians, and by becoming disciples of His Son to render glory to Him, who created alike Christians and Jews, Roman and other heathens; since the time of his judging, in order to give rewards to His servants, is close at hand. This call was in effect that, which was made by the first preachers of Christianity; and the judgment alluded to is that, which we shall have brought before us in vv. 14–20 and in C. 20; 4. 8. The second angel proclaims the swift and sure coming of the downfall of mighty Rome,—the stronghold of heathenism, on account of her having debased and injured all the nations through her covetous, ambitious, and idolatrous propensities. The occurrence of the event here denounced is directly symbolized in Cs. 16–19, where we shall have to inquire into the time and manner of the accomplishment. 9–11. The third angel proclaims, that the fiercest vengeance of God, even the bitterest potion which His wrath can mix,—the fire and brimstone which is reserved for the devil and his angels, and this aggravated by behold-
Synoptical interpretation.

ing in contrast the highest bliss of heaven, shall be the punishment of every one, who, whether by seductions or threats or sufferings, is induced to apostatize from the faith, so far as to render any token of subjection or reverence to the dominant world-power: yes, whosoever shall thus 'draw back unto perdition' shall suffer inconceivable torments for an endless period; and, in contrast with 'the faithful unto death' (who will have awarded to them a preferential season of rest and peace), he shall not enjoy one moment's rest from his torments by day or by night. 12. At this point the seer interposes a declaration to the effect, that the persecution, under which the saints were suffering at the epoch of his writing, would greatly try the long-suffering of those faithful ones, who habitually keep God's commandments, and stedfastly adhere to Christ's religion. 13. Here a special mandate from heaven requires the seer to record, for the comfort and encouragement of such, the declaration of Jehovah, that those who should thenceforth die in Christ would be pre-eminently blessed, inasmuch as they would at once enter into a state of rest, and would escape the sight of and participation in the final miseries, which were coming upon their native land. To give stronger assurance to this declaration the voice adds, that the Divine spirit, who wrought all their good works in them, solemnly ratifies it, giving as a special reason for their blessedness, that they will have rest from the sufferings inflicted on them by their persecutors, and that, moreover, their sufferings will not be without their reward, for their services in the cause of the truth will be had in remembrance before God. 14. After this interlude, a fourth angel appears, as a special representative of the all-conquering Son of man come to rescue his people in Judea, and to gather them into his heavenly garner. 15. A fifth angel comes out of the temple on the earth to denote, that the first Dispensation is at an end; and, as the guardian of the Jewish temple, he performs the last act of his office in calling on the Mediator of the Covenant to gather his own people to himself; since the time for gathering them is now fully come, their appointed number having been made complete, and the series of ages of 'the Mystery of God' having reached its terrestrial goal. 16. His requisition is instantaneously complied with, and the Lord's people from among the Jews are rescued, in part by a temporal deliverance, as by the escape of many Christians to Pella, and in part by an eternal redemption, the confessors for the truth as it is in Jesus being at once admitted into their preferential rest. 17. A sixth angel comes forth from the temple in the heaven to denote, either that he is prepared to execute a special decree of the Almighty, or that he is the guardian-angel of Christianity coming to execute judgment on her enemies. 18. A seventh angel,—he who was the guardian of the sacrificial fire,
comes forth from that altar, under which the souls of the martyrs who had been sacrificed on "the altar of their faith" had lain as reduced to ashes (cp. 6; 9), to denote that he comes as the avenger of such. With a stern voice, like to one invoking vengeance, he calls on his companion, to whom the office had been assigned, to destroy the enemies of Christ's people in Judea; because they have filled up the measure of their iniquities. 19. No sooner is the call made than the work is performed. But the symbolization does not stop here, as in the former instance. To exhibit the destruction of those, who by their iniquities had brought destruction on their native land,—of those, 'whose hearts had waxed gross, and who had closed their eyes and their ears against the Gospel,' and persecuted those who received it, was the principal object in view; and this point is therefore dwelt upon, and depicted in the most vivid colours. The unfruitful vine, on which all the labours of the husbandman had been bestowed in vain, is now at length "cut down" (Lu. 13; 8), and is cast into the vat of God's wrath to be trodden, until all its vital spirit has been expressed. 20. The ancient Jewish polity, civil and ecclesiastical, being now utterly cast off by God, is annihilated by man. And "the blood of Jehovah's quondam servants do the heathen (as on the parallel occasion, but to a much greater extent) shed like water, not only on every side of Jerusalem," even throughout the length and breadth of the land; but within her walls, and in the sacred enclosure of God's temple. The latter they reduce to a heap of smouldering ruins, and "leave not one stone upon another of the city, which knew not the time—of her visitation." This final rejection of the Jewish Church and people, from being the Church and people of God, necessarily implies the termination of the old Dispensation, and the substitution of the Christian Church in the place previously held by the Jewish,—the latter being the event which is designated, in the parallel place of the seventh heptad (C. 19; 7, 9), "the marriage of the lamb."

Interpretations of the heptad of the judgment-angels.—I. C. 14 relates generally to the conquest of Rome by the Goths [Bossuet]. To the Reformations [Brightman, Pareus, Jurieu, Faber]. The vintage was in England in Cromwell and Cranmer [Brightman]. From A.D. 606 to the judgment [Fleming]. To the Church at the end of the world [Croly]. To the Waldenses, the Lutheran, Calvinistic, and Reformed professions, and the final temporal judgments on the enemies of the Church [Vitrins]. To Protestantism [Fuller]. To the future [Burgh]. A.D. 1789 to 1851 [Elliott]. A.D. 1173 to 1641: the harvest is the slaughter of the Huguenots, A.D. 1571: the vintage the massacre of Irish Protestants in 1641 (Ireland is 1600 stadia long, [Gell]). "The son of man" represents the converted Jews [Jenour].—
The angels of the last plagues.


Introductory remarks. This tableau is parallel to the last, both in respect of its introduction and of its details; and, as that corresponded in the way of a supplemental crisis to the first, so does this to the second tableau of the seventh trumpet.

HEPTADAL PRELUDE. The victors on the sea of glass, and the mission of the seven plague-angels.

This prelude in its song of triumph indicates the result of the seven plagues, which it is the business of the angels of this series to inflict. It is essentially identical with the preceding one, the same parties being brought to view in both under different aspects. And this, like that, is to be regarded, as being placed at the epoch of the trumpet-consummation, the conquerors being supposed to stand as witnesses of the proceedings of the angels from first to last. This, too, admits of division into seven parts, which I will indicate as before.—The general purport of this prelude is well stated by Stuart as follows. “Seven angels are commissioned to go and inflict upon the beast and his coadjutors the seven last plagues, so called because the wrath of God is accomplished by them. No sooner is this command given than the glorious host of martyrs around the throne of God, whose blood had been shed by the beast, sing the song of anticipative triumph, and praise the justice of God as about to be displayed in the overthrow of the beast. The temple in heaven is then opened; and the seven angels, charged with the execution of divine justice, go forth from it in splendid apparel. One of the four living creatures which support the throne of God, gives each of them a vial or cruse filled with material to execute the wrath of God. The temple is immediately filled with smoke, arising from the fire which burns
fiercely around the Almighty, as the emblem of his anger (comp. Ps. 18; 8), and also of his power to destroy. By reason of this, no one is able to enter into the temple; and of course, no one is permitted to intercede for those who are about to be punished. Punishment, therefore, is certain and inevitable."

(1). The sign of the seven plague-angels. Xv; 1. 1001–3. And I beheld another sign in the heaven, great and wonderful,—seven angels having the seven last plagues; because in them the wrath of God is brought to an end.

1001. Another sign. This is the last of the three ‘signs’ of the Apocalypse. The word another points to the two former in C. 12; 1, 3, the first of which is described as ‘a great sign,’ and the second in reference to it is called ‘another.’ See on 777.—This exceeds the first two in being wonderful, as well as great. And it appears to be designated as both great and wonderful; because it is a celebration of the victory of the woman, and her son, ‘and those that are with him’ (who constitute the first sign), over the dragon and his angels (who form the second). The repetition of the words great and wonderful in vs. 3 has probably been made, after the manner of a catchword, to indicate this. Some think, however, that the third sign has been described by these terms, “not in respect to the others, but considered by itself” [Hengstenberg].—In the heaven. Why there? Various reasons may be given. 1. For congruity with the two former signs, and also with the vision of the 144 chiliads (14; 1–5), the scene of all of which was laid in the heaven. 2. To indicate, that the mission they came to execute was from the God of heaven. 3. To denote, that the judgments they should inflict would be in retribution for the persecution of God’s people. 4. Because heaven was now the abode of those, who had gained the victory over the dragon, and had been exalted to the place, whence he had been cast down.

1002. Seven angels. Not the seven, as in C. 8; 2; and therefore, we may presume, not the trumpet or presence angels. Moreover, as we are now under the seven blasts of the seventh trumpet-angel, congruity would scarcely admit of his being introduced in a way, that would assign to him two contemporaneous settings.—Having the seven, etc., or, lit., having seven plagues which are the last. Emphasis is thrown on last; and it is augmented, and the sense in which the term is used explained, by the clause which follows. These are called the last; because in them the wrath of God being expended, there will be no occasion for more. These are the last plagues, too, in reference to those of the preceding six trumpets (see on 639, 648, 724).—Strokes or afflictions might be a more accurate term in place of plagues (see on 859); but the latter term is too firmly established to be removed.—This clause is added as a characterizing designation of
these angels, and not because they had the plagues at this time; for at the time of their first appearance they have not the vials, see ve. 7: and the use of the clause afterwards (17; 1: 21; 9), when the vials have been poured out, confirms this view. Observe, that these angels are here designated (op. ve. 6: 21; 9) as angels of the plagues, not of the vials. Whence vial-angels is not so appropriate an appellation as plague-angels.—Hengstenberg remarks here; "It is to what these were destined to accomplish, that the song of praise refers, which was raised by those who stood on the sea of glass mingled with fire. Only in the presence of the seven angels could they sing as they did. The song forms a commentary on the appearance of the angels." I agree substantially, but not wholly in this view. I consider, that these angels are mentioned in the first instance to indicate, that the scene of the victors on the sea of glass, and that of the egress of the angels from the temple, form essentially one scene, and are both included in the prelude. From the manner in which the two scenes follow one another, and are divided by the clause "after these things," it would naturally have been supposed, if ve. 1 had not been inserted, that they were distinct and consecutive scenes, the former constituting the prelude, and the latter being part of the principal heptad. To guard against this, the appearance of the angels is anticipatively announced in ve. 1; for it would appear from vv. 5–6 that they could not actually have come into the seer's view, till the martyrs' song was ended. Hence ve. 1 is to be regarded as an introductory heading to the prelude, serving, when connected with vv. 6, 7, to bind it together, so as to indicate its oneness.

1003. Because. The reader should mentally supply before this word, 'which are called the last.'—The wrath of God: namely, that spoken of in the prelude (11; 18), and in the preceding heptad (14; 10).—Is brought to an end = exhausted, drained to the last dregs (see on 688). God's wrath had been fulfilled or accomplished many times previously; but on those occasions more remained to be accomplished. Now, there is to be, not only an accomplishment, but a finality in respect of it and of the subjects of it; for this is the last outpouring during this series of ages; and the wrath will be poured out to an extent, that will leave no room for repetition in respect of its present objects, since it will utterly consume them. It will follow, that at least the last of these outpourings cannot precede the burning of Babylon in C. 18, or the destruction of the beast in C. 19; 11–21. When it is said in them is ended, the meaning must necessarily be 'in the infliction of them will be ended.' This is one of the many instances in which, when it is desired to express very emphatically the absolute certainty and close sequence of an event, the past or present tense is put for the future.
(2). The victorious harpers on the sea of glass. XV; 2. 1004–8.
And I beheld as it were a glassen sea, mingled with fire, and those
who come off conquerors from the wild-beast, and from his image, and
from the number of his name, standing on the glassen sea, having harps
of God.

1004. As it were a glassen sea, &c. Cp. on 804 and 646.—This sea
is not to be conceived of as being symbolically identical with that in
O. 4; 6. The absence of the article shows this. Moreover, this sea
is said to be mingled with fire, which that was not; while, on the
other hand, that was said to be like to crystal. At the same time, the
scene is generally the same here as there, both being laid in the
heaven. But there is here a specific adaptation of the crystal sea to
a particular purpose. The conception to be formed here is of a vast
pellucid floor or expanse, flashing with blood-red corruscations in
every direction. Thus regarded, this will be seen to be a symbol
introduced with reference to those who stand on this sea. The fiery
flashes are emblematic of their having been tried and purified in the
furnace of affliction and persecution, even unto the shedding of their
blood. Compare—"Purified seven times in the fire;" "Think it
not strange concerning the fiery trial, that is to try you, &c.;" "The
fire shall try every one's work, &c.;" "Ye have not yet resisted unto
blood." The diaphanous brilliancy denotes the purity, with which
they have come out of the fire. There is the virgin-purity of the
144 chiliads. They can endure the trial of 'the sea of glass,'—the
mirror of the Spirit; and be found "without fault before the throne
of God:" and this can be said only of those, who are symbolized by
the 144 chiliads. Moreover, this glittering pavement may be taken
to have a symbolic aspect for those, who are unable to stand on it,—
for the worshippers of the beast, whom its fire will consume as in a
moment. And here Hengstenberg's solution may come in. He says;
"The glass denotes their blamelessness and purity; and the sea
being mingled with fire, indicates, that it is chiefly about the mani-
festations of God's wrath,—his punitive righteousness, that the vision
is occupied. The meaning of the symbol is given by the song, which
those standing on it sing. Both the symbol and the song anticipate
what is to be accomplished by the seven angels with the seven last
plagues."

1005. Those who come off, &c. The present tense may be designed
to indicate, that mention is being made of persons then actually
'striving for the mastery' with the beast: cp. 7; 14.—Hengstenberg
says; "The words are literally: the conquering out of the beast.
This peculiar construction, quite unusual elsewhere, points to the
circumstance, that before the victory they were in the power of the
beast."—Perhaps 2 Co. 6; 17, 18 ('Come out from among them, and
be ye separate, &c.) may be a guide to the true meaning. They conquered by coming out of, and renouncing all connexion with the adherents of the beast.

1006. And from his image. Here the R. T. inserts and from his mark; but the clause is not well authorized.—As to the three terms see on 920, and compare the formula in the parallel heptad: 14; 9.—This description of those, who are privileged to stand on the sea of glass, forms an equivalent to the writing on the foreheads of the 144 chiliads, and thus serves to identify these conquerors with those redeemed ones.

1007. Standing, &c. See on 452.—"The expression, ‘standing on a sea of glass,’ carries an allusion to Ex. 15; 1, where Moses beside the Red Sea, with the children of Israel, sings a song to the Lord (cp. ‘they sing the song of Moses and the Lamb,’ in vs. 3). The Red Sea, in which the Egyptians were drowned, and which therefore presents itself as an image of the righteous judgments of God, was a type of this sea of glass" [Hengstenberg].

1008. Having harps of God. This expression may be a Hebraism, signifying harps of the highest excellence. But, in any case, it must be allowed to attach a remarkable significance to these harps; for neither those of the representatives of the redeemed (5; 8), nor those of the 144 chiliads (14; 2) are described as being harps of God. The expression is doubtless intended to assign an especial excellence and honour to these harps, in order to exalt in the highest degree our conception of the song of praise, which they accompany. The circumstance of these conquerors, and of the 144 chiliads, having both of them harps is another indication of generic identity in the things signified by the two. Cp. on 931.

(3). The victor’s song. XV; 3, 4. 1009-16. And they sing the song of Moses, the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying: ‘Great and wonderful [are] thy works, O Lord! the almighty God! righteous and true [are] thy ways, O king of the nations! Who of a truth would not fear, O Lord! and glorify thy name? because thou alone [art] divine; because all the nations shall come and worship before thee; because thy righteous judgments are made manifest.

1009. The song of God’s servant Moses. Cp. Ex. 14; 31; “His servant Moses.”—It is generally agreed, that the song referred to is the triumphal song of Ex. 15, sung on the deliverance from the Egyptians, and not the prophetic song of De. 32. The designation of this song, the introduction of a ‘sea,’ and the similarity of the earlier ‘plagues’ of this heptad to the Egyptian plagues, all tend to show, that the Egyptian deliverance, and the passage of the Red Sea under Moses, have been had in view as prototypes.—Such a song as this the victors could only sing as having been Jews; and hence this
is a clear indication, that they are such. By it they doubtless give thanks for the blessings and privileges of the Mosaic Covenant, as well as for a deliverance similar to that, for which their forefathers, who had suffered under the literal Babylon, are similarly represented as giving praise (7; 10).

1010. And the song of the lamb. This song, as contrasted with 'the song of Moses,' the conquerors can sing only as being Christians; and by it they celebrate the praises of redeeming love. As being qualified to sing both, the parties symbolized are shown to be 'a peculiar people,' 'the first-fruits to God and the lamb,' gathered (mainly at any rate) from among his ancient people Israel; and as such, or in so far as they are such, entitled to all the blessings, and to the preferential privileges of both covenants. Thus they stand alone, as a chosen and distinct body. And this may lead us to see, why the song of the 144 thousand is described as 'a new song, which none but themselves could learn.' For this description, which represents the song of the conquerors as a song proper to Judeo-Christian confessors, is doubtless an equivalent and explanatory description of the very same song. And if so, the singers of the two, that is, the parties signified, must be identical. The 144 thousand 'having the lamb's name and his Father's written on their foreheads,' which is a parallelism to 'the song of Moses and of the lamb,' confirms this.—I have spoken hitherto, as though two songs were had in view. And I have done so; because the clauses which have been considered so far would lead us to form this opinion. Indeed, even if they have not been introduced with the express object of leading to this view, I doubt not, that it has been designed by the two descriptive clauses to indicate two aspects of the song (in the way that has been shown); and perhaps also to intimate the difference of construction, which, it is manifest, must be assigned to the two clauses. For, while in the first Moses is unquestionably spoken of as the author, in the second the lamb cannot be mentioned as being the author, but as the person addressed. All this is made clear and easy of explanation by its being shown by what follows, that there is in truth but one song, and that the song which the author proceeds to recite is the song he means. The song he records is not, however, that which Moses composed and sang; though there are points of similarity between the two. And hence we must construe the two titles in such a way, as will accord with the facts. If, then, we understand the meaning to be, that the conquerors sang a song, based on and accordant in spirit with that of Moses, but adapted to Christian circumstances and sentiments, and addressed to the Lamb,—the Saviour 'specially of them that believe in him,' we shall probably not be far from the truth. However, after all, the intention may possibly have been, that the two clauses should
be construed in the same way, which they may be, if we regard them as being a mystical method of signifying, that the song is one of praise for the righteous judgments of God under the Mosaic and Christian Dispensations, sung by those who had lived under both. —Hengstenberg has remarked; “It is common to this song of the Lamb, and the song of Moses, that in both alike the power of the heathen world is the object of the judicial energy of God.” —Let me direct attention to the circumstance, that my stichéical distribution of this song presents three lines of exclamation ending with vocatives, followed by a middle line, which forms the basis for three reasons in as many lines, each beginning with because; and thus making in the whole seven lines.

1011. Great and wonderful are thy works. Cp. Ps. 66; 3: 92; 6. The sign of the seven angels of the plagues had just been characterized as “great and wonderful.” The use of the phrase again here shows plainly what are the works had in view. This is a song of praise, called forth by the avenging of God’s servants by means of the strokes, which are about to be inflicted on their persecutors.—O Lord, &c. See on 31, where I have shown, that Christ is probably the person addressed, when this designation is used.—The repetition for substance of this and the next clause in C. 16; 5, 7, confirms the remark just made, as to the works referred to.

1012. Righteous and true, &c. Cp. 16; 5, 7, and the parallel prelude, 19; 2; where the reason is given; “because thou hast judged the great whore,” &c.—Thy ways. “The justice or righteousness is manifested in this, that he gives to each their own, to His church salvation, to His enemies destruction.” The truth is shown in fulfilling what He had led each to expect.—O king of the nations. The R. T. has of the saints; and there is a reading of the sons, in reference to which I may notice, that in Test. XII. Patr. Christ is spoken of as ἰσχυρός αὐτὸς, who shall reign over all people.” The reading I have adopted is the one best accredited by MSS., and by the connexion. Cp. 1; 5; “The archon of the kings of the earth.” This title, importing that Christ is ‘the ruler of the rulers of Judea’ (see on 20), would have been an appropriate one in the last heptad, which is designed in part to exhibit the judgments coming on the rulers of Judea. And certainly the true reading here is most apposite in the heptad under our consideration, inasmuch as the chief object of this heptad is to portray the approaching judgments on the Gentile nations.’

XV; 4. 1013. Who would not fear. Cp. 18; 15: 19; 5, and ct. 13; 4.—MSS. of some authority insert thee.—The precedent is in Je. 10; 7; “Who would not fear thee, thou king of the heathen!”

1014. And glorify thy name. Ct. 18; 7. Three reasons follow, showing why all must glorify that name of the Lord, which the 144
is has have had written on their foreheads. These reasons flow out of one another. Because the Lord is divine, He visits the heathen with judgments to avenge His people: or, because of His judgments, the heathen are brought to come and worship Him, and acknowledge Him to be the only God.

1015. Because thou alone art divine, that is, sacred or godly. The Greek word is used in the N. T. only here, and in 16; 5. There is a various reading, which would be translated holy.—The term is applied to God in strong contrast to those, whom the heathen call gods, as may be seen by the precedent in Ps. 86; 8, 9; “Among the gods there is none like to thee, O Lord, . . . all heathen whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, and give glory to thy name.”—This first reason corresponds to the first exclamation; and there is point in the term divine, when that exclamation is regarded as being uttered in reference to Christ.

1016. All the nations (i.e. the heathen), in the second reason, indicates a correspondence in it to the second exclamation, in which occurs, Thou king of the nations. At the time of writing, the reigning head of the beast had “power over every tribe . . . and nation” (13; 7). Some copies have all [sc. men].—Shall come and worship thee. The change to the future in this instance, while the present or the past is ordinarily used, is not without significance. It indicates, that such will be the ultimate, though not the near result; for, that it is not meant, that it would be the immediate result, appears from what follows in C. 16; 19, 20, 21, where it is declared, that ‘men repented not to give God glory,’ but ‘blasphemed God’ to the last. We must therefore understand, that the general worshipping is predicated in reference to the more distant future. That the prospect of the heathen being ultimately brought to worship their Lord was a cogent reason for Christians glorifying Him is self-evident.

1017. Because thy righteous appointments have been made manifest. Righteous appointments, judgments, or acts (cp. 19; 8) has appeared to me to be the best rendering of the Greek word, which is not the same, nor precisely identical in meaning, with that rendered righteousness in C. 19; 11.—The righteous actings being in this instance of a fear-inspiring character, there is in this third reason a correspondence to the, Who would not fear thee, of the third exclamation. The manifestation of God’s righteous judgments is well calculated to induce the righteous to glorify Him.

(4). The egress of the seven angels. XV; 5–6. 1018–24. And after these things I beheld, and the temple of the tabernacle of the testimony in the heaven was opened. And the seven angels who have the seven plagues came forth out of the temple, wearing a pure bright stone, and girt about the breasts with golden girdles.
1018. *After these things.* I have shown (see on 285), that this is a technical formula, used in four places to indicate a wider break than ordinary. This, indeed, sufficiently appears from the mere circumstance, that, the principle on which the Vision proceeds being one of general consecutiveness, there could be no occasion to notify sequence only here and there; and consequently some other object must have been had in view in the introduction of this expression. Hengstenberg says; "The expression indicates, that here the main scene begins, and that what went before has only the character of an introduction." But I apprehend, that the object in using the phrase here has rather been to mark a wide distinction between the state of felicity and glory, in which the victors on the sea of glass are placed, and the state of misery consequent on the action of the angels of the plagues.

1019–20. *And.* The R. T. inserts here *to.*—*The temple.* Here as elsewhere it is the sanctuary, the holy house, that is spoken of.—*Of the tabernacle of the testimony.* Cp. Acts 7: 43–48; 'The tabernacle of Moloch. ... The tabernacle of the testimony was among our fathers in the wilderness, ... David sought to find a dwelling-place for the God of Jacob; but Solomon built Him a house.'—The Greek word for *testimony* occurs in the Apocalypse only in this place; and, as a nearly related word, which occurs frequently, and which I have rendered by *testifying,* is in the A. V. translated *testimony* without distinction, it is the more necessary to call attention to the exact meaning of the two words. The term used here denotes the thing testified or the testimony given, but the other the act of testifying, and (in its Apocalyptic use) a testifying to the truth under persecution. (See on Nos. 6, 708.) The *tabernacle* of this testimony must be the place, in which the record of the evidence given is deposited, just as the ark was the depository of the tables of the covenant. And there is clearly a correspondence between the *tabernacle of the testimony* here, and the *ark of the covenant* in C. 11; 19. But why, we naturally ask, has the phrase been varied? We may reasonably expect to find an answer to the question in the differences between the significations of the contrasted terms; and certainly, if we cannot derive the true one from these, we are likely to seek it in vain. These lead us to suppose, that what is had in view here is, not a religious *covenant,* but a *testimony* given to the truth under persecution; and that, as the place of deposit is not one of permanency and concealment from view (such as an *ark* or chest would be), but one of temporary and easily accessible character (such as a *tabernacle* or tent is), so the thing contemplated is not one that involves secrecy and duration. That the symbolization of this *tabernacle* differs widely from that of the *ark* further appears from the circumstance, that this is not, like that, said to be
exposed to view.—The temple of the tabernacle of the testimony in the heaven, then, will denote the heavenly temple, wherein is kept in a safe place of deposit, ready to be produced at the approaching “hour of judging,” the testimony which the saints of God have given to the truth for His name’s sake.—The opening of a temple, designated as this is, in order to afford egress to avenging angels, will signify, that these are sent forth on a mission on behalf of this testimony, that is, to take vengeance on those, who have persecuted the testifiers of it.

XV; 6. 1021–2. And the seven angels, &c. The seven trumpet-angels are distinguished as ‘those, who are wont to stand in the presence of God’; these as ‘those, who have the seven plagues.’ The former appear to have issued from the temple in the heaven, and their mission was generally to inflict judgments from God: these come forth out of the temple in the heaven, and their duty is specially to accomplish God’s wrath by inflicting the last plagues. The judgments of the former include and culminate in those of the latter.

1023. Wearing. Being clothed with is the more common expression in the Apocalypse: see on 56, 299. Possibly being clothed may signify investiture by another party, and wearing self-investiture.—A pure bright stone. Doubtless we are here to conceive of a brilliant diamond: cp. Da. 10; 6. The extraordinary nature of the clothing makes nothing against this being the true reading; for we have parallels to it in ‘the woman clothed with the sun,’ and in ‘the angel standing in the sun.’ It suffices, that this is the reading of the most ancient MSS. (A and C), and of some of the versions. To which may be added the consideration, that the apparent improbability of such a reading may well account for the change of stone into linen, more especially as the alteration would be made in the Greek by changing one letter only. The reading makes however, so far as I can perceive, no difference in the real signification; inasmuch as under either an appearance of dazzling brilliancy, denoting a glorious and heavenly righteousness, must be signified. Cp. C. 4; 3: 21; 11, 19. As in C. 19; 8, so here ‘the righteous deeds’ (ve. 4) of the angels (in this instance, in inflicting judgments), and thus of the Lord Jesus, the great Judge, are denoted.

1024. And girt about the breasts, &c. In like manner the ‘son of man’ in C. 1; 13 was girt, but apparently with a broader girdle reaching up to “the paps;” see on 57. In both instances ‘the girdle of truth’ is probably meant.—The result in respect of the vestment and girdle of these angels is, that by them they are represented as coming forth to vindicate and make manifest ‘the righteousness of the ways’ of that God, “to whom vengeance belongeth;” and to show forth His ‘truth’ in the fulfilment alike of His threats and of His promises. The apparel of the angels is thus in keeping with the
words of the song, which accompanied their appearance ("Righteous and true are thy ways:" ve. 3), and with the utterances, which accompanied their acts ("Righteous art Thou." "True and righteous are thy judgments: 16; 5, 7). Some commentators have supposed, because the dress of these angels in some respects corresponds to that of the Jewish priests, that they are represented as bearing a priestly character. But, if their dress does so correspond in some respects, it does not in others; and hence there is no sufficient ground for attributing to them such a character.

(5. The giving of the bowls. XV; 7. 1025-28. And one of the four living-creatures gave to the seven angels seven golden libation-bowls, filled with the wrath of that God, who liveth unto the ages of ages.

1025. One of the four creatures. I can see no propriety in Hengstenberg's explanation, namely, that "the cherubim act here, as the representatives of the living creatures of the earth, on which the judgments of God are to alight (16; 1);" for with what propriety could they be represented, as giving a commission to inflict judgments on themselves? True, the zōa as a whole symbolize the creature in general. But then it is not the zōa, but one of the zōa, that is brought to view as acting here. And most probably it is intended, that we should conceive of the first of the zōa (the one "like a lion," the lion of Judah), as coming forward in symbolization of the act of him, who, while being "the first-born of every creature" and "the beginning of the creation of God," is also "the lion of the tribe of Judah" (5; 5), and who was before symbolized (10; 3), as announcing the judgments to be inflicted by these angels in a voice "like to the roaring of a lion." On this view, the Lord Jesus, having exchanged the character of a lamb for that of a lion, and acting in vindication of his people, will be represented as giving the angels their commission.

1026. Seven golden libation-bowls. The shape of the vessel intended was that of a shallow basin or bowl-like dish—of a saucer rather than a vial. Such bowls were used in the temple-service to hold the aromatic incense, which was offered on the golden altar by means of coals, taken from the brazen altar. But the outpouring from them in this instance requires, that we should look upon these rather in the light of patera or bowls for libations, such as were used in making offerings to appease the manes (Virg. Æn. 3; 67). These would carry with them a symbolical significance, very appropriate to this passage. For they would imply, that the judgments poured out of them as it were came (as the judgments here symbolized are elsewhere, e. g. in C. 16; 6, represented to have come) in retribution of injuries inflicted on the saints of God, and in answer to their cries for vengeance. Cp. 6; 10, where, as in this passage, the Lord is called
upon the ground of his being “holy and true.”—The idea suggested by libation-bowls calls to mind the words of the Lord; “Hear what the unjust judge saith. And shall not God avenge His own elect, which cry day and night unto Him, though He bear long with them? Yea, I say unto you, He shall avenge them speedily.”—That the bowls are of gold cannot of course have reference to those, on whom their contents are poured; but must look back to those who pour from them, or to him who gives them (which comes to the same thing; for Jesus will be signified in either case). The purity, preciousness, and splendour of the gold denote the unsullied character of his righteousness, even in the energetic manifestation of his wrath.—The number seven has unquestionably been determined by that of the angels; but we must not omit to notice, that the repetition of the word carries with it the idea of completeness.

1027. Filled with, &c. Cp. 14: 10: 17: 4: 18; 3, 6: and with the φιλᾶξ χρυσός γεμομένως τοῦ θυμοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ &c. the φιλᾶξ χρυσός γεμομένως θυματίου (which are the prayers of the saints) of C. 5: 8. The last-mentioned bowls called forth the former.

1028. Who liveth, &c. This addition may have been inserted here to imply, that God’s wrath, like His favour, is endless in its effects.—Perhaps the occurrence of the word ἄγοι in this place may have led to the various reading, God of the ἄγοι, in 1012.—Hengstenberg remarks; “That God liveth for ever (see on the expression at 1: 18: 4; 9, 10: 10; 6) was given even in De. 32: 40–43 as a pledge, that he would ‘avenge the blood of His servants, and render vengeance to His adversaries.’ In Heb. 10: 31 it is represented as a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God. With God’s eternity his omnipotence is inseparably bound up. To the wrath of the Eternal here corresponds the wrath of the Almighty in C. 19: 15. How dreadful the wrath of the eternal and almighty One in comparison of the wrath of impotent mortals!”

(6). Access to the temple debarred. XV: 8. 1029–32. And the temple was filled with smoke from the glory of God and from His might: and none could enter into the temple, until the seven plagues of the seven angels should be brought to an end.

1029. The temple was filled. We should probably understand, that in strictness the outer apartment or Holy place is meant here by the temple, the inner or Holy of Holies being the depository of, or tabernacle of the testimony,” which the saints had given, and in vindication of which the smoke of Divine wrath now fills the temple.—With smoke. In old times the tabernacle had been filled with smoke, when consecrated by Moses (Ex. 40: 34), and the temple, when dedicated by Solomon (1 Kgs. 8: 10). In all three instances Jehovah’s taking possession is symbolized. But, in the two precedents the
smoke is to be conceived of, as proceeding from or being occasioned by "the incenses," which wafted to heaven the prayers of His saints for grace and mercy to themselves: while in the present case it proceeds from those, which rendered acceptable their prayers for retribution on their persecutors. In the former instances the Lord took possession with a view to the exercise of grace and mercy; but in this of retributive vengeance.—The figurative use of smoke (when it is conceived of as black, sulphureous, and stifling; see on 576) to signify wrath, punishment, destruction, may be exemplified from various sources. Ex. 19; 18; "M. Sinai was altogether on a smoke; because the Lord descended upon it in fire" (cp. He. 12; 18 ss.). 'The whole manifestation on the giving of the Law was an angry one. It called aloud to Israel, that their God was a consuming fire, and that none could escape, who should set at nought His commandments.' Is. 6; 4; "and the house was full of smoke." The manifestation here also was a wrathful one. Is. 14; 11; "From the north cometh a smoke," meaning a destroying army. De. 29; 20; "The anger of the Lord shall smoke against that man." 2 Sa. 22; 9; "A smoke went up out of His nostrils." See also C. 9; 2, 17: 14; 11, and the remarks thereon. Heathen writers would also furnish many examples; e.g. Virgil: Geor. 1. 3; 86: Æn. 7; 76; 81: Theoer. Idyl. 1; 18: Persius, Sat. 5; 91: Plaut. Amphitr. Act 4: Martial, l. 6; cp. 64: Pindar, Nem. Od. 1. In particular, the Oneirocritics interpret a house filled with smoke to mean punishment from a supreme power.

1030. From (or out of) the glory of God, and from (or out of) His might. These terms correspond to the fire which causes the smoke to rise, as the wrath does to the smoke. Hence, it is virtually said, that God's wrath was occasioned by His glory and His might, that is, it was called forth by and manifested in vindication of these. And this is the mode of representation constantly found in the precedents, as the following examples will show. Nu. 14; 21 ss.; 'As truly as I live, all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord. Because those men which have seen my glory ... have tempted me, ... they shall not see the land, &c.' Nu. 16; 19; 'Korah gathered all the congregation against them unto the door of the tabernacle; and the glory of the Lord appeared,' as the prelude to the destruction of Korah and all his company. 'In Ha. 2; 14; "for the earth is full of the knowledge of the glory of the Lord," the glory of the Lord is an angry one, manifesting itself in judgments.' Here, for the justification of God's servants in saying; 'Who will not fear Thy power, and yield the palm of glory to Thy name?' it was necessary, that the Lord's surpassing power and glory should be manifested by the subjugation and punishment of the heathen, who had placed themselves in antagonism to Him and His people.
1031. And none could enter into the temple, that is, to approach the golden altar to make intercession. This was; because, the temple being filled with the wrath of God, there was no room for mercy, and none could endure the atmosphere that prevailed in it. The same representation is found in the fundamental passages. In Ex. 40; 34, 35; ‘The cloud covered the tent, and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle. And Moses was not able to enter into the tent; because the cloud abode thereon, and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle.’ And in 1 Kgs. 8; 10, 11; ‘When the priests were come out of the holy place, the cloud filled the house of the Lord; so that the priests could not stand to minister, because of the cloud. For the glory of the Lord filled the house of the Lord.’—It should be observed, that the expression in the Greek is not (as rendered in the A. V.) “no man.” It is unrestricted, and capable of application to all created beings; though here it would most naturally be understood to have in view the inhabitants of the heaven, since in it the temple was situated. The intention appears to have been to convey, that none of the heavenly hosts, no, not even He whose office it was to make intercession, could so much as approach the temple for that purpose. In the syllabus of the seventh seal, 8; 2–5 (the seventh trumpet of which we are now considering), it was symbolized, that there would come under that seal a time when, in answer to the prayers of the saints invoking retribution on their persecutors, intercession should cease. The realization of that, which was there summarily and distantly announced, is here directly exhibited. It is symbolized, that intercession has been rendered impossible; and hence the door of mercy is closed, and all hope of escaping the dire vengeance of the Lord is gone. The fiat has gone forth, that ‘there shall no longer be delay:’ and the angelic messenger of the covenant (cp. 10; 1, 6), who had hitherto been pleading for delay (“Let it alone this year also”), is now converted from an intercessor into an avenging judge. Pertinently has it been remarked; ‘So long as Israel was the people of the Lord, the pillar of the cloud exclaimed to all his enemies; “Touch not mine anointed, and do my prophets no harm.” So here: that the temple is full of smoke, and no one is able to go into it, this is a “sign for believers, that the Lord in love to them was now going to complete the destruction of their enemies:” Zullig.’

1032. Until the seven plagues of the seven angels. The insertion of the seven twice has probably been intended to denote the fulness and completeness of the destructive effects of the last plagues.—Should be ended. See on 683 and 1003. Cp. also 1185, where there is a parallel and synchronistic reference to the same occurrences: ‘The ten horns shall give their sovereign authority to the beast, until the words of God shall have been brought to an end by their accomplishment.'
(7). Mandate to the angels. XVI; 1. 1033–6. And I heard a loud voice out of the temple saying to the seven angels; ‘Go and pour out the seven bowls of the wrath of God into the earth.’

1033–4. Out of the temple. That is, from Him who had taken possession of the temple as “a consuming fire,” and who, in the fulness of His wrath, now issues His mandate in vindication of the testimony, laid up in ‘the tabernacle’ of the temple.—The procession of the voice from the temple, and also the propriety of preserving a uniformity in the introduction of the first bowl with those of the six which follow it, show, that this verse was intended to form part of the prelude, and not to belong (as the A. V. makes it appear) to the scene itself.—The voice may be said to have come ‘from the temple in the heaven,’ instead of directly ‘from God,’ in order to carry with it the idea, that the voice speaks on behalf of Christianity. Note, that the same voice which here gives the command to pour out from the bowls, in ve. 17, when they have been poured out, announces the consummation, saying; ‘It is done.’—In Eze. 9; 1, cpd. with C. 7; 8, is a precedent, in which the Lord cries “with a loud voice,” saying; ‘Cause them, that have charge over the city (Jerusalem) to draw near, every one with his destroying weapon in his hand;’ and then He goes on to declare, that He will ‘shortly pour out His fury, and accomplish His anger upon her.’

1035. Pour out, &c. Hengstenberg remarks; “The symbol of the vials rests on the passages of the Old Testament, which speak of the pouring out of the wrath of God. The pouring out has respect to the copiousness of the manifestations of God’s wrath. The vials serve the same purpose. They are regarded as vessels, from which it may be copiously poured out.” The fundamental passages are the following. Zeph. 3; 8; ‘That I may pour out upon the heathen mine indignation, all my fierce anger.’ Ps. 69; 6; ‘Pour out thy wrath upon the heathen, that have not known thee, &c.’ Je. 10; 25; ‘Pour out thy fury upon the heathen, that know thee not, &c.’ “The connexion in the last passage shows, that by the heathen are not meant heathen nations generally, but those which had acted hostilely toward the Lord’s people.” The expression pour out in Ps. 69; 6 points back to ve. 3, “have shed their blood round about Jerusalem.”—We may notice here, that the Targum of Jonathan gives the phrases in Is. 51; 17; 22, thus; “the vials of the cup of malediction” and “the vials of the cup of my indignation.”

1036. On the earth. Inasmuch as we subsequently find, that the bowls were poured out on ‘the earth,’ ‘the sea,’ ‘the rivers,’ &c., it is manifest, that the term earth is used here in its most comprehensive sense, as denoting the whole of the symbolical world: while in ve. 2, seeing that it stands contrasted with ‘the sea,’ &c., it must be taken.
in its more limited and proper sense, as meaning the land in contradistinction to the waters. Hengstenberg has recognized this in saying; "There must be an earth upon the earth, which was set off as a special region for the first vial."

THE HEPTAD OF THE PLAGUE-ANGELS.

Under 1002 I have shown the propriety of the designation, which I have given to this heptad.

A decided parallelism may be traced between the seven trumpets and the seven bowls. In the first four of each the same symbolical objects are affected, and in the same order. In the fifth of each the effects, as symbolized, are substantially identical. In the sixth of each the Euphrates, and a great battle thence arising, are brought to view. In the syllabus of the seventh trumpet (11; 18-19) and in the seventh bowl the same great catastrophe is symbolized: in the former anticipatively and as it were from a distance; in the latter directly and immediately. It is natural to ask; Why has this parallelism been made, and what inference may be drawn from it? We might infer with as much reason as in the case of similar parallelisms (but in truth with no reason at all: see Vol. I: p. 52), that there is an identity in the things signified: yet I am not aware, that the generality of those, who have commonly converted parallelisms into identities, have consistently carried out the principle in this instance. But, be this as it may, I cannot doubt, that the parallelisms have been made merely with a view to produce correspondencies between the symbolical tableaux, and that they do not extend beyond the Visional symbolism, or, at any rate, that identity in the things signified can no more be inferred merely from them, than it could be between the plagues symbolized by the bowls and the Egyptian plagues, because parallelisms are found to exist between these. And this leads me to observe, that more stress has commonly been laid on the last-named parallelisms, than ought to have been. In the first, second, and fifth bowls the sixth, first, and ninth Egyptian plagues respectively appear to have been had in view as precedents, but, I believe, as nothing more: and strange is it, that interpreters (e.g. Bengel) should be found, who take all these plagues literally, on the ground that those of Egypt are to be taken 'in a literal way.' (We may note by the way, that the Rabbins have a saying, that, 'whatever plagues God inflicted on the Egyptians in former times, he will inflict on the enemies of His people in all later times.')—I may here suitably advert more particularly (see on 545) to the question of the chronological relation of these plagues to one another; since the parallelism, which has just been noticed, of the first four with the first four trumpets will, in some measure, afford a guide to the solu-
tion of the question. It is quite incredible, that a series of four disastrous occurrences, producing substantially the same effects, should happen twice to the same four objects in the same order. Hence we are driven to conclude, that the order of time has not been observed either in one or in both instances. It will suffice to assume, that it has not in one of the instances. And the most probable view will be, that in the earlier the order of occurrence, or at least of the commencement of the events, has governed that of the symbolical representation, and that in the later (inasmuch as the time occupied by the events was so limited as not to necessitate, or even to admit of the observance of chronological order) the order of the preceding series has for the sake of the parallelism been followed, at least in respect of the first four plagues. The last three may stand on a different footing. They probably represent events later than the others, and partially in chronological order inter se. Thus, the first four may relate in general to the period of the Jewish war, and the last three more immediately to the later portion of that period and the sequel thereof.


XVI; 2. 1037-42. And the first went forth, and poured out his bowl into the earth. And there came a bad and painful boil upon the men, who have the mark of the wild-beast, and who worship his image.

1037. The first. In the trumpets the word angel is repeated in each instance. Not so in the bowls; for the various readings, which introduce the word in some of them, are to be rejected. Bengel has remarked on the omission; "The vials make short work."

1039. Into, and not upon, as the R. T. and Griesbach read. In the first three bowls the word used is equivalent to into or unto: in the last four to upon.—The earth must mean here, as in the parallel instance in the trumpets, and as shown on 1036, Judea. The parallel proclamation of the first angel in C. 14; 6 was addressed specially to 'those seated on the earth.'

1040. There came a bad and painful boil. Cp. Ex. 9; 10, where the prototype of this symbol occurs in the sixth Egyptian plague; in the LXX. of which text the Greek word is the same, that is used here. The boil or 'botch of Egypt' has doubtless been adopted as a symbol here, with the view to denote an affliction of the most grievous character; for in this light 'the sore of Egypt' is represented in De. Ca. 27–28. But whether any special calamity, or only grievous affliction in general, is had in view here cannot be determined. The character of the plague can be ascertained only by determining, who were the parties on whom it was inflicted, and what were their cir-
cumstances.—Boils or sores are mentioned again under the fifth bowl, ve. 11, which, and Luke 16; 21 (‘The dogs licked his sores’), are the only other places, where the word occurs in the New Testament.

1041–2. Upon the men who have the mark . . ., and who worship, &c. For upon the R. T. and Griesbach have unto.—The twofold description is intended to indicate, I conceive, that both those who yielded servile submission to the Roman beast in the person of Nero, and those who submitted to the demands of the new dynasty set up by Vespasian, should alike be affected by this plague.

At the commencement of the Jewish troubles, there was a considerable party among the Jews (at the head of whom was Herod Agrippa), who counselled submission to the Roman power, and exerted all their influence to induce the Jews to comply with the commands of the emperor; and that, too, at a time, when the idolatrous compliances demanded of them, and the tyrannies of the Procurators fully justified resistance: see on 880, 894, 900. Indeed, even as early as the time of Archelaus, there was a large party in favour of the adoption of republican institutions, and the direct government of the Romans. This appears from what the fifty Jewish ambassadors, who waited on Augustus, accompanied by 8000 of the Jews who dwelt at Rome, said. “The main thing,” they stated, “that they desired was this: That they might be delivered from kingly and the like forms of government, and might be added to Syria, and be put under the authority of such Presidents as should be sent to them; for that it would thereby be made evident, whether they were really a seditious people, or would live in an orderly manner, if they might have governors of any sort of moderation set over them” (Ant. XVII: xi; 3).

Agrippa’s party, when the Romans had been temporarily driven out of the country, naturally became objects of suspicion to the insurgents, and were subjected to confiscations, indignities, and persecutions, and in some instances to imprisonment and death.—The quotations which have already been made from Josephus will serve to illustrate this plague.

If we compare this bowl with the first trumpet, we shall find marks of essential difference existing between them: in fact, the only point of correspondence is in the same object, the earth, i. e., the dry land of the symbolical world, being affected in both. Under the trumpet the result of the blast was, that ‘there came hail, fire, and blood,’ which ‘burnt up a third of the earth and of the trees, and all grass:’ while the outpourings of the bowl occasioned a boil on the worshippers of the beast. The same remark will be found applicable, in a greater or less degree, on a comparison of all the trumpets and bowls.
The angels of the last plagues.


XVI; 3. 1043–46. And the second poured out his bowl into the sea. And it became blood, as a dead [man's blood]: and every living soul of things in the sea died.

1043–4. The sea I of course take, here as elsewhere, to denote the territory of the world-power, that is, in this instance, of Rome: see on 860.—Observe, that the parallel proclamation of the second angel, 14; 8, had in like manner reference to the Roman commonwealth: as also the blast of the second trumpet; cp. 8; 8–9.

1045. It became blood, as a corpse's. In like manner in the precedent of the first Egyptian plague, Ex. 7; 20; "All the water that was in the Nile was changed into blood, and the fish that were in the Nile died." But under the second trumpet only 'a third of the sea became blood' (and that, not "as of one dead"), and 'a third of the living creatures &c. perished.' The symbolization here obviously indicates calamity of the same kind, that was symbolized under the second trumpet, though greater in degree.—The becoming, not merely blood, but black blood, evidently denotes a very disorganized state of the body politic. It appropriately symbolizes the ill effects, which Nero's maladministration and atrocious proceedings, and the civil war which ensued on his death, produced, in disorganizing the national and social institutions of the state.

1046. Every living soul, &c. Scholz rejects living.—Hengstenberg remarks; "According to the fundamental passage, Ex. 7; 20; 'which [were] in the Nile,' the well-supported reading τα ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ is to be preferred, not all living creatures died in the sea, but all living creatures in the sea died." So far, however, is this reading from being 'well-supported,' that I do not find it mentioned in critical editions, as existing in any ancient MS. Still the sense contended for must from the nature of the case be conceded. Cp. and see on the phrase in C. 8; 9, which differs from this.

The events of the time, to which I refer this symbolization, will accord well with it. In respect of Nero's reign, besides his having been the murderer of the heir to the throne, of his own mother, and of two wives in succession, he is said to have ordered Rome to be set on fire; and thus to have occasioned the destruction of a great part of the metropolis. In reference to that part of his reign, which I suppose to be more immediately referred to in this symbolization, it has been said, that "it was a catalogue of crimes. Virtue in any form was the object of Nero's fear and hatred; and almost every month was marked by the execution or banishment of some distinguished man." The atrocities perpetrated by Nero, however, and the evils he brought on Rome are so well known, that it is unneces-
sary for me to dilate on them. Nor is there more occasion for me to
dwell on the miseries, which the civil wars that ensued on his death
entailed on the Roman territory. The fact of four emperors having
been set up by the legions within two years speaks volumes. Intern-
ally and externally the body politic was in a corrupt and disorganized
state, and multitudes of lives were sacrificed in consequence.

DIV. 3. THE PLAGUE FROM THE THIRD ANGEL'S BOWL. On the waters—

Roman dependencies. A.D. 67–70.

XVI; 4. 1047–50. And the third poured out his bowl into the rivers,
and into the fountains of the waters. And they became blood.

1047–49. The rivers, &c. As shown in Vol. I: p. 11 and on No. 558,
these symbolize the tributary and dependent states of the world-power;
in this instance, the outlying provinces of Rome: cp. 17; 15, and see
on 946.—The parallel proclamation of the third angel, 14; 9–11, was
universal in comprehensiveness; and hence would include the Roman
territories in their widest extent.—Observe, that, under the third
trumpet, the star fell only on 'the third of the rivers, and on the
fountains of the waters.'

1050. They became blood. Cp. 11; 6; "They (the two witnesses)
have power over the waters to turn them into blood."—Under the
third trumpet, "the third of the waters became wormwood, and many
men died of the waters." The latter effect is not mentioned here,
probably in part because the becoming blood sufficiently implied it,
and in part because it is for substance indicated in the interlude which
follows.—It will be observed, that the plague of this bowl is the same
in kind as that of the second, but not so severe in degree, and its
actually realized effect is left undetermined. We may conclude, that
a calamity of the same description is symbolized under both bowls;
but that the plague which came upon the rivers and fountains was
less severe and comprehensive, than that which fell upon the sea.
The facts will be found to accord accurately herewith; for the out-
lying territories of Rome suffered less under Nero and 'the three
rebels' than Rome-proper.

INTERLUDE, having reference to the second and third bowls.

XVI; 5–7. 1051–60. (And I heard the angel of the waters saying;
'Righteous art thou, the 'who is and who was,' the divine [One]; because
thou hast judged thus; because they have poured out blood of saints and
of prophets, and thou hast given them blood to drink: they are worthy.'
And I heard the altar saying; 'Yea, O Lord! the almighty God, true
and righteous are thy judgings.')

The introduction of the angel of the waters, and also the reference
to the giving of blood show, that this interlude relates to the second
equally as to the third bowl; for the term waters includes the seas as well as the rivers, &c., and in both bowls the symbol of the plague is blood.—This interlude divides the heptad into the triad and quartad. The preceding heptad was similarly divided; while those of the seals, the trumpets, and the two first of these lines of crisis (Cs. 12–13) were divided into the quartad and triad.—The striking similarities of expression between this interlude, and the song of the victors on the sea of glass (15; 3, 4), indicate an allusion—in the one to the other; and indeed it plainly appears, that the purport of this interlude is the avenging of those martyred victors. This confirms the view, that that song is part of a prelude to the series under consideration.

1051. The angel of the waters. The words of the waters were wanting in the text followed by Luther; but there does not appear to be any MS. authority for omitting them.—No doubt the angel, who according to the spiritual cosmography of the ancients presided over the element of water, is the symbolic angel here. Cp. John 5; 5: Re. 7; 1: 9; 14: 14; 18. He is probably introduced in this place for greater effect; since, when the angel, who might have been expected to stand up in defence of his especial charge, is poetically represented as coming forward to admit, that they (“the peoples, &c.” 17; 15) were utterly indefensible, and to proclaim the righteousness of the Lord’s acts, almost in the same terms that their victims had done, the atrocity and unjustifiableness of their conduct is symbolized in the most effective manner.


1053. The who is and who was. Cp. and see on 32, 71, 316, and 766.—Some editions add and who will be. But MS. authority is wanting for the addition; and probably it has been made by some undiscerning editor, in order to produce uniformity with the similar formulae in the places above referred to.—The divine [One]. The text followed by Luther improperly inserted and before this clause, thus making it a part of the formula. The word, which I have rendered by divine, occurs only here and in the prelude, thus affording a strong mark of parallelism: see on 1015.

1054. Because thou hast thus judged, that is, because thou hast visited them with these judgments. This is parallel to the clause (1017) in the prelude, “because thy righteous judgments have been manifested.” The judicial rule laid down of old, according to which God appears as righteous in these judgments, was; “Whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed.” Ge. 9; 6.—Stuart puts a full stop after judged, and connects holy or divine with the clause that follows it.—It may be observed, that thou and they alternate in Nos. 1054, 5, 6, and 7; and hence it may be suspected, that
a transposition of these clauses has been made by some accident, or at any rate that they were designed to have an alternating connexion; since they would read more naturally thus: 'Righteous art thou... because thou hast judged thus, and hast given them blood to drink. Because they have poured out the blood of saints, they are deserving' of having blood given to them. Or, again, a transposition may be made in the way paraphrastically exhibited thus. 'Thou art shown to be righteous, and the glory is justly attributed to thee; because thou hast thus inflicted judgments. Thou art proved to be the alone divine One, and hast vindicated the supremacy of thy power; because thou hast given blood to drink to those who thirsted for blood. On the other hand, they are deserving of the plagues, with which they have been visited.'—That Jesus is spoken of I cannot doubt: see on 31.

XVI; 6. 1055. Because they have poured out saints' and prophets' blood. The word and is marked by Griesbach as omitted by some, but in his judgment to be retained. Its omission would convert the clause into the holy prophets' blood.—Prophets is to be taken here in the sense, which it invariably has in this book, viz., of inspired teachers of Christianity; seen on 698. In this sense it will of course include the apostles: Cp. 1 Co. 14; 3 ss.—Saints may have specially in view Jewish converts.—Cp. 18; 20, 24; 'In her (Babylon) was found the blood of prophets, and saints,' &c. This text tends to confirm my remark, that the interlude before us has reference as much to the second as to the third bowl; since in the former Rome-proper is the subject.—See also in the syllabus of the trumpet, 11; 18; 'to give the reward to the prophets and to the saints.'

1056. And blood hath thou given them to drink. Cp. Is. 49; 26; 'I will feed them that oppress thee with their own flesh, and they shall be drunken with their own blood.'—Very pertinent is Bengel's remark here; 'People fill themselves with the blood of which they are greedy, chiefly in civil wars, in which each seems to drink the blood of his fellow-citizens.'—See on 1050.

1057. They are worthy. The for which precedes this clause in the R. T. is rejected in critical editions. We certainly might have expected a third because in this place; and probably the apparent want of some such particle has led to the insertion of the word for. The precedent in the analogous passage (15; 4) in the prelude, too, would seem to strengthen the expectation; since, by the insertion of because here, that word would be, as there, three times repeated. But a closer inspection of the passage will show, that there is here a corresponding twofold, and not a threefold parallelism. As there are here only two bases, the arrangement can only be one of those exhibited under 1053.

XVI; 7. 1058. I heard the altar say. The R. T. has another (int.
The angels of the last plagues.

angel) out of the altar. And even those commentators, who rightly reject this reading as being destitute of all MSS. authority, yet assume an ellipsis of some kind. Thus, Stuart says; “Angel or him of the altar must of course be implied.” And Bengel asserts; “As in the fifth seal the souls under the altar cried with a loud voice, so without doubt it is they, who here make themselves to be heard, having found after the shedding of their blood a resting-place under the altar; and hence it is, as if the altar itself spoke.” But if the author had intended either of these meanings, he might easily have expressed it. And as he has not done so, we are bound to take that sense, which his words grammatically and plainly convey. I quite agree with Hengstenberg, that the various reading and these glosses “have had no better origin than exegetical incompetence.” And even if I did not entertain this opinion, and felt at liberty to suppose that an angel was intended, I should not adopt the above solution, but should rather think, that the angel, who was introduced in the prelude of this seal (8:5) as standing on the altar, was meant. As, however, it is the altar that is said to speak, we must understand the altar to be meant. And there is no more difficulty in this, than there is in many other similar instances: see, e.g. 9:13; 10:3. On the contrary, there is a remarkable force and propriety in the symbolization, which is wholly lost in the above interpretations. “The altar” must be the altar of atonement,—that from which the martyred souls of the fifth seal had cried for vengeance, and from which in the parallel series, 14:18, the angel who presided over the fire came forth to demand the execution of vengeance on the Lord’s enemies (see on 9:8). The speaking of this altar, then, in words of approval must signify, that, not only is the only means of reconciliation with the great Judge taken away, but that it is even converted into an assessor in judgment approving the condemnation. This is a very forcible mode of signifying the certainty and justice of the retribution. Gen. 4:10; “Thy brother’s blood crieth from the ground,” may have been a suggestive precedent.

1059. Yea, O Lord, &c. That Jesus is addressed see on 31.—‘The yea,’ as Hengstenberg says, ‘does not contain “a perfectly cordial response toward God in all that He wills, and does, and says;” but it expresses agreement with the preceding speech of the angel of the waters.’

1060. True, &c. This is an echo of the words in the prelude, 15:3, and there is a similar repetition in the prelude to the seventh series, 19:2. See on 944, 1012.

XVI; 8-9. 1061-67. And the fourth poured out his bowl upon the sun. And it was given to it to scorch the men by fire. And the men were scorched with a great scorching. And they blasphemed the name of God, who hath power over these plagues: and they repented not to give him glory.

1061-2. On the sun, that is, the supreme power, the reigning sovereign; see on 566. In this instance Nero must be meant, and perhaps his immediate successors may also be included.—Under the corresponding trumpet a third of the sun, moon, and stars was obscured.

1063. And it was given. The occurrence of this phrase in certain places only is somewhat peculiar: cp. 9; 3ss.: 13; 5, 7, 15.—To it, the sun. The Greek pronoun admits of being rendered either to him or to it. Bengel, Hengstenberg, and Stuart adopt the former rendering. But the first two understand the angel to be meant; while Stuart still refers the pronoun (as he rightly may) to the sun. I cannot doubt, that this is the reference intended, not only because it is the most natural construction, but also and chiefly because the scorching plainly indicates the sun’s action,—because there would be no propriety in the sun’s being introduced, if it were not referred to here,—and because in no other instance does the plague ensue by the direct action of the angel, but only through the instrumentality of the thing smitten. Hengstenberg after all by his interpretation brings it round to this.—As some erroneous interpretations are subverted by the fact, it is important to note, that the sun is not the sufferer, but the instrument which causes the suffering. No change whatever in the sun, nor any injurious effect upon it, similar to those on the sea and on the rivers (or, more strictly speaking, on their contents) is indicated. The territorial terms were manifestly used in the first three bowls to indicate the scene of the plagues, as distributed over the different localities, into which the symbolical world is divided. But now the sun is used to show the source or cause of the plagues, that is, the secondary cause, or instrument in the hand of the Lord.—To scorch, wither, or burn up by fire. Cp. the terms used in C. 14; 15, 18.

—The sun, in respect of the beneficial heat and light which proceeds from it, would be an emblem of blessings bestowed; but, in respect of its power to wither, distress, and destroy all living things, it is a symbol of the most dire infictions. Cp. Is. 49; 10: Je. 17; 8: 1 Pe. 4; 12: Re. 7; 16.—The men. Not men in general (see on 563, 585, 593, 640, 939), but a particular class of men,—those, namely, who ‘worshipped the beast, &c.,’ as appears from what precedes (ve. 2), and from what follows.—By fire. Symbolic fire denotes, as I have shown on 548, a severe but undefined means of annoyance or destruc-
tion. It has clearly been introduced here for congruity with the
source of the plague.

XVI; 9. 1064. And the men were scorched with a great scorching.
"Scorching heat," says Wemyss, "signifies persecution or destruction."
The threefold repetition of the term is doubtless intended to give force.
The disastrous effects on both Jews and heathens of Nero's tyrannical
conduct must be chiefly had in view. Bengel, however, takes the
sun's scorching literally, as productive of "excessive heats, drought,
and at length famine:"—another instance, showing how false systems
of interpretation will not fail to expose their true character by their
inability to maintain a consistent principle of interpretation.

1065. And they blasphemed. The preceding clause stands related
to this as cause to effect, that is, the two should be read as though
written; because they were scorched, they blasphemed. And it was
the object of the scorching to make them thus blaspheme. The sun,
as being a symbol of Nero, is an equivalent for the beast. And, as the
beast both bore "the names of blasphemy," and "blasphemed the
name of God" himself (13; 1, 6), so it was his object to make his
worshippers blaspheme it likewise.—Scholz adopts the reading, which
inserts the men a third time.—The name of God. We ought, perhaps,
rather to render of the god, who &c. That is, the heathen blasphemed
the god, whoever he might be, who inflicted the plagues.

1066. Who hath power. 'The best MSS. have the article before
the word rendered by power,' which indicates that absolute power is
had in view.—Over these plagues. We might have expected, that it
would have been said, this plague. The plural here indicates a unity
in these plagues, which will be satisfactorily explained on the hypo-
thesis, that they are virtually contemporaneous.

1067. And they repented not. Such was the case, too, with "the
rest of the men" under the sixth trumpet (9; 20); while "the rest"
in C. 11; 13 "were affrighted, and gave Him glory."—To give Him
glory. He would therefore obtain it from them by means of these plagues.

DIV. 5. THE PLAGUE FROM THE FIFTH ANGEL'S BOWL. On the throne of the
beast = the imperial dynasty or authority. A.D. 68.

XVI; 10-11. 1068-75. And the fifth poured out his bowl upon the
throne of the wild-beast. And his kingship became darkened. And they
gnawed their tongues from the pain, and blasphemed the God of the
heaven from their pains and from their boils; and they repented not from
their works.

1068-9. On the throne of the beast. If any doubt could exist as to
the reference of these symbolizations, the mention here of the beast,—
the symbol of the civil power of heathen Rome, must remove it.—
His throne, which is in the head-quarters of persecution, Rome, is
that of the dragon and Satan (2; 13: 13; 2), and represents the imperial authority:—"not the capital city, but the governing power," says Hengstenberg. The effusion thereon must denote some stroke given to the dynasty, whereby the imperial authority received a deadly blow. And I doubt not, that the reference is to the death of Nero,—the last of the descendants of Julia, sister of Julius Cæsar,—with whom the Julian dynasty became extinct.

1070. And his kingship was made dark. So 'the third' of the Roman polity had been under the fourth trumpet, when Julius Cæsar subverted the Republican constitution; and so 'the sun and the air were darkened' under the trumpet corresponding to this bowl.—The Greek noun may be translated either kingdom (i.e., "in a passive sense, of the subject-territory") or kingship, meaning sovereign authority (i.e., "in an active sense, of the governing power"). Of the latter, in which sense the word appears to be used here (as Hengstenberg also thinks), examples may be found in Jo. 18; 36: Re. 1; 6, 9: 11; 15: 17; 12, 18.—The effect of making things dark is, that they cease to be objects of sense, and so apparently cease to exist. And just so by Nero's death the dynasty of Cæsars, and their imperial authority, appeared for a time to come to an end; and the Julian dynasty actually did so: see on 567, 577. The emblem of darkness is manifestly taken from the ninth Egyptian plague: Ex. 10; 21 ss.: cp. Ps. 105: 22; 28: Wis. 17: 21.

1071. And they gnawed their tongues. "When one bites his tongue from pain," says Hengstenberg, "this can only be an attempt to produce a reaction against the insufferable pain that presses on one, by means of another voluntarily inflicted,—to deaden the passive pain by means of an active one." Artemidorus (3; 23) interprets the eating of one's own flesh to denote the utter wasting of one's substance. Without specializing so much, we may safely say, that this is a highly expressive figure to denote extreme anguish. Perhaps it is even more forcible than that used (9; 5–6) to describe the torment, which the scorpion-locusts occasioned. In both instances, the horrors caused by a war, which partook of the character both of intestine conflict and of foreign invasion, appear to be intended. In the one before us, the miseries caused by the contests for the throne, which ensued on Nero's downfall, must be had in view. But Hengstenberg says; "The subject in they gnawed are the possessors of the throne, and those whose fortune was bound up with theirs." Such a construction, however, is a clear perversion to suit his own interpretation. 1st. It is not the natural construction. 2dly. There are not possessors, but only one possessor of the throne, viz., the beast,—a symbol including indeed a series of kings, but representing only one at a time. 3dly. The obvious reference is to the subjects of the kingdom, that
is, to the men, who had been spoken of under the preceding bowl. And this reference shows, that the subjects of the several bowls are in the main the same, that is, all are subjects of the one great world-power.

XVI; 11. 1072. And they blasphemed the God of the heaven. This verse is clearly identical in meaning with ve. 9 in the preceding bowl, an indication of the substantial identity of reference in the two bowls: see on 1065.—It should be remembered, that it is the symbolic heaven that is had in view. Hence we may, perhaps, take the equivalent literal expression to be 'the God of Christianity.'—Ct. C. 11; 13; "They gave glory to the God of the heaven."

1073. From their pains. The preposition here and in 1071 is commonly interpreted as meaning by reason of or on account of. Doubtless this would be a true sense, but perhaps the more literal meaning would be out of the midst of. The same preposition is used here four times, and in senses so far differing from one another, that we might have expected, that different prepositions would have been used; and hence we may be led to suspect, that some reason must have existed for adhering to the same.—Pain occurs only in vv. 10, 11, and in C. 21; 4.

1074. And from their boils. As boils are not said to have been an infliction under this bowl, we are led to look back to the first, in which alone they are mentioned. And we may see, in the manifest reference thereto, another plain indication of the substantial identity and contemporaneity of the bowls.

1075. And they repented not from their works. This is a parallel clause to the last in the preceding bowl. It occurs, too, under the sixth trumpet (9; 20); where the non-repentance is explained to consist in not turning from 'the worship of demons, and idols of wood and stone, &c.' The preposition gives a constructio pregnans = they repented neither of nor from their works.

Three things are predicated in reference to 'the men' under this bowl, in manifest parallelism to the three predicated under the fourth. And this, again, may well incline us to believe, that the same events for substance are contemplated under the two bowls; though they are presented under different aspects, or (it may be) with slight differences in respect of time and origin. The events symbolized must, at any rate, be so intimately connected as to lead us to think, that the making of a heptad of plagues may have led as much to their separate symbolization, as the differences between them. At the same time, there is observable an element of contrast too, inasmuch as the former plague proceeded from an excess of solar heat, and therefore (it may perhaps be supposed) of light; while the latter arose from a darkening. But to lay any stress on this would probably be to push the symbolization further than was intended.
DIV. 6. THE PLAGUE FROM THE SIXTH ANGEL’S BOWL. On the Euphrates
= the sources of the strength of Rome. A.D. 68–69.

XVI; 12–16. 1076–96. And the sixth poured out his bowl on the
river, the great Euphrates: and its water was dried up, that the way of
the kings from the sun’s risings might be prepared.

EPISODE.

And I beheld out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of
the wild-beast, and out of the mouth of the false-prophet, three unclean
spirits as it were frogs (for they are spirits of demons, doing signs), which
go forth upon the kings of the whole civilized-world, to gather them to-
gether unto the war of that, the great day of the almighty God.

INTERLUDE.

‘Lo, I am coming as it were a thief! Blessed he who is watching, and
keeping his garments; lest he should walk naked, and they see his shame-
less nakedness.’

SUPPLEMENTAL CONCLUSION OF THE BOWL.

And he gathered them together unto the place, which is called in the
Hebrew Harmagedon.

XVI; 12. 1076–7. On the river. ‘Rivers and fountains’ represent,
as was shown on 558, the sources of a country’s wealth and power,
whether internal from commerce or arms, or external from foreign
dependencies. The river of a country, as being its chief fertilizer
and mean of trade and intercourse, may represent the sources of a
nation’s strength, or by a natural figure it may be put for the country
itself. Thus in Is. 8; 7 the brook Siloam is put for Jerusalem, and
Euphrates for Babylon. And in like manner Juvenal makes the
Orontes represent the provinces of Asia, and Tiber Rome: and on a
coin of Nero’s reign, now in the British Museum, the Tiber appears
as a symbol of the Roman empire. Virgil also puts the Euphrates
for countries bordering on it.—The great Euphrates. Some copies
insert (before Euphrates) a third article. Even without it great stress
is thrown by the two articles, primarily on the size of the river, and
secondarily on the magnitude and resources of the country symbolized.
—From what has just been said it will be evident, that Euphrates
may be used here poetically for Babylon or the sources of its wealth
and strength, meaning not the city merely, but the state of that
name. And hence, as Babylon is allowed to be the mystical designa-
tion for Rome (op. 17; 18), Euphrates becomes a synonyme for the
power of Rome; as I have already (on 626) by a variety of arguments
shown it to be.—This reference to C. 9; 14 leads me to notice, that,
as under the sixth trumpet the liberation of the four angels from the
Euphrates was the cause of the gathering together of mighty hosts to
battle, so under this sixth bowl the object and consequence of the
drying up of this river is the gathering together of the kings and
their armies to the great battle of Harmagedon. Taking into account these facts, namely,—that the object affected is the same,—that the places of occurrence in numerical order (the sixth in each instance) are identical,—that the immediate results are the same (in the one case the liberation of four spiritual beings, in the other of three),—and that the more remote consequences are similar (in both instances great armies being gathered together), can we doubt, that there was an object in the parallelism, and especially in its being brought under the same number? Can we doubt, that Hengstenberg is right in saying; "This cannot be accidental." If we cannot, what could the object be, but to intimate some connexion of the bowl with the trumpet? Now, such a connexion will strikingly appear, if we consider, that the operation of drying up must occupy the period of this bowl (since it constitutes its plague), and that that period on my interpretation terminates at the accession of Vespasian in July 69. For then this plague will have been consummated exactly at the termination of the symbolical 'hour, day, month, and year' of C. 9; 15, and there will remain a literal 'hour, day, month, and year' (corresponding to the precedent in Eze. 4; 5 in connexion with the first destruction) previous to the second destruction of Jerusalem in August 70: see on 627. Thus, the sixth trumpet and the sixth bowl are seen to be connected together by a numerical link.

1078. And its water was dried up. This constitutes the plague of this bowl; and hence it is incumbent on an expositor to show, how the drying up would operate as such. This, I am inclined to think, most expositors fail to do in consequence of their looking upon the drying up, as being merely the means to bring about the infestation, and not the infestation itself, as it really is, though doubtless it has an ulterior object in view besides. Let me first, however, advert to some precedents. Doubtless, in this drying up of the Euphrates, in order to afford an easy passage to the kings, an eye has been had to that division of the Red Sea, in order to the passage of the Israelites and the destruction of their enemies, which formed the consummation of the plagues of Egypt. So also Jordan was parted for the entrance of the chosen people into the promised land: and similarly it was prophesied by Isaiah (11; 15: cp. 19; 5: 44; 27) and by Zechariah (10; 11), that the Euphrates and the Nile (if indeed the latter is not merely put figuratively for the former) should be dried up to allow of the ready return of the Jews to their own land. In the instance before us, though the proximate end is different, the same object of benefiting the people of God is had ultimately in view. For the way is prepared for the kings, who are the enemies of the Lord's people, only in order to lead them on to their destruction, so that the saints may be at once delivered and avenged.—And here it is expedient to
give a caution or two. (1). We should not be led by the first two precedents into the common error of conceiving of a drying up as taking place in one part only of the river; so as to give space merely for a passage. The original precedent, indeed, does not really sanction the error; for in it not a desiccation, but a dividing is spoken of. In our text, on the contrary, not a dividing, but a desiccation, and that "of the water" of the Euphrates, and not merely of a part thereof is affirmed. This, indeed, must necessarily be the case in respect of a river; since, the supply being cut off in one place, the water must fail throughout its whole course below that place. (2). We shall also do well to note, that the passage which the drying up implies has reference only to the symbolization, and that an actual passage of a river in the thing symbolized is not at all to be looked for. I have thought it advisable to call attention to these points, not only because much misapprehension has existed in reference to them, but also because due attention to the former will lead to a better appreciation of the force of the symbolization.—We will now proceed to consider the figurative meaning of the statement before us. Abundance of water "in a barren and dry land," where it was often scarce, was one of the most highly prized blessings of life (cp. 7; 17: 22; 1). Hence, for a great river, which flowed through the length of a country (as the Tiber, e.g., does through Italy), and on which, say in respect of drainage only, the whole country might be said to be dependent for its habitability,—for such a river to be dried up would almost entail the extinction of the entire population. How forcible a figure, then, would this be of that exhaustion of the resources of a country, and of the energies of its people, which a civil war produces! Wemyss, indeed, represents the matter somewhat differently. He says; "If a river or sea be dried up, it is a symbol of ill to the land adjoining. It signifies, that its enemies will easily make a conquest thereof, when they find no water to stop their passage." But in this there is a confounding of the symbol with the thing symbolized. The statement is true in reference to the former, but is not applicable to the latter. The matter stands thus. The symbolic river stops the passage of the symbolic invaders. Then, as the drying up of the former removes the impediment in the way of the latter, so the thing signified by the drying up, viz., the exhaustion of the country's resources, facilitates the success of the parties symbolized. Now, such a national exhaustion as is here symbolized was actually realized in the case of Rome-proper in the interval between Nero's death and Vespasian's accession. During that period, not only the forces of the country itself, but of its most distant tributaries,—it may be said, of the whole world, were collected together from four different quarters to make Italy the battle-field for the empire of the world:—at any
rate, the effect of their being gathered together was to exhaust the
resources of Rome. First, the Spanish legions in support of Galba;
next, the Praetorian to set up Otho; then, the German for Vitellius;
and lastly, those from Asia and Egypt for Vespasian, took up arms.
Such a series of civil wars might well be depicted as a drying up of
the welle springs of the nation’s prosperity,—an exhaustion of the
wealth and strength of the land: and how great a ‘plague’ and
calamity it must have been is self-evident. Suffice it to quote a single
sentence from Gibbon; “Nero involved the whole empire in his ruin.
In the space of eighteen months four princes perished by the sword,
and the Roman world was shaken by the fury of the contending
armies.’’—Dried up. The term is the same that is used in C. 14; 15
in reference to the harvest.

1079–80. That the way of the kings from the sun’s risings might be
prepared. This clause implies, that the plague of this bowl, great as
it was in itself, was only preparatory for a greater still. The sixth
bowl has in view, and is introductory to the grand consummation of
the seventh; though the special realization of the latter, in respect of
‘the kings,’ is reserved to form the grand climax of all under the
seventh and last blast of the seventh and last trumpet: see C. 19;
19.—Our principal inquiry here will be; Who are these kings?—
Merely to recite the answers, that have been given would occupy no
small space, and would present one of the curiosities of Aposcalypic
interpretation. Without wasting time and space in refuting hypo-
theses so absurd, as are most of those contained in the list at the
end of this heptad, I will content myself with directing attention
to one or two points in the text, which ought to suffice for the ex-
clusion of most, if not all of the solutions that have been pro-
posed. First, the parties spoken of are “kings.” Now, without in-
sisting on the reception of the term kings in its strictly literal
sense, it may safely be said, that, with no propriety, and in no use
of the word, literal or symbolical, can it be taken to signify a people,
a company, kingdoms, or an abstraction (see Vol. I: pp. 19, 310
ss.): and this fact will suffice to exclude most of the interpret-
ations. Secondly, the kings are said to be, not kings of the east, as
(owing doubtless to the mistranslation in the A. V.), they are so
commonly called, but emphatically “kings from the east,” τῶν
βασιλέων τῶν ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν ἡλιοῦ: cf. ve. 14, and 19; 19. Whether
they are or are not ‘kings of the east’ is not stated; for this is
not the point in view. Nor yet is it their being kings. But the
salient point of the designation is, that they come “from the east.”
Now I apprehend, that this point is commonly lost sight of, or
placed in a subordinate position, being sometimes introduced almost
incidentally; and I believe it would be found, that several of
the interpretations above alluded to would be wrecked, if required to
steer by this rule. Thirdly, these are not spoken of indefinitely as
‘kings from the east’ (though Stuart has thought proper so to trans-
late), but (with two articles to give a strong emphasis) as ‘the kings
from the east.’ Now, no kings having been spoken of before, this
mode of introduction must be based on the assumption, that such a
descriptive designation as the one before us would sufficiently convey
to the parties for whom the author primarily wrote, who were the
kings intended. But, unquestionably, scarcely one of the solutions
just alluded to could by possibility satisfy this assumption, in respect
of the author’s contemporaries; and none will be found to have done
so, if the general recognition of later ages be made the rule.—Having
now, as I suppose, sufficiently shown the untenableness of the con-
jectures hitherto made, I proceed to lay before the reader the answer,
which I would give to the question. I believe, that Vespasian and
his two sons, Titus and Domitian, are intended by the designation,
the kings from the east. All three subsequently became kings in the
mystical use of the term by becoming emperors; and they constituted
the Flavian dynasty. Vespasian at the epoch of this bowl held the
command in the east. There he was proclaimed emperor, and thence
he marched to take the empire, which he easily obtained in conse-
quence of the exhaustion of the rest of the Roman forces by the wars
of the three rebels. And thus, through the drying up of the resources
of the rest of the empire, and also owing to the maladministration,
extortions, and atrocious conduct of the three chiefs, ‘the way was
prepared for these kings from the east.’ That the emperors of the
Flavian dynasty would be readily recognized under this designation
by the author’s contemporaries, there can be, I conceive, no doubt:
at any rate, if not they, none could be. Nothing appears to the
contrary; and there is evidence in support of the view, which may
be deemed conclusive. This evidence has been in part cited under
No. 899; and consequently I need only recall here the prominent
points. 1. Vespasian and Titus, the emperor and the Cæsar, made
their triumphal entry into Rome, coming from the east, and as
conquerors of Judea. 2. Josephus states, that ‘the Jews were led
by an oracle in their sacred writings to believe, that one from their
country should become ruler of the habitable world; but this oracle
really referred to Vespasian, who was made emperor in Judea,’ and
‘who went thence to take the empire.’ In another place, Josephus
speaks of Vespasian as being “emperor over the east.” 3. Hujus
(Vitellii) tempore Vespasianus in oriente principatum arripuit. Aurel.
Victor. Epit. c. 8. Suet. in Vesp. c. 4. 4. Tacitus, speaking of Ves-
pasian’s lieutenant, says (Hist. iii: 1); “Venturum cum copis orientis
Mucianum.” And, referring to the oracle of which Josephus speaks,
The angels of the last plagues.

he states, that "The greater part of the Jews had a strong conviction, that at this very time 'the east was to prevail, and some who came from Judea to attain empire,'—AN EQUIVOCAL PREDICTION OF VESPASIAN AND TITUS." Bp. Newton had the last passage in view, when he wrote thus; "Vespasian and Titus, from commanding in the east, were advanced to the empire; and Vespasian for this reason was regarded, both by the Romans and foreigners, as that great prince who was to come out of the east, and obtain dominion over the world." From the foregoing passages it appears, that, to come from Judea would be, in the view of our author's contemporaries, to come from the east; and hence we may infer, that kings from the east is a descriptive expression used (in accordance with the common mode of speaking) in reference to Rome, and not to Euphrates. On this view, the reference would be, as is so often the case elsewhere in dependent or descriptive phrases, to the thing symbolized rather than to the symbol. But we are under no necessity to have recourse to the supposition of such a constructio ad sensum. For, in respect of the symbolic scene, we may conceive of the kings from the east as coming from the east of the Euphrates; and to this would answer, in respect of the actual world, Vespasian and his sons coming from the east of the Tiber, that is, of the Roman territory-proper. This is the more consistent and probable view, and the circumstance that the symbolic kings are gathered to Harmagedon, the plain of Megiddo, in Palestine, appears to place beyond doubt that it is the true one.—Here let me add, that, Hengstenberg unintentionally confirms my view here, when, arguing against Rome being the subject of this plague, he says; "If the expedition was directed against Rome, then, kings from the east would be mentioned as the instruments of punishment." On my view they were instruments of punishment to Rome; though it is true, that they were afterwards "overthrown blindfolded."—From the sun's risings. I have followed Hengstenberg in rendering the Greek phrase verbatim. He says; "From the rising of the sun, that is, from the regions whence these risings proceed,—from the east. Wherever the plural risings is used, it refers to the daily recurring act of going forth: cp. Mt. 24; 27: Lk. 18; 29: Re. 21; 13."—There is a reading, which gives the word in the singular (as in 7; 2), but it is not well authenticated.—Might be prepared: to what end? I answer, for their accession to the throne in the first instance; and then for the speedy annihilation of their dynasty, and in it that of the beast.

It will be proper here just to state, that I am of opinion, that ve. 16 ought to be read in close connexion with the verse we have been considering; since the intermediate portion is introduced parenthetically, while ve. 16 forms a supplement to the bowl-proper. So that the text would run; 'The sixth poured out, &c. that the way of
the kings from the east might be prepared. And he gathered them, &c. unto Harmagedon.' Ve. 16 will be expounded in due course. Here it will be proper only to call attention to the evident connexion existing between vv. 12 and 16,—to the supplemental character of the latter, and the need of it to make the former complete,—and to the circumstance, that it stops short at the gathering of the kings to Harmagedon leaving the battle which ensued to be included (as in respect of the thing signified it really is) in the comprehensive symbolization of the seventh and consummating bowl.

EPISODE.

XVI; 13. 1081. And I beheld. I have shown (Guide, p. 200), that this phrase forms one of the technical means of marking a division of greater or less magnitude. Hence its insertion here I take to be one of the indications of a distinction in what follows from what precedes it.—Out of the mouth of the dragon,—the military power of Rome actuated by Satan: see on 784. It is common to represent the mouth, as being the source or cause of a means of annoyance or destruction: op. 1; 16: 3; 16: 9; 17: 11; 5: 12; 15: 13; 2.

1082. And out of the mouth of the wild-beast,—the imperio-civil power of Rome, as shown on 850. The next clause leaves no doubt, that it is "the first beast" of C. 13, that is meant here.

1083. And out of the mouth of the false-prophet. Who or what is meant by the false-prophet? The fact, that this is the first introduction of the symbol may alone suffice to lead to a solution of the question; since, as in the case of the kings from the east, such an abrupt introduction must imply, that the thing intended will be readily recognized. Now this it can be in the present instance, only if it or the thing symbolized by it has for substance been already mentioned under some other designation. And thus we are led to inquire, under what designation the thing that is had in view can have been spoken of. And we need not search far. For it would seem, that no other symbol than the second beast of C. 13 can present itself as at all likely: and so many indications will be seen to support the view, that the second beast and the false prophet are symbols of substantially the same thing under different aspects as to leave no room for doubt on the point. Under 889 I have mainly aimed to establish the specific diversity of the two: here I will offer some considerations tending to show their substantial identity. 1. The association, in which the false prophet is here and elsewhere brought to view, is a strong indication to this effect. It is reasonable to suppose, that a very intimate connexion must subsist between this symbol, and the dragon and the beast, with whom it is allied and acts in concert. Now just such a connexion is seen in C. 13 to exist between the dragon, the
first beast, and the second beast. 2. The designation leads to the same conclusion. A prophet in the Apocalyptic use of the term (see on 698) means an authorized propagator of a religion or form of worship. The epithet false might per se import, either that he was not what he claimed to be, or that he was an inculcator of a false worship; but the latter is the only admissible sense in this connexion. Further, this was not merely a false prophet, but the false prophet: he was a notable and distinguished one. All this accords with what is said of the second beast. He is described as inculcating and enforcing by persecution a kind of worship. That worship was pre-eminently a false and depraved one; for it consisted in worshipping an "image" and "a beast." And the inculcator of it was a distinguished personage, and the—the only inculcator of it. 3. The other passages, in which the false prophet is mentioned, tend to establish his substantial identity with the second beast. They are two. In C. 19; 20 it is said; "The beast was taken, and with him the false prophet (or, his ally the false prophet) who did the signs before him, by which he deceived those, who received the mark of the beast and worshipped his image." Compare with this what is said of the second beast in C. 13; 12 ss.; "He exerciseth the power of the first beast before him, . . . and doeth great signs, . . . so that he deceiveth those who dwell on the earth by means of the signs, which it was given him to do before the beast: . . . and he maketh all to receive a mark, &c." Comparing these two passages, it is impossible to doubt, that the signification of the two symbols is in the main identical. The other place is in C. 20; 10; "The devil who deceived them was cast into the lake of fire, where the beast and the false prophet are." The finishing testimony is given to the closeness of the alliance between the three, by the circumstance of their being partners in the same final destiny, and also by the devil or dragon and the false prophet having the same character of being deceivers attributed to them (12; 9: 19; 20). And as it is scarcely possible to doubt from the intimate connexion between the two beasts, that the second was involved in the same condemnation as the first, we may reasonably conclude, that he is here again for substance represented by the false prophet.—But, it is natural to ask; If the beast from the earth and the false prophet have substantially the same signification, why have two so widely differing symbols been used? Why should not one have sufficed? And wherein does the difference between them consist? These questions have been fully answered in the exposition of C. 13; 11 ss.; where it was shown, that the former represents the Flavian dynasty as individualized in Vespasian under its civil aspect, and the latter the same under an ecclesiastical aspect. Hence when, as in the text before us, the dragon, the beast, and the
false prophet are brought forward as acting in concert, they may be
taken to represent the military, civil, and ecclesiastical powers of
heathendom, as leagued in antagonism to Christ and Christianity.
The fitness alone of such a representation may well be allowed to go
far towards ensuring its reception. And the personification in the
same individual may suffice to obviate any difficulty, that may be
felt. The beast from the earth was, as I have shown, individualized
in Vespasian. And Vespasian was also made the personification of
the false prophet. If it be asked; why Vespasian in particular? the
answer may be twofold. If we regard him as the personification of
the power of heathenism in the abstract, it may be alleged, that he
would be personally a fitting representative thereof, inasmuch as in
the earlier part of his career he had had high sacerdotal honours con-
ferred upon him, and he subsequently became Pontifex maximus.
And if we regard him as the agent of the first beast, and as being
himself specially symbolized by the second, more than one reason
may be given. He was sent into Judea by Nero to inculcate, and to
enforce the worship of the beast, i.e., of Nero himself. This is the
reason plainly indicated in C. 13. And to it we may add, that by
Vespasian, that is, by his authority and in his reign, "the glorious
land" of God's people was devastated, Jerusalem made "heaps" and
"not one stone left upon another," the "holy and beautiful house of
God burnt with fire," and "the glorious holy mountain" laid bare,
the temple-service finally terminated, the Mosaic economy and "the
mystery of God" 'in fulfilment of the words of God' "finished," and
God's ancient people 'scattered into all lands.' He was the Pontifex
maximus, under whom and through whom the old Dispensation was
brought to a close, and by whom the tribute, which had formerly been
collected for the support of the worship of Jehovah, was transferred
to that of Jupiter Capitolinus. He in short, it may be said, was 'the
Destroyer of Judaism' (see on 893), and the sacerdotal propagator of
heathenism at the point of the sword. So that, unquestionably, no
other person could be selected to personate the false prophet with a
tithe of the propriety, that Vespasian was. He, indeed, earned for
himself, by the uprooting of Judaism and the transference of its
funds to heathenism, pre-eminently the title of "the false prophet."
—but it may still be asked; If the beast from the earth and the false
prophet symbolize heathenism under different aspects or distinct
elements of its antagonistic power, why should the description of the
latter have been mixed up with the history of the former, and no
direct and distinct introduction given to the latter? Besides the
reason which has just been given, and others which might be assigned
(as convenience of narration and suitability to numerical arrange-
ments), it may be observed, that this disposition was in exact accord-
ance with the unity and almost identity of the Church and the State in heathen Rome. The doings, too, which were made characteristic of the beast from the earth were those, which also stigmatized the actors as the impersonations of the false prophet; and thus it became scarcely possible, and certainly rendered it unnecessary, to introduce a separate delineation of the latter symbol.

1081–3. I may be expected to show here, how the things signified by the three spirits proceeded out of the mouths of the three primary symbols. But this will be most conveniently done, when we have seen what the three spirits symbolize.—Another question, however, arises, which must be considered first, namely; Is it intended, that three spirits proceeded out of each of the mouths, or one out of each, or that each spirit was the joint product of the three mouths? The first hypothesis would not have occurred to me, if I had not seen it seriously maintained in The Christian Annotator. It seems to me, however, so clear, that the meaning is not, that there were nine spirits in all, and there appears to be so universal a consent on this point (for I do not recollect to have seen the notion broached in any other work), that I do not hesitate to dismiss it without another word; more especially as, if such had been the meaning, some distributive word would doubtless have been used here, as in C. 4: 5; 8: 21; 21. On the contrary, as the intention is to exalt in the highest degree the idea formed of the odiousness of the three spirits, I am more inclined to think, that the design is to represent each spirit, as being the product of the combined and concentrated venom of the three great enemies of Christ and his people. And on the whole, I would adopt the second hypothesis in respect of the symbol, but the third in respect of the thing symbolized. For, on the one hand, congruity of representation would not allow of each spirit being described as proceeding from the three mouths; and, on the other, it would seem to be impossible on any view to trace the origin of each of the things signified by the secondary symbols severally to one, and to one only of those signified by the primary symbols.

1084. Three unclean spirits. These are obviously symbols; but if symbols, then the things symbolized—those really meant, cannot be spirits. Yet the symbolic sense would seem to require three individual entities or substantive existences, answering to each symbol. So also the spirits being said in v. 14 to work miracles, and to go forth to gather men together to war, indicates, that persons are meant. The number, too, intimates the same; for I know not, that any other satisfactory reason can be assigned for there being three in particular, than that there were in fact so many in the reality symbolized. In C. 18: 2 "an unclean spirit" appears to be used in like manner, as a symbol of 'a heathen man or a publican,' that is, of a detestable
person. And in C. 13; 15, even as here, the thing signified for substance by the false prophet is said to 'have power to give a spirit to the beast's image,' that is, to constitute it a living, acting being, representative of something cognizable by the senses, and not of a mere abstract idea. Hence I conclude, that these three spirits are symbols of three persons; and I unhesitatingly reject all those interpretations, which represent them as symbolizing abstractions, forms of evil or error, wicked spirits, or corporate bodies.—The following passage from Josephus (Wars VII: 6; 3) may serve to throw light on the origin and significance of the symbolization. The historian, speaking of the herb Baaras says; "If it be brought to sick persons, it quickly drives away those called Demons, which are no other than the spirits of the wicked, that enter into men that are alive and kill them, unless they can obtain some help against them." Hence we may suppose, that the intention in making demoniacal spirits the symbol here has been to stigmatize the parties signified as being persons possessed, and led on by evil spirits to their destruction.—As to what three persons are symbolized, this can necessarily be ascertained only from the general signification and reference of the passage. But on my view it will be determined readily, and, I think, satisfactorily; for there can be no doubt, that Galba, Otho, and Vitellius must be the persons had in view. They might well be symbolized by 'unclean spirits,' and to them everything that follows will be found to be applicable. In particular, they might with propriety be symbolically represented, as being the progeny of the dragon, the beast, and the false prophet. To the military power they successively owed their accessions to the throne. The maladministration of the civil power under the Julian dynasty, and especially by Nero, paved the way for their usurpations. And the conduct of Vespasian in Judea, and in particular his waiting the course of events, and delaying to become himself a candidate for the empire, afforded the opportunity to the others. Or, without being thus specific, it might be merely intended generally, and as it were poetically speaking, that 'the three rebels' were the evil offspring of the military, civil, and ecclesiastical elements of the state; and hence were endowed with qualities to effect the greatest evils, that could be achieved by the three combined, when placed in the worst hands.—As it were frogs. The reading of the R. T. gives like to frogs; but it wants the authority of the best MSS. —It is common with expositors to subordinate the primary designation of this symbol to this secondary comparison. Elliott, for example, constantly calls the symbol, not 'the three unclean spirits,' but 'the three frogs;' and he does so with the view to gain a basis for referring the bowl to the kingdom of France, of which he aims to show, that the arms were three frogs. But 'the three unclean spirits' is clearly
the proper title of the symbol, inasmuch as it indicates the essential nature, while 'the three frogs' is merely introduced as a simile, showing at the most only the kind of external shape (as it were frogs), which the spirits assumed; and this with the view to denote certain qualities attaching to the things signified. But it may even be questioned, whether this simile was designed to indicate the external shape at all, since an examination of the places in which the Greek particle occurs would show, that it does not necessarily denote anything more than a participation in some quality or qualities, deemed characteristic of the thing to which the comparison is made. What the qualities were, in this instance, can only be learnt from the sentiments entertained in reference to the animals mentioned. Now the frog is generally regarded with an aversion and disgust inferior only to that felt for the serpent,—the symbol of the evil spirit: and indeed the whole connexion goes to show, that these three unclean spirits have the quasi frog-like shape assigned to them (if such be the case), as being imps of Satan. The frog is loathsome to the eye in its shape and appearance, and offensive to the ear by its continual croaking noise. This croaking, together with its bloated shape, and its mode of suddenly jumping up, and then being lost to sight again, have led to its being made in the fable an emblem of puffed-up ambition. Among the Jews this creature was classed among the unclean animals; and hence its form was one specially appropriate for unclean spirits to assume. And in accordance herewith we find an evil spirit spoken of, as appearing to Rabbi Channina in the shape of a frog. Horace, Ovid, and Martial apply to frogs the epithet 'nasty.' Aristophanes and Juvenal represent them as the proper inhabitants of the Stygian lake. And the Egyptians made them the symbol of impudent sharpeners. In the middle ages heralds are said to have used them as emblems of degradation. On the whole, we cannot doubt, that this clause is intended to attribute to the things signified the most hateful qualities. Such qualities, from the writer's point of view, might well be attributed to Galba, Otho, and Vitellius; and in particular, if his design was specially to exhibit the three spirits, as representative of ambitious men, who suddenly rose to view, made a great noise in the world for a short space, and then sank into total oblivion, nothing could be more exact. At any rate, as to the general representation, history will fully bear it out. Galba, who was by far the best of the three usurpers, is described by Tacitus as being 'a person of moderate abilities, and rather exempt from vices than adorned with virtues.' He was accused of meanness and stinginess; and his rigour is said 'in some instances to have been carried to the bounds of cruelty, while in others avarice and favouritism procured impunity to the most guilty.' Otho was the associate of Nero in his excesses and debauch-
erries. Having first seduced Poppæa, wife of Rufus Crispinus, and then married her, he appears to have purposely thrown her in Nero's way, that she might captivate him. Ruined by his extravagance, Otho planned a conspiracy against the life of Galba, in order to obtain the empire, as being the only means of retrieving his fortunes. Vitellius was about the same time proclaimed emperor; and the two rivals, in the midst of negotiations, each hired assassins to murder the other. 'The sluggish and sensual disposition of the one, and the luxurious habits of the other, rendered them little worthy to decide so great a quarrel; and the Roman world might be pitied, which, whoever were the victor, was to fall under the power of a worthless, or at least a justly suspected master.' Vitellius was accused of practising fraud with respect to the offerings and ornaments of the temple, by substituting base metal for silver and gold. He carried indolence, vacillation, sensuality, and extravagance to an unheard of extent, and was a monster of swinish gluttony and stupid insensitivity. 'The indulgence of his insatiable appetite was the object, on which he chiefly delighted to exercise his imperial power. The expenses of his table during the eight months of his reign have been estimated at five millions sterling. Prodigalities of every kind soon exhausted the treasury, which could be replenished only by exactions; and every evil, which Rome had suffered under the worst emperors, seemed to be its destiny in the reign of Vitellius. But a tempest was gathering, which was to sweep away this mass of corruption, and purify the polluted atmosphere of Rome. The eastern armies and provinces of the empire, disdaining a rule equally odious and contemptible, brought Vespasian into the field of competition; and another and more formidable conflict was to determine the possession of the throne. Antonius Primus declared for Vespasian; and, entering Italy, defeated the army of Vitellius with great slaughter. Meanwhile Vitellius was plunged in thoughtless luxury; and like the lazy animals which, when full-fed, lie torpid, he consigned the past, the present, and the future, to equal oblivion. After negotiating for terms of surrender with Sabinus, Vespasian's brother, who was then prefect of Rome, a party of his adherents treacherously attacked Sabinus, who fled for safety to the Capitol. The Vitellians stormed that sacred place, and in the tumult the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus was consumed by fire. Sabinus was seized, and massacred with every circumstance of ignominy. On the arrival of Primus, Rome was filled with blood and slaughter. Vitellius was found concealed in his porter's lodge; and, although he stooped to the most abject entreaties that his life might be spared, he was dragged to execution with his hands tied behind him, and a cord round his neck, like a common criminal. After being despatched in a barbarous manner, his head was carried round
the city on a spear; and his body thrown into the Tiber.'—A remarkable confirmation of the exposition now given may be found in an ancient tradition, which states, that on one occasion Nero vomited a frog covered with blood, "ranam visu terribilem." For what is this but a kindred symbolization to that of the three frog-like spirits, proceeding out of the mouths of the beast and his confederates? In it the rise of the subsequently murdered Galba is similarly traced to Nero, that is, to his maladministration, and premature death in consequence thereof.

XVI; 14. 1085. For they are spirits of demons. The connexion of this and the next clause, and of the remainder of the sentence, with the preceding portion is by no means clear. Either the two clauses may be thrown into parentheses, as I (and also Stuart and Hengstenberg) have placed them, or the principal stop may be put before for, as in the A. V. If the latter construction be adopted, it will be necessary, in order to make the sentence grammatically complete, to supplement the first verb by another, and to make it read thus:—

'I saw going forth out of the mouth, &c. three unclean frog-like spirits; for they are wonder-working demoniacal spirits, which go forth on the kings, &c.' In this case the latter portion must be taken to be intended, in part to explain why the spirits are so designated, and in part to give more information respecting them. If the former be preferred, two or three views of the construction of the passage may still be taken. Supposing the reading of Stephen's text to be adopted, the sentence would run thus: 'I saw three unclean spirits, ... go forth out of the mouth &c. upon the kings &c.' But, receiving the better authorized reading, it will as before be necessary to supply a complement to the first verb; and then we shall read; 'I saw going forth out of the mouth &c. three unclean spirits, as it were frogs (for they are spirits of demons doing signs), which go forth on the kings ... to gather them, &c.' Still it will remain to determine in what relation the portion in parentheses stands to the context; for three opinions may be entertained on this point. 1. The clause may be supposed to be inserted to explain, why the spirits are likened to frogs. 2. Or, why the spirits or the things signified by them are described as unclean and frog-like. 3. Or, to account by an independent statement for the symbol being spirits. The first must be rejected; because the clause does not in point of fact serve to show, why the spirits are likened to frogs, or at any rate it is not limited to showing this. The third is adopted by Hengstenberg, who translates and explains thus; "The parenthetical remark, For there are (that is, exist—the being in the sense of existing, as very commonly in John) spirits of demons, which do signs, makes preparation for ver. 15, and is like an impressive call, 'Watch and pray.'" But this rendering is so
unnatural, and the sense in my opinion so improbable, that I do not hesitate to reject this view. There remains, then, only the second hypothesis; but this includes two views, according as the explanation is supposed to have reference to the sign or to the thing signified. Stuart supposes the former; but at the same time, by taking the sign literally, he makes it identical with the thing signified. He interprets the clause thus:—"The unclean spirits sent forth are in reality of demoniacal disposition, being such as work false or pretended miracles in order to deceive men." For myself I incline to adopt the latter hypothesis, thus supposing that there is a constructio ad sensum, and that the three kings are said to be symbolized (1.) by unclean spirits, because they are actuated by devilish spirits, and (2.) by frog-like spirits, because they do such signs as spirits symbolized by frogs have power to perform. I have thus stated the different views, which may be taken of this passage; but I have refrained from entering into any lengthened discussion of them, because the difference made by any of them in the meaning is not of sufficient importance to make prolonged discussion expedient. I have only to add; that there are two readings, which may be rendered respectively spirits of demons or spirits of false gods (see on 650); but no material difference of meaning can be elicited from them.

1086. Doing signs. So the beast from the earth in C. 13; 13, and the false prophet in C. 19; 20, are said to have 'done signs;' and we may safely assume, more especially as these three spirits proceeded in part from, and are so closely connected with the false prophet, that their signs were of the same general character as his. If, then, we have rightly concluded on 897, that 'feats of arms,' 'warlike exploits,' or the like, formed at any rate a part of the signs there spoken of, we may assume, that such are intended here. We must not forget the symbolical character of the expression. The three spirits would do literal signs or miracles, but what in congruity would best answer thereto, in respect of the kings who are symbolized by the spirits, would be military exploits. A different view might, indeed, be taken. We might translate practising signs; and suppose, that what is meant is either practising the heathen system of divination by omens and incantations, according to the custom of the Romans before undertaking a military expedition, or in general working pretended miracles. But I prefer the former explanation.

The general purport of this statement relating to the three spirits may be gathered to be, that they signify heathens of the like kind with the false prophet, tools of the draconic spirit, the devil, set up by him to do his work, and fully prepared to subserve the cause of demons, meaning thereby the false gods of heathenism.

1087. Which [spirits] go forth upon. Not merely unto, as in the
A. V.; but, according to the nature of spirits, they fly upon or enter into the kings. This intimates the strong influence, which the action of the three rebels had in bringing about the result.—The kings of the whole world. The word kings in the generic sense, which it commonly has in mystical use, may be taken to include not only the chief rulers, such as emperors, but also provincial kings, prefects, governors, generals, and the like. But its exact sense must, in each instance, be determined by the context and circumstances.—The R. T. inserts of the earth and after kings; but the reading is deficient in MSS. authority, and is rejected in all critical editions. Perhaps the insertion may have been derived from the virtually parallel place in C. 19; 19.

—Of the whole cicoumene, that is, the Roman world: cp. Acts 17; 6: 24; 5: Jos. Ant. XII: 3; 1.—The question now arises; What kings are meant? Are they the same with the kings from the east spoken of in ve. 12? Are they also identical with "the kings of the earth" of C. 19; 19, the confederates of the beast? According to Stuart, so far from being the same with the kings from the east, they are "the tributary kings of the empire," who are gathered together "for the purpose of giving battle to those from the east." Ewald, again, represents them as united with the beast to attack Rome. While Bengel makes these to be "the kings from the other three quarters of the globe." And Hengstenberg, on the other hand, appears to consider the three to be identical. I doubt not, that the last is nearest to the true view. For when (ve. 12), in reference to the first-named kings, we find an act done in order that their way may be prepared; and when immediately afterwards (ve. 16), and it may almost be said in the same sentence, we find certain kings gathered together unto a war, to enable them to come to which we are led by the connexion to suppose, that the way was prepared, how can we do otherwise than conclude, that these (in ve. 14), are the same kings, for whom the way was prepared?. Or when, again, in ve. 14 we read that certain kings were "gathered together to the war of the great day of God," and shortly afterwards (19; 19) find kings again mentioned as "gathered together to carry on the war" with the Word of God, which war is symbolically described as "the great supper of God," is not the conclusion irresistible, that the same war is spoken of; and hence that "the kings" are, almost necessarily, the same? Any objection, that may be supposed to arise from the different designations, may be easily removed. It is quite the manner of this book (as I have had occasion to show more than once) to assign different symbolic designations to the same or substantially the same thing, suitably to the different aspects in which it is regarded. And this is exemplified in no instance, so fully as in that of the Flavian dynasty. When, in C. 13; 11, it is desired to indicate its imperio-civil character, and its
origin in contradistinction from that of the beast from the sea, it is 'the beast from the earth.' When, in C. 13; 14 ss., to intimate its similarity to, and yet distinctiveness from the first beast, it is 'the image of the beast.' When, in C. 16; 13, to put prominently forward its quasi-ecclesiastical mission, in respect of its inculcating and enforcing the worship of the beast, it is 'the false prophet.' When, in C. 16; 12, the object is to indicate the quarter, whence the kings composing it derived their power, and marched to seize the throne, they are designated 'the kings from the east.' When speaking of them (16; 14), with a design to intimate their obtaining possession of the imperial authority, they are 'the kings of the whole Roman world.' When the purpose is at once to mark their origin, and to identify them with the beast from the earth, 'the kings of the earth' is used (17; 2), as being a phrase wide enough to include them and other rulers. And lastly, in order strongly to stigmatize the Flavian dynasty, on account of its being 'the destroyer of the earth' (11; 18) and of 'the pious,' that is, of Judea and its inhabitants, it in particular is designated (17; 8) 'the beast from the abyss.' Thus it would seem, that no less than seven designations are given to this dynasty, to indicate different aspects or relations of it. In what I have now said, I have incidentally given the answer to the question with which I set out.

1088. To gather them together. As spirits may be conceived of as seizing upon men, entering into them, and compelling them headlong into perdition, so the conduct of 'the three chiefs' was powerfully influential in leading the three kings into the contest with Christ, which was to terminate in the annihilation of their dynasty.—The expressions in the clause which begins with these words are so very similar to those, which occur in the last heptadal blast of the seventh trumpet (19; 11 ss.),—wherein, on the occasion of 'the great supper of God,' 'the beast and the kings of the earth and their armies' are said to be 'gathered together to carry on the war with him who sitteth on the horse,'—that it would seem to be impossible to doubt, that they relate to the same events; and if so, the two heptads must be chronologically parallel.—Unto the war. The article is omitted in the R. T. here, and in C. 19; 19. This has probably arisen from the circumstance, that, as this war had not been mentioned before, and as in every similar instance that preceded the article was not inserted (op. 9; 7, 9: 11; 7; 12; 7, 17: 13; 7), some editor could not account for its insertion here; and therefore left it out. But it was no doubt used for emphatic distinction, that is, with the intention of indicating, that this would be the great war, the final war.—In the A. V., in Stuart's, and in other versions the Greek term is rendered battle. But, though that is doubtless a meaning of the word, the rendering is
scarcely justifiable here for the following reasons. The English word \textit{war} may be used in every instance in the Apocalypse, and is used in the majority of instances; while \textit{battle} cannot be used in some: whence it appears, that a single engagement is not necessarily meant in any instance, while a contest of some duration must be intended in some, as in C. 11; 7: 12; 17: 13; 7. Again, our term \textit{war} may be specialized by the context to denote a single conflict; whereas \textit{battle} cannot be extended to mean \textit{war} in general: so that it is preferable to adhere to the term, which may be used in every instance. But, if a war may be meant, the duration of the contest will be left wholly undetermined: it may be indefinitely prolonged to almost any extent. And if so in respect of the symbols, much more in respect of the things symbolized. So that the time of the consummation of the war will not be confined within narrow limits. And even if a battle be supposed to be meant, it must be remembered, that it will be a symbolical battle; and this may denote in the world of realities a contest of indefinite duration.

1089. \textit{Of that, the great day.} A pronoun is introduced, as well as two articles, to indicate the superlative degree of greatness in that day.—The word \textit{day} may perhaps be thought to restrict the time, so far as to show, that in the reality a single fight is meant. But this opinion will be entertained only when it is forgotten, that the term is used figuratively in respect of the reality symbolized. The word \textit{day}, when used figuratively in Scripture, has commonly such a degree of latitude attributed to it, that it might stand for a thousand or even thousands of years. But, without going to such an extent as this, it will be correct to say, that it is used with a greater or less degree of indefiniteness. An \textit{hour} may be put figuratively for many days or perhaps years; and so a \textit{day} may stand for a proportionately longer period (see on 749). It is only necessary, that the time should be constituted one period by the acts or course of conduct predicated being carried on continuously during the whole duration.—\textit{The great day} directs our thoughts to “the great and dreadful day of the Lord” spoken of in Mal. 4; 5,—an expression, which may probably have been had in view by the seer. But still more are we led to think of “the great day of His wrath” of C. 6; 17. A comparison of this phrase with that may well lead us to see in the two expressions another of the many parallelisms, which are made in connexion with the two destructions of Jerusalem. And I may safely say, that it is quite inadmissible to interpret, after the manner of Presentist expositors, one of these days as meaning merely an epoch of political catastrophe, and the other the final one of universal judgment, or of the future advent of Christ.—\textit{Of the almighty God}. If, after what has been said on No. 31, any doubt can be entertained as to Christ
being intended by this phrase, it may be removed by a comparison of the parallel passage, C. 19; 17-19. 'This war of 'the great day of the almighty God' is there called 'the supper of the great God;' while He, who makes the feast by waging the war, 'smiting the nations,' and 'treading the wine-floor of the fierce wrath of the almighty God,' is 'the Faithful one,' 'the Word of God.'—Stuart has the following remarks on this clause. "The day of Jehovah is everywhere in the Old Testament a name for a day of evil, and mostly one of sore punishment. See the great day of the Lord in Zeph. 1; 14-18, and cp. Ez. 13; 5: Joel 1; 15: 2; 11: Is. 13; 6, et al. The Apocalyptist has added to God the attributive almighty, in order to increase the intensity of his representation, and to show the absolute certainty of victory over the enemies of the Church. When the author prefixes the pronoun to day, he means of course to render the latter word emphatic and distinctive. So the same phraseology is employed in Mt. 7; 22: 26; 29: Acts 2; 18: 2 Th. 1; 10, where it refers to the day of Christ's coming. So here, reference must be made to a day, i.e., a time, well understood by Christians, when Christ would appear in vindication of his disciples, and to the terror and confusion of his enemies."—Hengstenberg says; "The great day of the Lord is the collective result of all his judgments on the ungodly world. In the historical realization it manifests itself in an entire series of calamities."

A few remarks, in reference to the relation in which vv. 13, 14, stand to the context, appear to be called for here. Hengstenberg says; "Vv. 13, 14 are of a regressive character." By this I understand him to mean, that they are synchronous with ve. 12, that is, they are introduced episodically to explain more at large the operations under the sixth bowl, and the results to which they would lead. This is the view maintained by me. I conceive, that in the first instance the locality and the plague of the bowl, with the special object which the latter had in view, are concisely stated, after the manner observed in the former bowls. But this bowl, being somewhat of an exceptional character, needed to be dwelt upon at more length. Hence an episode is introduced, in which the cause and method of drying up the water of the Euphrates, and preparing the way for the kings from the east, together with the object in view in promoting their advance, are stated. If this view be correct, it will follow that the conclusions of vv. 12 and 14 terminate synchronously. And with this result the purport of them well agrees; for that of the former announces the preparation of the way of the kings, while that of the latter intimates the putting forth of the influence requisite to bring the same kings. Thus both end at what is the terminus of this bowl, namely, the completion of the preparation for, and the advent and
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The accession of the kings from the east.—The purport of the verse that follows shows plainly enough, that it is introduced after the manner of a parenthetical interlude, and neither enlarges nor advances the main action of the drama.

INTERLUDE, marking the time present.

This interlude has probably been superadded to the episode, partly in order to make a break, which might indicate, that the actual gathering together of the kings is not to be too closely connected with the action of the three unclean spirits, who originated that gathering; and partly to intimate, by the parallelism with the interludes of the two preceding heptads, the arrival again at the epoch of the time present to the writer.—The mention of "the great day," when Christ was to come, appears to have suggested the topic of this interlude, which, if regarded only as a practical interjection, is strikingly appropriate. "The words, Lo, I come," says Hengstenberg, "stand immediately connected with what precedes. The 'great day of God the Almighty' is also as certainly the day of Christ, as it is certain that the Father has committed all judgment to the Son. The allusion to the judgment, which threatens destruction to the enemies of the Church, calls forth an admonition from the Lord to his own people."

XVI; 15. 1090. Lo, I come as it were a thief. Two readings of no authority are found in some copies: namely; an insertion of For thus saith the Lord; and a variation in the verb, which gives, Lo, he cometh. They have doubtless originated in a design to relieve the abruptness of the introduction of a new and unmentioned speaker; but they mar rather than mend the aesthetic propriety.—The expression Lo, I come, occurs four times in the Introduction and Conclusion, and again four times in the seven epistles (in 3; 3, "I will come as it were a thief:" (op. on 26). In all these places it is necessarily spoken as at the time then present to the writer. Is it not, then, a fair inference, that the phrase has been purposely introduced here to indicate by the parallelism, that the Vision, in the course of its regular evolution, has arrived at the same chronological epoch?

The present tense must denote a coming sufficiently near to be considered a present coming, and to interpret the clause as referring to a coming yet future, that is, which was then at the least very many centuries distant, is to make the text say just what the interpreter pleases, and is a mode of interpretation, which would, if consistently carried out, render language utterly useless. See on 3, 13, 26.—That the real speaker is Jesus admits of no doubt; but perhaps we should conceive of the angel of the plague, his representative, as being the symbolical speaker.—As a thief we must, of course, understand to mean only unexpectedly. The clause, which follows this simile in
C. 3; 3, would remove all doubt on this point, if there were room to entertain any.

1091. *Blessed he who watcheth.* The mention of a thief naturally led to this commendation of watchfulness, especially after the injunctions which the Lord had given. "Watch; for ye know not the day nor the hour, when the master cometh; lest, coming suddenly, he find you sleeping." "Blessed is that servant, whom his lord, when he cometh, shall find watching."

1092. *And keepeth his garments,* to wit, from being stolen. Christ is of course addressing his own followers, who, in consequence of their faith in him, are assumed to have received the white garments, which denote righteousness. It is not the 'washing' of the garments to make them white, spoken of in C. 7; 14, that is had in view here; but the keeping of the white garments, which they have previously received. See on 212, 508; and cp. Eccl. 9; 8: Is. 30; 22: Ju. 23; "hating the garment spotted by the flesh:" Ja. 1; 27; "keep himself unspotted from the world."

1093-4. *That he may not walk naked, and they see his shame.* Hengstenberg says; "The nakedness here is not the guilt, but the punishment." If, however, it be considered, that this is a Hebraic construction, and that the clause should be taken thus: *lest, walking naked, his shameful nakedness be exposed to view,* it will be seen, that this is not the case. Strange, indeed, would it be, if what happened by a man's own fault, were not his guilt (or, at any rate, the manifestation of his guilt) but his punishment. I say then, that not only the being, but the audaciously walking openly naked, constitutes the guilt, and the being seen so,—the being caught in the act (that is, being found destitute of the robe of Christ's righteousness) at the Lord's coming, entails the punishment. From the earliest times the Jews considered the indecent exposure of the person to be a disgusting offence in the eyes of God and man, and worthy of indignation punishment. Voluntary or self-entailed exposure was regarded as a crime: exposure by others was sometimes inflicted as a punishment. In accordance herewith, the whore is threatened in C. 17; 16, that she shall be made naked, as preliminary to her destruction. And in like manner, in various places of the Old Testament, as in Is. 3; 17: 47; 8: Ho. 2; 10: Na. 3; 5, exposure of nakedness is threatened as a punishment.—There is a striking similarity in this clause to some in C. 3; 17, 18: so much so, that Beza has been led, though on no better ground than a perfectly gratuitous conjecture, to suppose a transference from the one place to the other. It will be worth while to adduce for comparison the clauses to which I refer. "Thou knowest not, that thou art... naked. I counsel thee to buy of me... white garments, that thou mayest be clothed, and the shame of
thy nakedness not be made manifest.” Figuratively, nakedness de-
notes the being destitute of the robe of Christ’s righteousness, and
ready for compliance with the lascivious allurements of idolatry,—a
sense which may have had its origin in the result of the first act of
departure from God; “They knew, that they were naked” (Ge. 3; 7).
Thus, in several places of Scripture it is put for idolatry, or for con-
exion therewith. For example, Ex. 32; 25; “When Moses saw,
that the people were naked (for Aaron had made them naked unto
their shame among their enemies),” &c. 2 Chr. 28; 19; “Ahaz
made Judah naked,” i.e., by leading the people into idolatry. Eze.
16; 35 sa.; “O harlot! (Jerusalem); because thy filthiness was poured
out, and thy nakedness through thy whoredoms, . . . and with all
the idols of thy abominations; . . . therefore will I gather all thy
lovers against thee, and will discover thy nakedness unto them, that
they may see all thy nakedness: . . . they shall strip thee also, and
leave thee naked and bare; . . . and I will cause thee to cease from
playing the harlot.” The frequently recurring tendencies of the
Jews to adopt the idolatries of the neighbouring nations are rebuked
in this passage, which seems to have been a precedent had in view
in the one before us. The association in it of the figure of fornication
and playing the harlot, with that of nakedness, being similarly
found in the Apocalypse, tends to strengthen the view I have taken
of the signification. So also does the contrast, that the servants
of the Lord are emphatically represented, as having garments given to
them (3; 5, 18: 6; 11), being clothed (7; 9: 19; 8), and walking, not
(as here) naked, but with Christ in white (3; 4). But, at the same
time, it is proper to state, that a somewhat different aspect has been
attributed to this statement. Adam Clarke has remarked on it;
“Here is a plain allusion to the office of him, who was called the
prophet or overseer of the mountain of the temple. His duty was to go
his rounds during the watches of the night; and if he found any of
the Levites sleeping on his watch, he had authority to beat him with
a stick, and burn his vestments. See Middoth, fol 34, 1, and Tammid,
fol. 27, 2; 28, 1. Such a person being found on his return home naked,
it was at once known, that he had been found asleep at his post, had
been beaten, and his clothes burnt; thus his shame was seen—he was
reproached for his infidelity and irreligion.” It must be allowed, that
this illustration strongly recommends the view, that this benediction
is designed to serve simply, as a warning to the Christian not to be
found sleeping, like the foolish virgins, when his Lord shall come.
But then we should remember, that to adopt this view will involve
taking the passage in a literal or quasi-literal sense, while on the
other a symbolical is assigned to it; and in the case of such a work
as this, contrary to the general rule, a symbolical sense is to be pre-
ferred. Perhaps, as it is evident from Clarke's concluding remark, that the generic idea is the same in both, it may be allowable to combine the two views. Then, the declaration (combined with the prelude: 11; 18) will import, that that Christian man will be blessed, who at 'the great day' of the Lord's coming 'to judgment,—to give the reward to His servants, and to destroy those who destroy the earth;' shall be found to have been led, neither by 'the wrath' of 'the kings of the world' or of 'the nations' on the one hand, nor by the lascivious allurements of idolatry on the other, so far to relax his watchful hold on the truth of the Gospel, as not to be recognized for a servant of Christ through wanting the robe of His righteousness.

The following is Stuart's exposition of this sentence; "The writer means to say, Let Christians be on the watch, and live continually in a state of readiness to receive their Lord and Master at his coming in a proper manner. He wills that no one, because He has promised deliverance, should remit for a moment his entire vigilance. He who is guilty of such remissness will be like to the man who, not expecting the thief, lays his garments aside and gives himself to sleep. In the meantime the thief comes and takes them away, and then he is obliged to go forth naked, and thus to be exposed in that state to the gaze of men. So will it be with the unfaithful and heedless disciple. When his Lord shall come and summon him to service in the great contest, he will have no armour for the day of battle, nor any costume which will fit him to stand in the ranks of tried and faithful and vigilant soldiers."

SUPPLEMENT TO THE SIXTH BOWL.

XVI; 16. 1085. And he gathered them (the kings) together. The connexion of this verse with the preceding context is a point of some difficulty and of considerable importance. 1. Most expositors, considering ve. 15 to be parenthetical, regard ve. 16 as connecting with ve. 14, so as to form part of the same sentence, and to be a conclusion of the episode. Thus, e.g., Stuart says; "The verb ἔσχοναν in the singular number corresponds to ἔσχοναν in ve. 14, and both agree (as is usual) with the neut. plu. πνεύματα. This is evidently the right construction here; for it is first said of the evil spirits, that they went forth to gather, &c.; and then, that they did gather, &c." I should rather say, that 'this is evidently not the right construction here;' for, if such a construction had been intended, the two verbs would doubtless have been put in the same tense (just as Stuart himself in the second sentence actually does render them); and we should have read either 'which go forth to gather, . . . and which gather,' or 'which went forth . . . and which gathered,' &c. The reason, which Stuart adds, is nothing more than an assertion, begging the question. It is not necessarily the case, that the gathering to the war, and the
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gathering to the place called Harmagedon must be precisely the same thing. 2. Others, rejecting the forced construction, whereby the verb in the singular is rendered 'they gathered,' translate it naturally 'he gathered.' But then the question arises; Who is referred to by the he? (1). Hengstenberg says; "The subject is God the almighty. At the close of ve. 14 everything was already connected with the Divine agency: 'of that great day of God the almighty." And he adds some arguments, which are of too little cogency to be worth notice. It may suffice to refute this construction to say, that it supposes a reference to a person mentioned only incidentally, in a way that would involve a violation of all grammatical propriety. Moreover, to suppose God as coming forward to act in person, in a purely symbolical and visionary representation, is too incongruous a view to be entertained for a moment. (2). Another hypothesis is, that the speaker in ve. 15, namely, Christ, may be referred to. But this speaker has not been formally introduced himself, and it is allowed that the verse is parenthetical. In every way this construction would be even more incongruous and inadmissible than Hengstenberg's. (3). There only remains one other possible solution, which, therefore, if the others have been conclusively disproved, must be the true one. It is, that the angel of the plague is the agent; as was maintained by Bengel.—The principal objection made to this construction is, that the verb is so far removed from the subject, that such a connexion between them is improbable. But this objection will be entirely removed, if my view, that the intermediate portion is episodical and parenthetical, be adopted. I may add, that many examples of a longer severance of closely connected passages by parenthetical matter may be found in S. Paul's epistles.—Another objection raised by Hengstenberg is, that "the angels have nothing more assigned them than the pouring out of the vials." He had surely forgotten, when he wrote this, that he had said on ve. 9 (though, as it happened, erroneously there); "We must not render, 'It was given to it,' the sun, but 'to him,' the angel." There, where the plague of the bowl is in question, and with reference to which it might truly be said, that the plague is never attributed to the direct action of the angel, he does so attribute it: while here, where it is not in question, he makes a misplaced assertion, the small force of which may be obviated on the ground of the exceptional character of this bowl. It has been found expedient to introduce into this bowl an episode for the purpose of more fully explaining it, and an interlude suggestive of practical application; and this has rendered necessary the addition of a supplemental clause to the bowl, which might help to indicate the episodical and parenthetical character of the portion included within it, and fix as it were the insertion in the middle of
the bowl. How little weight attaches to an argument, based on the supposition of a rule of unvarying uniformity, will best be seen from the following comparative table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The earth.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Sore on men having the beast's mark.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The sea.</td>
<td>Blood.</td>
<td>Every soul died.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rivers, &amp;c.</td>
<td>Blood.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Two angels introduced.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Beast's throne.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>His kingdom darkened.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Blasphemed and repented not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Euphrates.</td>
<td>Its water dried up.</td>
<td>To prepare for kings from east.</td>
<td>3 spirits. Interlude.</td>
<td>The kings gathered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The air.</td>
<td>Thunders, &amp;c.</td>
<td>Cities fell, &amp;c.</td>
<td>A voice from heaven.</td>
<td>Blasphem ed. (No 'repented not.')</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The construction I adopt will amount only to this, that the angel gathered the kings through the agency of the three spirits: that is, the primary effect of his outpouring was, that the three spirits operated to dry up the Euphrates; the secondary, that thus a way was prepared for the kings from the east; the tertiary, that in consequence these kings were gathered together.—Other arguments in support of this construction may be advanced. For instance: I have shown, that the war, to which the kings are gathered here, is the same with the war spoken of in C. 19; 19; and that 'the kings of the earth,' who are there gathered to it, are the same with 'the kings from the east' in ve. 12: and, if so, we cannot but connect ve. 16 with ve. 12. Moreover, the circumstance that in C. 19; 17 it is an angel, that 'gathers together the birds of prey to the great supper of God,' favours the supposition, that an angel is the primary agent here. Again, the bowl-proper in ve. 12 is left incomplete without
such a supplement, as ve. 16 furnishes. It is quite incredible, that kings should be incidentally introduced as having a way prepared for them, without any further statement in reference to them; and in particular such an one as might indicate, whether they availed themselves of it or not. Further, the congruities and advantages, which will result from adopting the construction I advocate, tend to recommend it strongly. i. The bowl-proper, the episode, and the interlude will then be seen to converge to the supplement as to a common point, in which they find a terminus. The bowl-proper concludes with the statement, that 'the way of the kings was prepared:' the supplemental verse appropriately adds, 'and he gathered them, &c.' The episode concludes with, 'The three spirits go forth to gather together the kings, &c.:' and the supplement takes up the sentence, and completes it with, 'and he gathered them together, &c.' Finally, the interlude throws in a word of warning appropriate to the eve of the great event, on which it stands, and to which the bowl-proper and the episode have brought down the narrative. ii. All this tends to confirm the arrangement I have made of the whole. iii. The opinion, that 'the kings from the east' and 'the kings of the whole world' symbolize the same persons, is confirmed by the congruity of the results to which it leads. iv. The meanings given by all the other constructions are involved in that for which I contend without entailing a liability to the objections, to which the former are obnoxious. Thus, the angel being a symbol of Christ, the speaker in ve. 15 will in reality be the subject of the verb in ve. 16. And the 'almighty God' of ve. 14 being Christ, as shown on 1089, Hangstenberg's view will also for substance hold good. So also will Stuart's. For both 'the three spirits' and 'the angel,' each in his proper sphere, are concerned in gathering the kings together: the latter as the great first cause, acting with a Divine prescience of the end and the result, the former as instruments in his hand, acting undesignedly and in ignorance of the results to which their acts would lead.—Unto the place: not 'a place,' as in the A. V. A notable place is pointed at.

1096. Which is called in the Hebrew [language] Harmagedon. Some copies have Magedon. The R. T. has Armageddon.—The reference to the Hebrew for a designation may lead us to expect to find in the meaning of the name some symbolical signification: see on 9; 11. Now Harmagedon, the mountain of Megiddo, has been variously interpreted as denoting 'the mountain of excision' or 'of slaughter' (by Andreas and Arethas), 'the mount of the assembly' or 'the destruction of their army,' 'the mount of robbers,' and 'the mount of the gospel.' Inasmuch as the word stands connected in this place with the gathering together of kings to a war, which, as we are subse-
quently told, issued in their destruction, we may be led to give the preference to the signification of 'the mount of slaughter' or 'destruction' (cp. 19; 21; "The rest," i.e., all but the beast and the false prophet, "were slain with the sword.") And from such a signification we may reasonably infer, that the term has been framed and adopted, with the view to intimate the result of the gathering, rather than to indicate any actually existing mountain. And to this effect Jenour writes; "Since there is not, and never has been any place called by this name, it is evident, that it has respect rather to the event itself than to its locality." Nevertheless, we shall probably not obtain a full insight into the appropriateness and force of the term without inquiring, whether any local derivation and associations may throw light upon it. Now, in the neighbourhood of Mount Tabor, at the foot of the hilly range which trends south-east from Carmel, there was a village and fortress called Megiddo, which obtained great celebrity in ancient times from the many bloody battles fought in its vicinity. For, on the east of it, extending to M. Tabor, lay the extensive plain of Edraevalon (called also, or a portion of it, the valley of Megiddo), which, from the facility it afforded for moving large bodies of men, and especially cavalry, became a common battlefield of nations. There, Deborah and Barak engaged Sisera and his host, as we read in Ju. 5; 19 (cp. ve. 15: 4; 14); "Then fought the kings of Canaan in Taanach by the waters of Megiddo" (cp. Ju. 1; 27: 1 Kgs. 4; 12: 9; 15: 2 Kgs. 9; 27). There, 'Pharaoh-Necho slew Josiah:;' 2 Kgs. 23; 29: 2 Chr. 35; 20 ss.; "Josiah came to fight in the valley of Megiddo. And the archers shot at king Josiah. . . . and his servants brought him to Jerusalem, and he died. . . . And all Judah and Jerusalem mourned for Josiah. And Jeremiah lamented for Josiah: and all the singing men and women spake of Josiah in their lamentations to this day, and made them an ordinance in Israel." I have quoted this passage at greater length than may seem pertinent to the present purpose, on account of its connexion with one in Zech. 12. There the prophet, after declaring that the Lord 'will make Jerusalem a cup of trembling unto all the people round about, when they shall be in the siege both against Judah and against Jerusalem, and will make Jerusalem a burdensome stone for all people, though all the people of the earth be gathered together against it, . . . and will smite every horse of the people with blindness,' goes on to say, "in that day shall there be a great mourning in Jerusalem, as the mourning of Hadadrimmon (or of great wailings) in the valley of Megiddon" (alluding, doubtless, to that for Josiah). With this passage we must compare another in Joel 3; and we shall then be in possession of a basis, on which inferences of some importance may be founded. 'I will gather all nations
and will bring them down into the valley of Jehoshaphat, and will plead with them there for my people. . . . Proclaim this among the Gentiles; Prepare war: let all the men of war draw near. . . . Assemble yourselves, and come, all ye heathen, and gather yourselves together round about, . . . and come to the valley of Jehoshaphat; for there will I sit to judge all the heathen round about. Put ye in the sickle; for the harvest is ripe; for the press is full, the vats overflow; for their wickedness is great. Multitudes, multitudes, in the valley of decision (M. B. concision or threshing): for the day of the Lord is near in the valley of threshing." (Cp. Eze. 38; 4, 16: 39; 3: where also the Lord leads the enemies of His Church into His land to judge them there.) The last-cited passage Hengstenberg regards as "the fundamental one" of the text before us. And Vitringa says in reference to it; "the place of conflict, which Joel calls" [the valley of Jehoshaphat], "the valley of the judgment of God, the Spirit calls here Armageddon," that is, the mount of Megiddo. It does not, however, at first sight appear what connexion there can be between the two. Megiddo was the name of a fortified town in Samaria, near probably to a valley of the same name. "The valley of Jehoshaphat" was the name of a vale on the east side of Jerusalem, and probably the same with "the valley of Barachah" or "blessing," where Jehoshaphat assembled the people to "bless" the Lord with great shouts and rejoicings,—"with psaltries and harps and trumpets," for the miraculous deliverance accorded in answer to the prayer of Jehoshaphat (see 2 Chr. 20), and from which circumstance the valley appears to have been called by his name. The passage in Chronicles furnishes the link required to indicate the connexion. From it, coupled with that from Zechariah, we learn, that the mourning for the good king Josiah,—a mourning of such celebrity, that it had been commemorated 'in the lamentations of Israel unto this day, and made an ordinance,'—this mourning, begun at the valley of Megiddo, was transferred to and reached its climax at the valley of Jehoshaphat. Hence a sort of connexion was established between the two valleys; and both,—the one or the other as the occasion suited, might be used as a place figurative of great calamity or affliction. When a destruction having more immediate reference to the Jews, was had in view, 'the valley of Jehoshaphat,' from its proximity to Jerusalem, would be the more appropriate scene. When a gathering of the nations of the world, and a slaughter on a vast scale were contemplated, then the great plain of Megiddo or Esdraelon, or a mountain of the same name from which a view of the extent of the slaughter might best be obtained, would be more suitable to the occasion. But, from the connexion established between the two localities, the one might easily be under-
stood to imply the other. Hence, I conceive, that in C. 14; 14–20, the rejection and destruction of the Jewish people and the preservation of the true Israelites (the elect Christianized people of God) being symbolized, ‘the valley of Jehoshaphat’ is to be regarded, as being the theatre of ‘the judgment of God.’ In C. 16; 16 and in C. 19; 11–21, again, the gathering being one of ‘the kings of the world’ and their armies, ‘Megiddo’ is, from its associations, the more appropriate designation for the scene of conflict. Certainly, any one who compares the two series of passages cannot doubt, that the more ancient have been had in view as precedents, while writing the more recent. Compare the designation Harmagedon,—the gathering together of armies to war,—and the vast slaughter symbolized, of Rev. 16; 15, 16: 19; 19: and 14; 20, with the valley of Megiddo or Esdrachelon, and the associations which it would suggest,—with the destruction of life and consequent lamentations predicted in Zechariah,—and with the gathering together of the nations to war and to destruction in the valley of Jehoshaphat, as announced by Joel. Compare the figure of the harvest of Rev. 14; 14–20, and 19; 15, with the same figure in Joel: the armies of horse of Rev. 14; 20, and 19; 14, with ‘the horse’ in Ze. 12: and ‘the great day of the almighty God’ of Re. 16; 14 with ‘the day of the Lord’ of Jo. 3; 14. Compare, lastly, the ideas associated with the designations: ‘the mount of slaughter’ or ‘destruction’ of Re. 16; 16, with ‘the valley of slaughter’ of Ze. 12; 11,—with ‘the valley of the judgment of God’ of Jo. 3; 12,—and with ‘the valley of threshing’ of Jo. 3; 14 (cp. Jer. 51; 33; ‘Babylon is like a threshing floor; it is time to thresh her: yet a little while, and the time of her harvest shall come’). And there can be no doubt, that the passages in Zechariah and Joel have been followed as precedents.—There remains, however, one point of difference, yet to be accounted for. Why has this scene of slaughter been designated a mountain; when, so far as we know (though our want of knowledge is very far from proving, that such was the case), there was no mountain of the name in existence; and when the precedent would have led us to expect a valley to be the place named? One reason has already been suggested. But the principal one probably was, to make a contrast with the Mount Sion of C. 14; 1. As the martyrs, who had fought the good fight of faith for Christ’s name’s sake, were exhibited as on an eminence raised above the world, in order that their bliss and glory might be manifested to all; so must those, who dare to wage war with him and his followers, be exposed to view in such a way, that their ignominious discomforture and complete destruction may be seen and known by all men.—The difficulty, which has just been noticed, leads me to advert to another view, which may be taken of the symbolization implied in the name Harmagedon.
The angels of the last plagues.

Vitringa, Bengel, and others have supposed, that Megiddo is alluded to, not in reference to its historical associations, but in respect of its etymology. ‘Harmagedon’ may be derived from a word, which means manifestation. On this view, ‘the Mount of manifestation’ would direct our thoughts to the manifestation of Christ at his advent, as symbolized in C. 19; 11 sq.: and, instead of a contrast with the Mount Sion of C. 14; 1 being intended, that Mount (as being the scene of Christ’s appearance), and not the destruction of his enemies, is the salient feature in the symbolization before us.—Hengstenberg, again, argues, that, “if the meaning turned on the significion of the name, this would, as in C. 9; 11, have been rendered also into Greek. Its being said, ‘which is called in the Hebrew,’ shows, that not simply a proper name is brought forward,—that the word has an element in it, which must be explained out of the Hebrew. That no Greek explanation is appended shows, in connexion with the fact of Megiddo presenting no obvious derivation, that this Hebrew element can only stand in the syllable, Har, which required no explanation.”—As either view will suit my scheme of interpretation, I leave to each reader to form his own opinion.

“The sixth vial,” says Hengstenberg, “must of necessity break off here [namely, at the gathering together to Harmagedon, as preparatory to the war]—must stand at what immediately prepares for the final catastrophe; otherwise there would be no room for the seventh.”

“Here,” says Bengel, “the delineation of the conflict is broken off, which afterwards is carried out by the true and faithful one, who sits upon the white horse.” This last statement is true in respect of the symbolization under the figure of a war. Nevertheless, the result of the war of Harmagedon is for substance symbolized under the seventh bowl.

DIV. 7. THE PLAGUE FROM THE SEVENTH ANGEL’S BOWL. On the air = the territory and power of the dragon. A.D. 70 ss.

XVI; 17–21. 1097–1116. And the seventh poured out his bowl upon the air. And there came forth a loud voice out of the temple, from the throne, saying; ‘It is done.’ And there came lightnings, and voices, and thunders: and there came a great earthquake, such an one came not since man was on the earth, an earthquake so mighty, so great. And the great city was severed into three parts; and the cities of the nations fell: and the great Babylon came into remembrance before God to give her the cup of the wine of the wrath of His anger; and every island fled, and the mountains were not found. And a great hail[-storm], as it were stones of a talent’s weight, came down from the heaven upon the men; and the men blasphemed God by reason of the plague of the hail; because the plague of it is exceedingly great.
XVI; 17. 1097-8. The seventh... on the air. 'The old serpent, called the devil, which is the dragon,' is "the prince of the power of the air," having that region assigned to him and his evil hosts, as their special territory and sphere of action (see Vol. I. 17: Ep. 6; 12: and Stuart's Exc. I.) Hence, to inflict a plague on the air will mean to strike a blow at the root of Satan's power, and the metropolis of his kingdom. Thus to render the sphere of the dragon's evil machinations, and the source of the beast's power to work evil (13; 2), the mean of destruction to its occupants and their allies, is a symbolization of the greatest power for denoting the annihilation of the enemies of the Lord and of His people.

1098. There came a loud voice. The same, that gave the mandate to the angels to go forth, now announces the approaching accomplishment of their mission. See on 1033.

1100. From the temple. Some critical editions insert of the heaven. The omission or insertion makes little difference to the sense; since the next clause, from the throne, necessarily implies, that the temple in the heaven must be meant.—From the temple may be thought to import, that the voice proceeds from the God and author of Christianity: while from the throne denotes, that it comes forth in vindication of the Divine attributes; since the throne is "the throne of God and of the lamb" (22; 3), "the throne of justice and judgment" (Ps. 9; 4: 89; 14), "of holiness" (Ps. 47; 8), and of the Divine glory and covenant (Je. 14; 21).

1101. It is done. The work is accomplished by the pouring out of this vial. 'The wrath of God hath attained its end.' "The perfect tense is used to denote the full certainty of the destruction threatened, i.e., it is as though it had been already accomplished:": Stuart. We might render; It hath been (=Babylon was), as in Virgil, "Fuitus Troes! Ilium fuit!" The sense would be ultimately the same. The solemn significance of the word shows it to be used here, as the ne plus ultra of denunciation. And the precedents confirm and augment its denunciatory significance. We are immediately led to think of the last solemn word uttered on the cross, when the final act of redemption was on the point of being consummated,—Satan's head bruised: "It is finished; and he bowed his head, and gave up the ghost." And there are earlier precedents in the Old Testament. In Eze. 39; 8, speaking of the destruction of Gog, and of making the heathen know that "I am the Lord, the holy one in Israel," it is said; "Behold, it is come, and it is done: this is the day, whereof I have spoken." Again, in Eze. 9; 11, after the Lord had given a commission to slay all those in Jerusalem, on whom His mark had not been set, the immediate report is; "I have done, as thou hast commanded." But, for substance even more pertinently, on account
of the parallelism with the literal Babylon, may the 50th and 51st chs. of Jeremiah be referred to.—We shall meet with the same expression again, on the occasion of the creation of the new heaven and earth, and the descent of the new Jerusalem: 21; 6.

XVI; 18. 1102–3. And there came lightnings, and voices, and thunders, and a great earthquake. Here again, we have the formula of universal political catastrophe: see on 540.—The order of the first three terms in the R. T. agrees with that in the prelude of the seal we are now under (8; 5), where the terms run; "voices, and thunders, and lightnings, and an earthquake." But, as the nearer prelude,—that of the seventh trumpet (11; 19), runs thus; "lightnings, and voices, and thunders, and an earthquake," the reading given above is on this account alone the preferable, as it is also the best authorized one. We may notice further, that the incomplete formula in the general Introduction to the seven-seal book (4; 5) differs from both of those just cited; for there the order of the terms is; "lightnings, and thunders, and voices." I doubt not, that there has been a reason for the arrangement in each case, though we may not be able to divine it. But, be this as it may, I feel assured, that the same reality has been had in view in all, with this difference only;—that the syllabus of the seventh seal foreshadows it summarily, and as from a distance; that of the seventh trumpet as nearer to, though not having yet arrived at its realization; while in this seventh vial it is exhibited, as going out into actual accomplishment: and hence, in conformity with the greater apparent magnitude of objects close at hand, the denouement is brought into the boldest relief, that symbolic painting would admit of, by the additional touches which follow. I thus agree with Hengstenberg, that "we have arrived precisely at the same point, at which we found ourselves" in C. 11; 19; while I reject and disprove his assertion, that this is "to the discomfort of those, who turn the whole book into a continuous representation;"—if, at least, by 'a continuous representation' be understood only the interpretation in chronological order of those parts (to wit, the seals and trumpets), which are shown by the plainest internal marks to follow one another, in whole or in part, in consecutive order.—The epithet great prefixed to earthquake in this place, while it is not found in either of the preludes, is one item in the deeper colouring, to which I have alluded as being designed to indicate the actual arrival of the catastrophe. It was in like manner applied in C. 6; 12 to the earthquake, by which the parallel destruction of the literal Babylon was symbolized. (See also 11; 13). But the far surpassing magnitude of this catastrophe, as compared with that, is signified by the clauses, which are superadded here.

1104. Such an one came not, since man was on the earth. Several
precedents of such a mode of expression may be pointed out. Ex. 9:18 ("a very grievous hail, such as has not been in the land of Egypt since the foundation thereof, even until now") has a special pertinency, on account of the repeated allusions in these bowls to the Egyptian plagues. So, also, has Da. 12:1 ("There shall be a time of trouble, such as never was, since there was a nation even to that same time") on account of its referring to a similar political catastrophe,—the Antiochian profanation. But the most pertinent of all, on account of its relating to the destruction of Jerusalem (if at least my view, that Jerusalem is included in the present symbolization be well-founded) is Mt. 24:21; "Then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time." These precedents help to show, that this is the strongest possible expression for the superlative degree.

1105. An earthquake so mighty, so great. The use of two strong expressions to describe the magnitude of this earthquake did not suffice; but two more must be added, in order that by the number four its universality might be indicated. Yet all this accumulation of epithets, as compared with the single one applied to the fall of the literal Babylon, is only proportionate to the superior greatness of the mystical Babylon, as compared with that of the literal; and consequently the terms used to describe the destruction of each are not out of proportion.—The separation of the earthquake from the other three members of the formula, in order to be made the subject of so many qualifying epithets, indicates a difference from the rest. And this no doubt consists in the first three (those of which the heaven or air is the locality) being used as general terms of disaster or catastrophe, while the fourth (the earthly one) is made specially significant of political or national overthrow.

XVI; 19. 1106. And the great city. It is a much controverted question, what city is here meant. Most commentators have argued, that Babylon, i.e., Rome, must be intended; because the epithet great is applied only to Babylon. The use of such an epithet is, however, a very weak ground to rest upon under any circumstances; and that it is utterly unsound in the present instance may be seen by considering, that the metropolis of any country would in mystical language be, in respect of that country, 'the great city' (cp. Ge. 10:12; Jos. 10:2). But it is not true, that Babylon only is called 'the great city.' Jerusalem is so called in C. 11:8 (see on 731); and in Neh. 7:4, and Jer. 22:8. Hengstenberg recognizes the first example, while arguing that Babylon is meant here. He says; "Two cities have in the Revelation the name of great, Jerusalem in C. 11:8, and Babylon in all the other passages. It is quite incomprehensible, how some expositors should understand the great city here of Jerusalem.
By so doing they show, that the whole import of the group of the seven vials has remained hidden from them. The object of judgment throughout that group is the heathen worldly power as opposed to God. . . . Farther, the complete destruction that is announced here does not suit Jerusalem. In the Apocalypse Jerusalem always denotes the church. But this can never become wholly degenerate and fall away; and as little can it be the subject of consuming judgments."

In this quotation two arguments are advanced; and they contain all that is deserving of notice, in what Hengstenberg says. To the first I reply, that, admitting that ‘the worldly power is the object of judgment in the vials,’ I contend, that Jerusalem at this epoch has ceased to be ‘the holy city,’ and is now simply ‘the great city,’ that is, it has become ‘part and parcel’ of the antagonistic world-power. If so, the argument is invalidated: but even if not, it will still be unquestionable, that Judea is included, as one of the objects of judgment, from the fact of the symbolic earth being the subject of the first bowl.

On the second argument I remark, that what he ought to have said is, that ‘the destruction announced does not suit his interpretation of Jerusalem’ (and consequently it negatives it), not that ‘it does not suit Jerusalem.’ I contend and will show, that it does suit that city, and that Jerusalem never ‘denotes the church’ of Christ, but on the contrary stands opposed to ‘the new Jerusalem,’ which is a symbol of the Church. At present (referring the reader for further proof to the Guide, p. 20), I will content myself with offering in support of the opinion, that ‘the great city’ here means Jerusalem, two considerations, which are wholly independent of any scheme of interpretation.

First, no consistent interpretation of vv. 19 and 20 can be made on the other view. If ‘the great city’ is synonymous with ‘the great Babylon,’ then all the terms ought to be synonymous; or, at any rate, ‘the islands, &c.’ ought to correspond in sense to ‘the cities’ in the same way, that ‘the great Babylon’ does to ‘the great city’ (that is, some consistent principle of apposition must be adopted): but this cannot be made out; for unquestionably ‘cities’ and ‘islands’ cannot signify the same thing. On the other hand, a consistent sense and an orderly arrangement becomes apparent, when ‘the great city’ is taken to mean Jerusalem. For then we have Jerusalem, as the representative of Judaism, put in contrast with Rome, as the representative of heathenism; and the principal dependencies of the great heathen power in contrast with her inferior and isolated tributaries. And hence it further results, from the fourfold signification thus assigned, that an idea of universality is attached to the thing signified, which is in keeping generally with the symbolism of the book, and in this place specially corresponds to the fourfold symbolical formula, which immediately precedes. As in it,—in ve. 18, four.
causes were set forth (the fourth of which was qualified by four descriptive terms); so, on my view, in vv. 19, 20, are exhibited four distinct results. This I take to be a mystical equivalent for saying; 'As the causes, so the effects were universal in their extent.'—*Was severed into three parts.* Three, in correspondence, it may be, to the number of the powers that occasioned the division of the great city, namely, the dragon, the beast, and the false prophet. On my view, these three primary symbols were the originating causes of the going forth of three unclean spirits, who prepared the way for three kings from the east, under whose rule the great city Jerusalem was severed into three parts.—As it does not appear, that this severance was made with any special object in view (such as, to represent the preservation of a part or parts), we must conclude, that the intention was to symbolize, in the most forcible manner, the complete dissolution of the state represented. And, from the frequent division of things into three parts, in connexion with internal schisms and conflicts (see Cs. 8 and 9), we may well suppose, that the number three has been specially made in the Apocalypse the numerical representative of disruption. Stuart says; "The meaning is, that the city was severed and broken in pieces, so that the whole was reduced to a ruinous state." And Hengstenberg agrees herein, observing; "That, with the threefold division, we are to suppose a complete prostration concurring, is plain from the cause that produces it, the earthquake."

1107. *And the cities of the nations fell.* These are, of course, the capital cities put as representatives of the nations, to which they belong. For them to fall, through the concussion of the earthquake, is for the states to be subverted, as forming parts of Babylon's empire, and elements of her power: cp. 14; 8: 17; 10.—*The nations are those which are spoken of in the prelude (11; 18), as being moved to wrath.*—Hengstenberg translates the *cities of the heathen*; and, contending that the heathen are meant, infers; 'whence the great city Babylon can only be a heathen one, to the confusion of those who understand it of Christian Rome.'

1108. *And Babylon the great came into remembrance before God.* The city Babylon stands for the Roman state proper: see on 948.—"In the designation of Babylon as the great," says Hengstenberg, "there is a reference at the same time to her guilt; since she had only become great through her disregard of what is just and right."—Ordinarily, *to be remembered by God is for good,* but here (after Ps. 9; 12) for punishment. We may supplement the phrase from C. 18; 5; "God hath remembered her iniquities."

1109. *To give her the cup of the wine of the wrath of His anger.* There is here a superlative of the highest intensity. 'The wrath of the anger' is as 'the cream of the cup;' and it is an inflaming and
bitter potion: cp. C. 19; 15, and see on 950, 957.—The whore Babylon has a cup of her own mixing in her hand, when she first appears on the scene (17; 4), and of which she was wont to 'make all nations drink' (14; 8); and now, at the last, she has the 'cup of God's mixing' (14; 10) forced upon her, and 'in the cup which she hath filled, is filled to her double.'—In the symbolization of the parallel destruction of the literal Babylon (6; 17), the kings and others call upon the mountains to 'hide them from the wrath of the lamb; because the great day of his wrath is come.'—In the prelude to the trumpet which we are considering (see 11; 18), 'the coming of the wrath of God' is announced.

XVI; 20. 1110–11. And every island fled, and the mountains were not found. Of the four effects of the earthquake this is the only one, that is found in the parallel case. But what is predicatd of them here is stronger than in C. 6; 14. There, they were said only 'to be moved out of their places;' while 'to flee away' is in symbolic the strongest expression, that could be adopted (as may be seen by comparing C. 20; 11); and 'not to be found' is an equivalent for it (cp. 12; 8).—From the occurrence of mountains and islands together, in C. 6; 14 as well as here, it may be assumed, that, when occurring together in such a connexion, they are (as Hengstenberg also is of opinion) substantially one and identical in meaning. And the circumstance, that departure from their places is what is predicated of both alike, also shows this. Taking into account the relation in which they stand here to the other terms, they may be supposed to denote the smaller kingdoms and outlying states, partially dependent on Rome; though the signification arrived at under 440 would be quite admissible here.

XVI; 21. 1112. And a great hail [-storm] &c. Symbolic hail is introduced only in two other places. In the first trumpet (8; 7: where it is simply "hail") it does not form part of a formula, but appears to signify a deluging influx of marauding bands of enemies (see on 645). Hence we may infer, that hail is an independent symbol, and does not form an essential part of the formula of catastrophe; but, when superadded to it (as here), is appended as a supererogatory term to denote the climax and ne plus ultra of devastation. In C. 11; 19, also, "great hail" is attached as a fifth or supplemental term to the formula of catastrophe: and thus the last item, in what I consider to be a syllabus of the trumpet under consideration, is made to correspond in every particular with the present symbolization of the crisis of that trumpet, with the exception only of those intensifying additions, which are appropriate to the full and fully arrived exhibition of the catastrophe. This I take to be a conclusive proof of the correctness of my analysis of this part of the author's plan. From what
follows it will further appear, that this hail is distinguished from the formula-proper inasmuch as, while the latter is directed against the states in their corporate capacities as civil and ecclesiastical nationalities, and effects their subversion, the former is poured down upon certain persons to their individual annoyance and destruction,—a refutation of Hengstenberg's assertion, that "the seven plagues do not slight on individuals as such, but on the powers of the world."—Bengel thought, that "we have here the end of God's judgment on the earth," and both he and Hengstenberg have sought to account for the omission of the statement found under the fourth and fifth bowls, to the effect that 'these men repented not,' by the supposition that time was not given them to repent; since "this hail left no one in life, who was struck by it." But this is a very questionable solution. The last clause in the verse might be properly rendered, "because the wound of it was exceedingly severe," which implies, that the wound was not fatal. And the more natural construction of the passage seems to be, that the men blasphemed after they were struck; and consequently must have been left in life, and at any rate have had time to repent, so far as the hail was concerned. But whether so or not, it must be remembered, that this is only the symbolical representation.—As it were stones of a talent's weight. This was probably a common comparison to denote a very great weight. Josephus (Wars v; 6), speaks of stones of a talent's weight being thrown by the Roman engines during a siege; and the term is used in a Greek phrase, which means "terrible diseases." The Jewish talent was about 120 lbs. Of such hail we may well think, that what was said in Joshua's time would hold good; 'They were more that were slain by the hailstones, than those who were struck down by the first visitation of this plague;' and we cannot be surprised, that Bengel and Hengstenberg, in view of it, should have adopted the opinion just noticed. Still, a conclusion cannot be safely drawn from what merely seems to be implied in a simile, especially when the gist of the passage is opposed to the inference.—There is no more ground for supposing, that the plague of hail in Egypt has been had in view here, than in C. 11; 19.

1113. Come down from the heaven upon the men. As it was not necessary to insert from the heaven, it may be, that this phrase was added to indicate, that this great plague comes for the avenging of Christianity.—As before, not men in general are meant, but those who had previously been spoken of in vv. 3, 6, 8, 10, that is, the followers of the beast, the dwellers in Babylon, &c.

1114. And the men blasphemed God. This statement is made in three of the bowls as an intimation, that the opponents of Christianity were hopelessly hardened, and continued to the last to use 'the names
of blasphemy' (13; 1, 5, 6), wherewith from the first the beast and his worshippers had reviled or insulted the God of Christians. But there is a difference observable between the three places. In ver. 9 it is said; "They blasphemed the name of the god, who had the authority over these plagues:' in ver. 11; "They blasphemed the God of the heaven:' in ver. 21; "They blasphemed God." In the first it appears to be stated, that, as heathens, they blasphemed the particular god, whoever he might be, who had sent these plagues: in the second, that they blasphemed the God of Christians in particular: in the third, that they blasphemed 'all that is called God or is worshipped.' Thus, there is an ascending series of blasphemy. On the other hand, there is a descending series in the associated statement. For, in the fourth bowl it is said, that the men did not repent to such an extent as to give glory to God: in the fifth, that they did not even go so far as to repent from their works, i. e., to cease from persecutions (for repentance in the Apocalypse has reference, not only to a change of sentiment, but chiefly to a change of conduct: see on 649, 653, 1075): in the seventh, it would appear, that they had not 'space given them to repent;' not, however, because they were killed by the hail, but because the ruin of the beast's empire took from them the power to persecute. So that, as the plagues increased, their blasphemy increased and their repentance diminished: they hardened themselves yet more and more, and were finally given over to a reprobate mind.

1115. From [or out of the midst of, see on 1073] the plague of the hail. The word here rendered plague is in C. 13; 3, 13, commonly translated wound or stroke.

1116. Because the plague of it is exceedingly great. The use of the present tense, where the past might rather have been expected, may perhaps have been designed to intimate, that the events symbolized were regarded, as having already commenced at the time of writing. This superadded clause, (to which there is nothing similar in the other places, in which the men's blaspheming is spoken of)—this clause gives the finishing touch to the description, which makes manifest, that the seventh bowl contains the climactic and consummating plague,—that, which throws all the preceding ones into the shade, and makes them appear as trifles in comparison. This is, in short, the stroke, the finishing stroke to all the enemies of Christianity, and to great Babylon in particular. This seventh bowl is manifestly parallel to the vintage-work of the seventh angel in C. 14; 19–20, only with this difference, that that had more of the character of an ecclesiastical judgment, as this has of a political bouleversement.

1097–1116. The result on the whole, in respect of the real meaning of the seventh bowl, is this. The political or national result of the
war of Harmagedon is principally depicted, the symbolization of the
war itself being reserved to form the climax of the seventh blast of
the seventh trumpet, as being a more appropriate place for its intro-
duction. We see represented under this bowl, that the Lord has
decreed the downfall of all the powers hostile to Christ and Chris-
tianity, and that in the Providence of God a blow has been struck at
their foundations, which, in the course of time and by the operation
of natural causes, will lay them prostrate in the dust: I say, by the
operation of natural causes; for we can no more with reason look for
a supernatural intervention, nor suppose that such was contemplated,
in the instance of this seventh bowl, than in that of any of the others,
or of any of the other symbolizations.

As to the historical fulfilment of this prediction:—that, as a matter
of fact, it has been accomplished at the present time no doubt can exist.
The powers primarily contemplated have, either long since ceased to
exist, or been reduced to comparative nothingness. The Jewish
nation, as a political power capable of persecuting, perished at the
time. Rome and her subject kingdoms have long been blotted out of
the list of empires. And all heathen nations bow down to the powers
of Christendom. Christianity occupies the place then held by heathenism; and, from age to age, progressively gains ground on it:
while Judaism is reduced to comparative insignificance. The only
difficulty that can be felt is as to the time, when the accomplishment
was achieved. Now, to meet this, I would offer the following con-
siderations. First, if we are not led to expect (as we are not) a super-
natural intervention in the case of this seventh bowl any more than
of any of the others, such events as are symbolized in it could be
accomplished only in the course of time; and how long the time
might be could be estimated only by omniscience. Secondly, sym-
mbolic representation does not admit of any approach to a definition of
time, except by a succession of scenes and groupings of scenes. And
consequently, when a result simply is to be stated in a single scene,
all intervals or lapse of time must be left out of view, however great
they may be. All that can be expected in such a case is, that, if the
full and final result is to be brought about by a series of events, the
first of the series should be placed at the epoch of the symbolization,
and something like a continuity should be preserved, until the fulfil-
ment has been accomplished. This is all that can be required in the
case before us. To satisfy the requirement, I point to the destruc-
tion of Jerusalem and the dispersion of the Jews, as the first item
towards the accomplishment of the events symbolized in this bowl.
The contests for the empire, and the partial burning of Rome in the
conflict between the partisans of Vespasian and Vitellius, appear to
have been regarded, as a type and an earnest of the downfall of
Rome's power. Certainly, at this period causes began to operate, which sapped the strength of Rome, and ultimately caused the empire to fall to pieces, and become a prey to the barbarians. The removal of the seat of empire to Constantinople severed the kingdom in two, and despoiled Rome of her glory as the capital of the world. The establishment of Christianity by Constantine was a death-blow to the persecuting power of heathenism, and marked another step in the decline of pagan Rome. The final coup-de-grace was given by the Goths in a.d. 476.

I subjoin extracts, showing the sentiments of Stuart, Hengstenberg, and Browne on this point.—Stuart says; "It is only in the course of time (which is not limited), ... that the final extinction of the power of the beast takes place. And this, we should not fail to note, is in accordance with the fate of ancient Babylon. Her ruin was foretold in Is. xiii: xiv. It is there predicted, that "her time is near to come, and that her days shall not be prolonged." Yet it was at least seven centuries before this was fully and entirely accomplished. But the main work, the capture of the city, was speedily done. Her fall commenced with this capture; and she continued to fall, until at last she reached the bottom of the gulf of destruction. So with spiritual Babylon. The pledge, the symbol, or rather the commencement itself, of the final fall of the beast, began with the death of Nero, and the consequent cessation of persecution. Christianity, then in but an infant state, soon attained too much manhood and strength to be vanquished. Often was it attacked, and greatly annoyed; but, 'the blood of the martyrs was the seed of the church.' The gates of hell could not prevail against it."—Hengstenberg on C. 19; 4 says; "What was historically realised in the course of centuries is in the prophecy compressed into one scene. This prophetical mode of representation was not understood by many of the older expositors, who perceived that imperial Rome was the object of the threatening. Overlooking the difference between prophecy and history, they supposed, that in the history some single event was to be pitched upon, which the Seer must have had in his eye. Thus Grotius points to the taking of Rome under Attila, Bossuet to the taking of Rome under Alaric. They thus set in the place of the whole process, which developed itself in the history of the world, a single section of the process."—Browne in his Ordo Salicorum, p. 665, observes; "Events, which to the eye of the Seer and of his generation, lay contiguous or wrapt up together, now, on the retrospect, appear at wide distances. As in the landscape of a distant mountain range, the nearer heights lie blended with the more remote under one front and sky-line, and the interjacent vales and plains are withdrawn from the view; but, as the traveller advances, the scene gradually unfolds itself, the perspective opens more and more, at last
the objects lie for him in their true bearings: so is it with the time-
scene, which the Seer beheld in vision."

Summary of the prelude to the plague-angels. C. 15; 1 brings the
third Apocalyptic 'sign' on the scene. The angels of the final plagues
to be inflicted on the Roman empire are merely introduced in the first
verse, and then tacitly allowed to retire into the temple (see ve. 6)
while another scene is presented, in order that it may be seen, that
the latter is intimately connected with the mission of the angels, and
was not intended (as might otherwise have been supposed) to form by
itself the prelude. 2. In the prelude-proper those servants of the
Lamb, who had resisted all the efforts, whether by fraud or force,
which had been made by the heathen world-power to draw them from
their allegiance to their Lord, are represented as having been purified
'so as by fire,' and made capable of enduring the test of reflection in
heaven's bright and spotless mirror. 3. They are endowed with
the power and privilege of singing a song, which none but those who
had been at once Jews and Christian confessors could sing,—a song
of praise for having been partakers in the blessings and privileges of
both covenants. In it they give glory to Jesus, the Mediator of the
two covenants, for the might and marvellousness of his workings for
the deliverance of them, his persecuted people. They laud his truth
and righteousness in his dealings as sovereign lord of the heathen.
4. They declare, that all must stand in awe of him; and that to his
name shall be the glory given,—because he is the alone divine One,
—because all the heathen shall in time to come prostrate themselves
at his footstool,—because his righteous judgments in reference to them
and his people have been made manifest.—Both the parallelism, and
various indications which have been pointed out, show, that the same
parties (only under a different aspect) are symbolized here as in C. 14;
1-5. And, hence, in both preludes, their relation to and connexion
with their respective tableaux are the same. In both, the converted
Jews, who had been confessors of Christ (their conflict being ended,
and their crown won) are, for the encouragement of those who were then
placed in such circumstances, represented as being spectators of the
judgments, about to be inflicted by their great Captain on the beast
that had caused them to suffer so much. The appropriateness of pre-
senting such a contrast to the state of the enemies of Christ's people
under the plagues, which are about to be exhibited, must be self-
evident. 5. In the prelude-proper, the anticipatory song of praise
and triumph having been sung, the sacred place, where the Lord
keepeth 'the book of remembrance' of the testifyings of his saints,
and 'putteth their tears into his bottle' (Ps. 56; 8), is thrown open.
6. Thence issue forth the seven messengers, who, in fulfilment of the
"Lord's declarations, execute His wrath on the enemies of His people. Their apparel shows them to be now sent on a mission of vengeance.
7. These receive a commission from the Lion of the tribe of Judah forthwith to execute the fulness of that wrath. 8. Immediately, all access to the altar of intercession is debarred, in order that the wrath of God may have full scope to act in vindication of His power and glory. So that the day of grace under the Legal Dispensation is shown to be at an end. XVI; 1. And then, lastly, the command is given to the messengers of God to commence the work of retribution.

Synoptical interpretation of the fourth heptadal tableau of the seventh trumpet. XVI; 2. The first angel visits with a plague-stroke the once 'pleasant land,' Judea; and immediately the partisans of the heathen world-power are grievously harassed and afflicted. Inasmuch as Judea becomes at this epoch (from the Christian stand-point) a portion of the Roman beast's territory, the nation at large, and the calamities entailed by the Jewish war may be had in view in this bowl: or perhaps only the annoyances suffered by the Romanizing party among the Jews: A.D. 67-70. 3. The second angel smites the territory of heathen Rome; and its institutions become disorganized, and are perverted by tyrannical and vicious rulers,—Nero in particular, so that they are made unfit to sustain the political life and liberty of the people, and many lives are sacrificed: A.D. 67-70. 4. The third angel inflicts a scourge upon the dependencies of Rome, and feeders of her wealth and power; and a similar result is experienced among them from the rival competitors for the throne: A.D. 67-70. 5-6. Then the guardian-angel of the whole empire of Rome is poetically represented as coming forward, not to deprecate the vengeance hanging over it, but to recognize the holiness and justice of the ever-present Lord in these judgments; since it was right, that the same measure of blood, which the heathen had meted out to the Lord's servants, should be measured to them again; and they fully merited such retribution. 7. This recognition of the truth and righteousness of the Lord receives a response of the most conclusive kind. 8-9. The fourth angel makes the ruling sovereign, Nero, the medium of the divine wrath: and in consequence he subjects his professed servants to a torment as insufferable, as the being roasted alive before a slow fire. But they were only the more moved to utter imprecations on the god who chastised them: and they repent not, so as to give glory to God: A.D. 67 ss. 10-11. The fifth angel casts a blight on the dynasty of the Cæsars: and the first division of it is cut off by the abrupt termination of Nero's existence. So grievous were the calamities, that arose from the civil wars, which ensued in consequence, that the people gnashed their teeth as it were from the anguish of their sufferings. Yet they still blasphemed the God of
Christianity, in the midst of the miseries which they endured from the vices and contentions of their rulers; and they repented not from their ill treatment of God's servants: A.D. 68–9. 12. The sixth angel smites the district watered by the Tiber, that is, the sources of Rome's vigour and prosperity, in order that the way might be prepared for the accession of a dynasty of Caesars, who should come from the east, namely, the Flavian dynasty consisting of Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian. 13. The drying up of the resources of Rome (it is episodically signified) was effected by the agency of the three diabolical instruments of Satan, Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, who had the opportunity afforded them by the course of conduct pursued by the army, by the Julian dynasty, and by Vespasian in his tarrying in Judea to abide the course of events. 14. The wars of these 'three rebels' (as Suetonius calls them) prepared a way for the chiefs of the Flavian dynasty, and led them to aspire to the throne; and, in so doing, those chiefs were ultimately brought to enter on that conflict with the servants of the Lord, which, in the providence of God, was made to issue in the extermination of their dynasty. 15. In view of this, let a pause be made for a word of warning to the Lord's people. 'I Jesus am on the very point of coming; and, as I shall come (even as a thief comes) without warning, and when least expected, happy he, who is always on the look-out, and who habitually keeps himself from all those defiling pollutions, which result from the smallest participation in the idolatrous compliances of the beast's followers, and which render a man liable to a shameful exposure.' 16. It was stated, that the angel caused the way to be prepared for the kings from the east. It remains to be added in conclusion, that he caused them to attain to the place of conflict. 17. The seventh angel smites Satan's special sphere of action, and in so doing strikes at the source of Rome's power. Then the voice of the God of Christianity declared; 'Rome's doom is sealed.' 18. Immediately a universal overthrow of all the enemies of Christianity, civil and ecclesiastical, is symbolized. 19–20. Judaism, and the Jewish state and polity fall to pieces and are brought to ruin:—and this was wrought with accomplished. Heathenism, and heathen states in general are cast down from the pre-eminence, which they have hitherto possessed; in particular, Rome, the great power of heathendom, is made the subject of the bitterest wrath of God, and her remotest dependencies are involved in her ruin:—all of which has been accomplished in the Providence of God. 21. Moreover, besides the destruction of nationalities and abstract powers, the heathen are individually visited with a series of dire calamities. They proved to be, however, hopelessly hardened; and only the more blasphemed against God.—Thus ends the fourth tableau, which forms a series of crises corresponding to the third, its
Miscellaneous interpretations.


**HEPTAD XXI: FIFTH BLAST OF THE SEVENTH TRUMPET.** The whore on the beast from the abyss: Rome-proper, and the dynasty of the Caesars specialized in Vespasian. A.D. 64–70. Ch. xvii.

*Introductory remarks.* The two last series were devoted to a chronological epoch, which gave them the character of supplements or crises to the two first. This, on the other hand, retrogrades so far as to give it the aspect of a series parallel to the latter: and this view is confirmed by the circumstance of this series having, in the next heptad, a crisis appropriate to it. Yet it does not really retrograde to the extent, that may be supposed from the circumstance of the seven heads and ten horns of the beast being introduced; for these are not all brought separately into the history here depicted, but have been included of necessity, and (as in the case of the dragon, and of the first beast) for the sake of completeness, and in order to the identification of the thing signified. The point, at which this series takes up the history, is shown by ve. 6 to be later than the Neronic persecution, which began in A.D. 64.—While this *tableau* is evidently intended to present a pair of substantive symbols (as in the case of each of the parallel lines, Chs. 12, 13), it is manifest, that they are not meant to be put on a par. "The whore on the beast" (ve. 3), and not 'the whore and the beast' indicates this. And the title virtually given to the next series, in ve. 1, to which this serves as an
introduction, namely, "the judgment of the great whore," places it beyond doubt; and shows, that the beast is introduced subordinately and incidentally.

DIV. I. INTRODUCTORY. THE GREAT WHORE. *Rome: her character exhibited.*

XVII; 1-5. 1117-1186. And there came one of the seven angels, who had the seven bowls. And he spake with me, saying; 'Come, I will show thee the judgment of the great fornicatress, who sitteth upon the many waters, with whom the kings of the earth have fornicated, and they who dwell on the earth have been made intoxicated by the wine of her fornication.' And he carried me away in spirit into a desert. And I beheld a woman seated on a scarlet wild-beast, [which was] full of names of blasphemy, [and] had seven heads and ten horns. And the woman was clothed with a purple and scarlet [garment]; and gilded with gold, and costly stone, and pearls; holding in her hand a golden cup, full of abominations; and [holding] the unclean [things] of her fornication; and [having] upon her forehead a name written; 'Mystery, Babylon the great, the mother of the fornicatresses and of the abominations of the earth.'

1117. One of the seven, &c. Hengstenberg says; "That one simply of the seven angels is spoken of, without determining which, shows that the matter turns not on the personality of the angel, but only on the genus. The function being attributed to one of the angels must point to a close connexion, subsisting between this" and the next preceding series. The nature of that connexion will lead us to see, why one of the plague-angels is made the hierarch of this and the next heptads, Cs. 17 and 18. C. 16 is filled with an account of the outpouring of the last plagues on the Babylonian, i.e., the Roman empire in its widest extent, its first six bowls making preparation for the final overthrow, exhibited in the seventh. Parallel to this, Cs. 17 and 18 contain an amplification of the same history in reference to one part of that empire (namely, Rome-proper), C. 17 being introductory, and devoted to the primary causes and preparatory events, and C. 18 exhibiting the final 'judgment' and catastrophe. The propriety of one (and probably the seventh or principal) of the actors, in the former and more condensed series, being made in such a case the hierarch, in the subsequent and more detailed representation in reference to the principal subject of the former, is self-evident. It may not, however, appear so evident, why one of these plague-angels should subsequently (21; 9) have been introduced as the hierarch of the new Jerusalem: and I may therefore be allowed to advert to this point, though it is not immediately connected with the present place. That there has been a design to place the two cities, Babylon and the
new Jerusalem, the ‘abominable’ and the ‘holy’ cities, the whore and the bride (the lamb’s wife), in strong contrast appears from the two tableaux having been set (so to speak) in similar frames, that is, they are brought before the reader in terms, that are verbally identical in every particular, that the circumstances admitted:—with C. 17; 1, 3, cp. C. 21; 9, 10. Now, further to connect the two by a bond that might direct attention from the one to the other, and so to present them as companion-pictures in a way of contrast, appears to have been the reason for assigning the same hierophant to both.

1118. Who had or have, &c. As to the sense, in which this clause is used, see on 1002.

1119. He spake...saying. To me is added in the R. T., but rejected in critical editions; and the propriety of the rejection is confirmed by the absence of the word in C. 21; 9.

1120. Come. Cp. C. 6; 1, 3, 5, 7.—I will show thee. Hengstenberg remarks; “The judgment does not actually proceed here, as in the vials, but is only shown.” No grounds can be alleged, however, for predating any difference between the two chapters in this respect. In both, the things to be revealed are shown by symbols; and the only difference is, that, inasmuch as what was to be communicated in C. 17 and 18 did not admit of being represented to the eye, the symbolization was supplemented by the verbal description of an angel.—Stuart says; “Show, viz. by signs or symbols; for the word is particularly adapted to signify this.” But, if the word used in No. 5, and also that in 1143, be compared, it will be evident, I think, that the term here has been selected (as being perfectly generic) rather with the view to avoid limiting the idea to symbols; and thus to allow of this being regarded (as it is found to be in fact) as an explanation of even more than an exhibition by symbols. The judgment is shown by an explanation of the symbols, which exhibit it. And if explanation be the prominent feature, we may rightly expect to find here a greater literality than ordinary in the use of terms.—The judgment. Hengstenberg remarks; “The angel would show John the judgment of the whore. John has properly to do here only with the woman; what he says of the beast, of his heads and horns, serves only as a foundation for what he has to say of the woman; and what is said in other respects of the woman, serves only as a preparation for the judgment.”—The author of the Asc. Ex. breaks off his account of Josiah’s prophecy by referring his readers for the rest to the Vision of Babylon, meaning apparently Is. xiii, xiv, xxi, in which he expects them to find a type of the judgment on the mystical Babylon, Rome.—Of the great fornicatrix. See on 778.—I have chosen to adopt the term, which would admit of the greatest uniformity of translation in reference to the original: see on 102.—The
primary idea, that connects itself with the word _whore_, is that of one seeking sensual gratification, or the indulgence of lust in its proper sense; and, as representing this idea, and by reason of the hateful-ness thereof in God's sight, the word is constantly used in Scripture as the figurative term for idolatry. But a whore sells herself for gain; and hence there is connected with her the idea of covetousness or lust of wealth. This idea would attach to her, also, from the circumstance, that houses of public entertainment were usually kept by women of bad character; insomuch that the Hebrew word for _whore_ is derived from one, which signifies _to entertain strangers_. "From this notion," says Wemyss, "of a whore being a trader and entertainer of strangers, the city of Tyre, which was the finest mart in the world at that time, is, by the prophet Isaiah, called an harlot, in C. 23; 16, and so likewise Nineveh, in Nahum 3; 4. Whoring and trading are therefore synonymous, and to this purpose, see Is. 23; 17." Again, a whore takes up her vile trade in part from motives of vanity, and in order to obtain the means of decking herself out in such meretricious adornments, as may attract the admiration and envy of others; and hence there arises in connexion with her the idea of lust of admiration and exaltation, implying power. Now, all these three ideas may be attached to the whore Babylon; but specially and prominently the two last. The second (lust of wealth and the luxuries which it brings) clearly appears in what is said throughout C. 18 of her commerce with the merchants by land and sea. The third (ambition and lust of power) is seen in her connexion with and authority over the kings of the earth (vv. 1, 18, &c.), and in the ingredient of 'wrath' which is infused into the cup of her fornication (14; 8: 18; 3, cp. 19; 2). The three may be thought to appear together in C. 18; 3. And, with regard more particularly to the first (unlawful commerce with false gods):—though (as I have shown on 950) Babylon, as a city and state, is not charged with promoting _directly_ that particular form of idolatry, which consisted in worshipping the beast or his image, and _may_ not be _specifically_ or _exclusively_ charged with up-holding and promoting idol-worship in general; yet, that the latter is included in the charge made against her in this chapter, there can be, I think, no reasonable doubt (with C. 2; 20 cp. 18; 23). And therefore, as by Babylon I understand pagan Rome to be meant, it will be proper to notice here an argument which has been advanced against this view.—It has been said, that the charge of promoting idol-worship, and that too by persecution, could not have been brought against _pagan_ Rome; because, far from being intolerant in matters of religion, she was lax in the extreme. This is true to a certain extent, and in a particular direction; but as to these only. She allowed the utmost liberty for the
worship of false gods, and the introduction of an unlimited number of these into the Pantheon; and she accorded perfect freedom to any who received her gods, to add to them as many more as they pleased. But she had no tolerance for those, who adhered to the worship of the one God; and who consequently refused to 'serve her gods, or worship the images, which she thought proper to set up.' In other words, she was abundantly tolerant towards pagans, who would yield to her authority, when it was exercised; but she had no tolerance for Jews or Christians, who would not so yield. Indeed, the very extent of her own tolerance towards the former made her only the more intolerant towards the latter. For, being herself, though the ruling power, ever ready to recognize the gods of her subject-kingdoms, she could not understand, why any of them should object to acknowledge any god, whom she might think proper to canonize. And hence a refusal to do so, especially when it came from one of the least and most despised of the many kingdoms and sects, that had submitted to her sway, could appear to the Romans only in the light of the most insane treason and causeless rebellion (see Vol. I: 483). Consequently, if we knew not what was actually the fact, we might reasonably presume, that in such a case Rome would become a persecuting power. But the facts are well known. And the circumstance that the allusions of the text are made to the events of Nero's reign, when Rome, by her ruling magistrate, unquestionably did (and that for the first time) persecute Christians as Christians, and when she also sought to coerce the Jews into idolatrous compliances,—this circumstance is quite sufficient to obviate the objection, and to make every statement that is found perfectly consistent with the history, to which I suppose the text to refer. It should be observed, that Rome, is not in any way exhibited as being the only fornicatress; but, on the contrary, as the fostering 'mother' of others, and as 'the great whore,' by reason of the extent to which she carried her fornications, and the encouragement she gave to others to do the same. And it may further be observed, that, even if the objection had the weight, which those who advance it attribute to it, the object they have in view (namely, to bring in the alternative, that a Christian Church must be meant) would not be attained. Bossuet's reply may suffice to show this. "The prophets have said as much of Tyre, Nineveh, and Babylon, which unquestionably were not corrupt churches." I may add, that those nations certainly did not persecute on religious grounds, so directly as Rome did. Yet Wordsworth (Is the Church of R. &c.? p. 69) has been bold enough to state the argument thus. "The whore is represented as enticing 'the kings of the earth to commit fornication with her.' . . . This assuredly does not apply to heathen Rome. . . . She would have opened wide her doors to vol. II.
Christianity, if Christianity had been content to be enshrined with heathenism. But these words are strikingly characteristic of Papal Rome." The answer is obvious. Christianity was not content to be enshrined with heathenism; and hence pagan Rome was led to persecute Christians for being Christians, which papal Rome never did.—With the same object of showing, that a Church must be meant, Wordsworth has advanced an equally sophistical argument in these terms. 'A harlot is the (!) scriptural name of a faithless Church: and this Church can only be the Church of Rome (p. 54). No doubt, 'a harlot' is a scriptural name of a faithless Church, but it is also a scriptural designation of a hostile heathen power. (Cp. on 796.) Consequently, as the question at issue is, which is meant, the designation alone can prove nothing.—Wordsworth, again, has put forth the following argument (p. 67). "The False Prophet is said to have two horns like the horns of a Lamb. Now the word Lamb is used twenty-nine times in the Apocalypse, and in every one of these places it relates to Christ, the Lamb of God. Hence it is clear that the False Prophet, who is the ally of the Beast on whom the Harlot sits, makes a profession of Christianity. He is not therefore an infidel power. He is therefore the Minister of some form of Christianity, or Church. Therefore, again, the Harlot is a Church." Were so many sophistries ever before strung together in so small a space? Not a step in the argument will bear examination. 1. The false prophet is not said to have two horns, &c. The beast from the earth is; but this symbol has its characterizing signification, as distinct from that of the false prophet, as that of the whore is from both (see on 889). 2. In the clause quoted, the word lamb is used in a simile; but not so in any of the other places. Hence, no inference can safely be drawn from the latter, in reference to the use in the former. 3. In that clause the word is used indefinitely ('a lamb'): in all the other places definitely ('the lamb'). 4. In the former Christ is not meant (see on 891): in the latter he is. 5. The number of times, that the word is used in one sense, proves nothing. For a word may be used thirty times in a literal sense, and only once in a figurative; or vice versæ, as is the case here. The word temple is used above seventy times in the N. T. to denote a building. Could it thence be argued, that it must mean a building in John 2; 19; 'Destroy this temple' (cp. vs. 21)? I might, in like manner, go on to point out fallacies in the Doctor's inferences: but more than enough has been said to set aside his conclusion.—On the other hand, an argument has been drawn from the use of the word fornicatress, with the view to show, that a Christian Church could not be meant. If it had been, adulteress, it is said, would have been the term applied to the woman. But this, it must be allowed, is not a conclusive, but only a presumptive argument,
though strong in proportion to the probability there may appear to be, that the epithet adulterous would have been introduced. It is not conclusive; because, if the more immediate object was to exhibit the frequency and grossness of the offences committed, the term whore, in the sense of a common strumpet, might be used, even though the offender stood in the nearness of relation, which a wife bears to her husband; and so the term actually is used in reference to the Jewish Church in many places of the Old Testament. Nevertheless, if the object was (as it certainly was in this instance) to portray the offender in the worst possible colours, the presumption is very strong indeed, that the designation, which would best subserve that object by bringing forward the worst feature of the guilt, would not be withheld. In numerous precedents, e.g., in Je. 2; 2: 3; 8, 9, 14: 5; 7: 13; 27: 31; 32: Eze. 16, esp. vs. 32: 23, esp. vv. 37, 43: Ho. 5; 1, 3: 4; 12–15, both terms are introduced in speaking of the Israelitish Church. And in some passages, in which the word adultery is not actually used, the sin itself is implied in the form of the expression, as, e.g., in the phrase, 'They went a whoring after other gods,' in which the whole weight of the charge lies in the implied covenant-relation to one god. Now it is scarcely credible, that, if the Christian Church—the Church which Christ 'espoused to himself,'—"the bride, the lamb's wife," had been had in view, she would not in like manner have been stigmatized as an adulteress, as well as a fornicatress; or at least some form of expression have been used, which would have implied her covenant-relation to her Lord. This strong presumption is much increased by the fact, that in this very book (2; 21–22) both terms actually are used in reference to a heathenizing Church. It is further increased, too, by the consideration, that the introduction of the term adulteress, if a Church had been meant, would have served to guard against the error (in that case), into which there was so manifest a probability that readers would fall, of supposing a heathen body to be meant. On the other hand, all that can be alleged to account for the absence of the designation is, that it was 'unsuitable to a heathen symbol.' It is, however, scarcely justifiable to term this a heathen symbol (supposing a Christian Church to be symbolized by it), merely from a name having been borrowed from a heathen city. Moreover, the charge of incongruity would lie with more force against making a heathen city a symbol of a Christian Church at all. And it is pushing congruity quite too far to suppose, that the author would sacrifice the chief count in his indictment for the sake of avoiding so trifling an incongruity. Such a supposition might be refuted, too, by an abundance of cases in point. For the term, if it had been introduced, would have been used only by a sort of constructio ad sensum of the kind, of which there are (in principle) many...
examples; and in reference to which I have already shown (see on 600), that in a representation by symbols it must necessarily be the case, that the subordinate descriptive terms will frequently be taken from the thing symbolized. On these grounds I cannot admit the validity of the reason assigned; but must think, that there is a presumption of the very strongest kind, that, if the whore had been intended to symbolize a Christian Church, she would have been stigmatized explicitly or by implication as an adulteress. That she represents, or is a co-ordinate symbol with, a city is plainly stated in ve. 18. What we are there to understand by a city will come to be considered, when we arrive at that text. Here it will only be in place to remark, that the way in which the whore is introduced manifestly presupposes, that no difficulty would be found in recognizing what was the thing signified. But this could not have been the case with John's contemporaries, if the Church of Rome had been intended. Neither has it been the case with the great majority of the Christian world down to the present day, if that Church was really had in view.

The epithet great (which is emphasized by two articles) has been derived, as well as the whore's name, from 'the great city Babylon' (14; 8: 16; 19); and this from Da. 4; 30; "Is not this great Babylon that I have built?" That which, when applied to the city, in one point of view exalts it, when transferred to the whore, no less degrades her.

1121. Who sitteth [or is sitting] upon the many waters. A precedent for such a sitting upon waters may be found in Da. 12; 6.—To sit upon denotes to rule over (vv. 15, 18); just as, on the contrary, to come down from an elevated seat, and sit on the ground, signifies to be deposed from ruling: Is. 47; 1; "Come down, and sit in the dust, O virgin daughter of Babylon! Sit on the ground. There is no throne, O daughter of the Chaldeans."—The many waters represent "many peoples, &c." see ve. 15. The adjective is emphasized in the genuine text by two articles. Many waters may be made a symbol of many peoples, by reason either of the idea of multitudinousness which they convey, or of that of prosperity (abundance of water being productive of plenty, and a large population being the strength of a nation), or of that of commotion and uproar; for either or all of these points of similarity would be suitable under different circumstances. But, despite all that Hengstenberg has to say to the contrary, I cannot but think, that when, as in this instance, heathen peoples—those who are regarded as being "like the troubled sea, when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt,"—when these are had in view, the last is primarily, if not exclusively, the point of comparison, the waters being contemplated as raging under a mighty wind.
XVII; 2. 1122. With whom the kings of the earth have fornicated.
This is one of the instances, in which we cannot judge from the clause taken by itself, whether the term earth is used literally or symbolically. The general rule would favour the latter construction. But we must remember, that we have now before us a professed explanation. And hence, on this account, we might rather perhaps expect a literal use. If this be the case, we may refer to Is. 23; 15 ss. for a precedent; since in the LXX of that passage (in which Tyre is represented as a whore, on account of her trading) the corresponding phrase is rendered by μαγευσα της βασιλειας. Yet the difference in the last term in this phrase, as compared with that in the clause before us, leads to the opinion, that the word earth in the latter is used symbolically. And if such be its use, the term will denote Judea; and kings must be taken in its usual Apocalyptic sense (cp. De. 33; 5), as meaning rulers in general. Then, the Roman generals in Judea who enforced 'the worship of the beast,' and also the Herods, the Romanizing High Priests, and other leaders of the same party, may all be comprehended in it.—That the kings here spoken of cannot be the same with the ten kings mentioned in ve. 10 is evident from the circumstance, that these seek the harlot's favours, whereas those tear her and make her desolate: ve. 16.—Have fornicated. In the N. T. fornication, avarice, and ambition, as being only different kinds of lusting (the lust of the flesh, the lust of money, and the lust of power), and therefore closely related one to another, are placed in the most intimate connexion; and especially the first two, fornication being made the emblem of literal idolatry, and covetousness the synonyme for spiritual idolatry (cp. Ro. 7; 7: 1 Th. 4; 5, 6: 1 Jo. 2; 16). And so in this passage there are indications, that avarice and ambition are indirectly, if not directly brought within its scope; that is to say, these are the two principal inducements, which have led the kings to idolatrous compliances with the heathen harlot, who has her residence in Rome.—If we would obtain a correct idea of the sense, in which the verb to fornicate and its derivatives are used in the Apocalypse, we must call to mind the nature of the Jewish constitution: and it is in a great measure owing to this not having been done, that difficulties have been experienced in interpreting the terms, and that wide and interminable differences of opinion have arisen. The Jewish constitution was originally a theocracy; and down to the latest times Jehovah was more or less regarded, as being the civil as well as spiritual head of the Commonwealth. The Jews appear even to have considered, that all nations owed to Him the same direct civil allegiance that they did. So that, for any to refuse to render to Him either spiritual or civil allegiance was sufficient to constitute them fornicators. And certainly, the use of the term in the Old
Testament would seem to have in view, generally and prominently, the rendering civil allegiance to any ruler, who was not a worshipper of, and had not derived his authority from Jehovah. Hence, in the eyes of a zealous Jew, for any rulers of the nation to be partizans of a foreign power, even though that power required only civil obedience, would be to fornicate with it: it would be a species of idolatry.

1123. And they who dwell on the earth. The technicality of this phrase, and the sense in which it so frequently occurs (see on 571), as denoting the Roman invaders of Judea or their partizans, appear to me to decide the question raised on the last number, and to show, that the earth is used symbolically to denote Judea.

1124-5. Have been made intoxicated by the wine of her fornication. See on 950, and cp. 1198. The precedent here has doubtless been Je. 51; 7; "Babylon bath been a golden cup in the Lord's hand, that made all the earth drunken: the nations have drunken of her wine; therefore the nations are mad." Stuart says; "The sentiment is: Rome, wholly given to idolatry and to worshipping the beast, has allured and seduced all its tributary nations to do the same." But to this stands opposed the palpable fact, that the nations had themselves ever been 'wholly given to idolatry;' and consequently could have afforded no opportunity to Rome to allure or seduce them to it. I take the meaning to be, that Rome, through their hopes or fears, induced a considerable body of the chief men among the Jews to advocate submission to her mandates (which involved joining her against those, who were on the Lord's side); and that her own myrmidons were led to act insanely, like men drunk, in their mad attempts to enforce an idolatrous compliance with her decrees, and they, like herself (see on 1137) were made "drunk with the blood of the saints" of Judea (cp. 16; 6).

XVII; 3. 1126. And he carried me in spirit into a desert. So Daniel had been transported in vision to the river Ulai (Da. 8; 2), and so Ezekiel was carried from place to place.—The seer is careful to say, that it was only in spirit or ecstasy, that is, in the ideal, not in the real world, that he was removed (see on 37).—He had been previously standing (as it would seem from C. 13; 1) on the seashore. He is now transported, not to 'the desert,' into which the glorious matron had twice fled as into a place of refuge (see on 796, 836), but into 'a desert,'—'a place of desolation,' accounted to be one of "perils," and 'the resort of foul spirits and horrid demons,'—a place appropriate for seeing the great fornicatress "made desolate" (ve. 16: cp. 18; 2, 16 v.k.), just as 'the great and high mountain' (21; 10) was for seeing the glories of the new Jerusalem.—"In Je. 1. and li. the threatening constantly returns, that ancient Babylon should be turned into a
wilderness; and in Is. 21: 1 Babylon on account of the approaching desolation, is called the desert of the sea.”

1127. And I beheld a woman sitting on a scarlet wild beast. A woman is commonly made “the symbol of a city or body politic” (Wemyss), as well by profane as by the sacred writers: cp. on 778. Thus, in Æschylus, Persia and Greece are represented by two women. On medals too, and in inscriptions, and by statues cities are frequently personified as women.—To sit upon commonly denotes, as I showed on 1121, to rule over. Proceeding on this basis, Hengstenberg argues; “If we understand by the beast heathen Rome, or if we understand by it the papacy, the sitting of the woman on the beast cannot be explained but with the greatest arbitrariness.” As the best mode of meeting this assertion, in so far as it relates to heathen Rome, I will offer an explanation, and then leave to the reader to judge, how far my exposition is to be considered ‘arbitrary,’—by which epithet I understand Hengstenberg to mean, resting on no better foundation than the expositor’s fancy.—But, in the first place, I would just mention some other views, either of which it would be more reasonable to adopt, than to have recourse to Hengstenberg’s solution, in which Rome,—a substantive existence, appears in union with ‘the ungodly power of the world in general,’—an abstract idea. And first, if the primary object was to symbolize an intimate connexion and alliance between the whore and the beast, no other disposition of them could have been made than is made; for their relative positions could not possibly have been reversed. If, then, it was deemed an essential point to signify such a connexion, the risk of error, from the incidental and unavoidable introduction of what might be taken for a point in the symbolization, must necessarily be run. It may be, then, that the sole object here was to symbolize an intimate alliance between the whore and the beast, and that the sitting of the former on the latter was not meant to be taken into account, further than as the means of denoting this alliance. Again, the whore is described (ve. 15) as ‘sitting upon the many waters,’ while here she is said to sit upon the beast. How could she sit upon both at once? If it be thought necessary to produce consistency between the two statements, the beast must be regarded, as bearing or carrying her over the waters, that is, she is sustained by him upon them. And this view may be thought to be corroborated by the circumstance, that, when the two are mentioned together afterwards, they are described, not as ‘the beast and the woman that sitteth upon him, but as ‘the woman and the beast that carrieth her.’ Hence, some may think, that the idea intended to be conveyed is, that the woman is indebted to the beast for being placed and maintained in the position she occupies, that is (in plain terms), Rome owes her dominion over the nations to the
Cæsars. And no doubt, seeing that the dominion of Rome was greatly extended, and her power established and concentrated by the first Cæsars, this view might plausibly be taken. Once more, in ve. 9 the woman is said to sit on the seven mountains, which are signified by the seven heads of the beast. Here the meaning of 'to sit' evidently is to be located upon. And hence it may be thought, that, by the woman's sitting on the beast (more especially 'on his heads') is signified nothing more than, that the city intended is located on seven hills.—I proceed now to the solution, which is in my opinion the true one. And first I observe, that the ordinary symbolic signification of sitting upon, namely, ruling over, is shown to hold good in this place by two considerations. 1st. The relation, in which the two symbols stand to one another, establishes it. This is not a case of being seated in an ordinary way upon an inanimate object, as upon the earth, or upon a seat. And, whenever a person is represented as sitting upon a horse or other animal, it is naturally signified thereby, on the ground that the rider is master of the animal he rides and directs its movements, that the thing symbolized by the rider is ruler of that symbolized by the animal ridden: see on 389. 2dly. In ve. 18 the woman is explicitly declared to be the ruling power. This, then, being the case, I would further observe, that the symbol must not be regarded, as though it stood alone, and were unaccompanied by an explanation; but, while the signification of the compound symbol is taken into account, due regard must be had to the history of it which is appended. Therein we are told (vv. 13, 16, 17), that the beast, by means of his horns, 'will make the woman desolate and naked, and will eat her flesh and burn her with fire.' While, then, the woman rules the beast, the beast at the same time rends and destroys the woman. There is in this an apparent contrariety, to which it is scarcely possible, that more than one, and that the true solution should be adapted. But, on my view, the facts will be seen to accord most accurately with the symbolism. Be it remembered, that I consider the whore to represent Rome-proper, regarded in its popular republican constitution, in contradistinction from the arbitrary imperial régime, introduced by the Cæsars, and symbolized by the beast and his horns. Now, under the Cæsars, the republic continued to exist in theory. All decrees were made in the name of 'The Senate and people of Rome.' The Cæsars were professedly only the officers of the republic,—the imperatores or commanders in chief, the proconsuls, tribunes, censors, &c.; to which offices they were from time to time elected in conformity with the ancient customs. So that the republic was rightly represented to the eye, as being the ruling power. But, at the same time, as a matter of fact the Cæsars were the autocratic rulers of the state; and they rent the republican consti-
tution to shreds, and utterly subverted it. If, now, the interpretation, which exhibits so exact an accordance between the symbolization and the facts, can rightly be designated as 'arbitrary,' there must be an end to all hope of ever understanding the Apocalypse.—With regard to the interpretation on the antipapistical hypothesis, I leave to the advocates of that theory to defend it, as they best can. If the whore be taken to represent the Church of Rome (according to the common explanation) or the city of Rome (with Bengel), and the beast the empire of Rome from the kings to the popes (as it ought to be), or even under the popes only (said to be represented by the eighth head), I can imagine no plausible account, that can be given of the whore's sitting upon the beast.—Wordsworth, one of the expositors of this school, makes the following statements. "The Woman upon the Beast is the City and Church of Papal Rome" (p. 48). "The Woman sits on the Beast as on a throne, that is, governs it, and is supported by it" (p. 45). "The eighth head is the Beast on which the Woman sitteth" (p. 53). [N.B. For the last assertion there is not an iota of proof in the text.] The eighth head he interprets as representing the popes (pp. 53, 75). Hence it follows, on his own showing, that the Church of Rome governs and is supported by the popes, instead of the popes governing and being supported by the Church of Rome. This conclusion is, moreover, directly opposed to the citations, which he adduces elsewhere from addresses to the popes: e.g., "Head of the Church, Ruler of the world!" "Know thyself to be the Father of Kings and Princes, Ruler of the World."—A beast. See on 850.—Stuart, Hengstenberg, and Elliott speak of this beast as being "the same" with the one from the sea (C. 13). But this is merely because they are unable to account for any difference between them. That we read here "a beast" and not 'the beast' is sufficient to show, that the two are not intended to be considered as absolutely identical. Hengstenberg, indeed, asserts, that the absence of the article "is to be explained on the ground, that the Seer describes what he saw." But, that this explanation will not suffice to account for its absence, if the same symbol had been mentioned previously, or even tacitly had in view, may be seen by comparing, on the one hand, C. 11: 7: 19: 19: 10: 1 (cpd. with 4: 3): 11: 12 (cpd. with 10: 1): 14: 1 (in which texts the article is used), and on the other hand, C. 4: 4: 6: 5: 6: 6: 2 ss.: 9: 1 (cp. 8: 10): 12: 1, 3: 13: 1: 14: 1 (cp. 7: 4): &c. (in which the article is not used). Various differences, too, which will appear as we proceed, will further establish the non-identity. At the same time, that both are "beasts" suffices to show, that they are generically identical: and the validity of this view has been fully demonstrated on 726, 850, 889, 1083. How far they correspond, and in what respects they differ, will appear in the course of exposition,
and especially from ve. 8.—That this is described as 'a scarlet beast,' which the former was not, is one indication of diversity. *Scarlet has doubtless been assigned to the whore and the beast, from a regard to similarity both of appearance and of signification. In both symbols, it may denote at once supreme authority and a bloodthirsty disposition: and, with a view to take in this twofold signification, the colour may have been slightly varied from that of the red dragon. These two partake of the bloodthirstiness of the dragon; but, in addition to this, the connexion between the republic and the imperial despotism is indicated by an identity of the beast's colour with a part of the whore's vestment. Hengstenberg says; "Scarlet colour is employed as being the colour of blood. It is so used in Is. 1; 18, and also in the symbolism of the Law." And this interpretation is borne out by the whore being represented in ve. 6, as 'drunk with the blood of the saints.' The beast from the sea was described as being sufficiently bloodthirsty (13; 7); but that quality in him was comparatively so insignificant, that this may be depicted as being by comparison 'the bloody beast.'

1128. [A beast] full of names of blasphemy:—just as the four zoë were full of eyes: 4; 6, 8. Here is another mark of difference between the two beasts; for the former had only "on his heads names [or, a name] of blasphemy." This beast, therefore, far exceeded the other in derogating from the Divine majesty:—As to the signification see on 858, 870–4, 903.

1129. Having seven heads and ten horns. Here, on the other hand, is a clear mark of substantial identity; for the numerical agreement, supported by all the circumstances, can leave no doubt, that the two beasts represent the same corporate body, in the same locality, and under the same kings. But, on comparing C. 12; 3 and 13; 1, it will be seen, that, while the order, in which the dragon's heads and horns are mentioned, agrees with that in the case of this beast, in respect of the former beast the order is inverted. This difference may have been made in order to indicate a contrast with the former, and with a view to greater congruity with the whore, Rome being in this scene primarily contemplated in her civic and republican capacity, but in the former in her imperial aspect: see on 786, 851–2.—That Rome is here primarily viewed in her republican aspect, is further and more conclusively shown by the entire omission in this place of the regal diadems, which in C. 12; 3 were placed on the dragon's seven heads; and in C. 13; 1 on the beast's ten horns. Hence, while in C. 12 the bestial symbol has seven diadems, and in C. 13 ten diadems, here it has none. This I take to be a clear indication, that in the first instance the coercive or military, in the second the despotic or imperio-civil (see I. p. 36), and in the third the
republican is the salient characteristic of the thing signified, which is intended to be brought prominently to view in the several scenes.—We may note here, too, that the diadems being on all or on none of the members indicates a uniformity or parity between the latter, inter se, which does not exist on the antipapistical theory, according to which the heads denote Kings, Consuls, Dictators, &c.—We may, also, notice the omission here of the following particulars, mentioned in respect of the first beast:—his primary origin from the sea, his pantherlike body, his bear's feet, his lion's mouth, the draconic origin of his throne, his slain head, his mouth speaking blasphemies, and his warring on the saints. As a general rule, and if there be no reason to suppose the contrary, I think, that we should take silence, in a case in which general identity is indicated, to imply, that the things omitted are to be left out of the account, in so far as respects the symbol as it is now brought before the reader.

The result on the whole, in respect of the whore on the beast, is, that they form one composite symbol, which represents the city and state of Rome as theoretically republican, but really ruled by the Caesars, the whore exhibiting specially the seductive and grasping side of its character, and the beast the compulsory aspect thereof, as a heathen world-power, tyrannically ruling over and persecuting the servants of the true God.

XVII; 4. 1130. And the woman was clothed with a purple and scarlet garment. So 'the city' Babylon is said to be clothed and gilded in C. 18; 16,—a clear mark of the identity of the two, if any were wanted.—Op. Jo. 19; 2, and Mt. 27; 28; "They put on Him [a purple] a scarlet robe." These two texts would furnish proof, if it were required, that the apparel of the woman is significant of the rich and proud pomp of the mistress of the world.—Precedents may be found in Eze. 23; 14, 15, 16, 40: 28; 13.—Jerome calls Rome "the purple whore."

1131. And gilded with gold, and costly stone, and pearls. In like manner 'the great city, Babylon' (18; 16), and also 'the holy city, new Jerusalem' (21; 18–21) are described as being adorned 'with gold, and costly stones, and pearls.' But the apparel and adornments of the woman and the great city are to be conceived of as such, as would be proper to a harlot, that is, they are meretricious bedizenments, false tinsel, and mock jewels: while the decorations of the bride are all genuine, and unrivalled in splendour.—As the literal Babylon was to be 'stripped, and made bare, and her nakedness uncovered' (Is. 47; 2), so in C. 18 the stripping of the mystical Babylon is depicted: while the new Jerusalem is to retain her adornments for ever and ever.—Wordsworth says (p. 69); "This description of the woman's attire is so definite, and is repeated in C. 18; 12,
16, with such emphasis, that it is manifestly intended for the purpose of identification." He then proceeds to show, how accurately it suits the attire of the popes, who on great occasions are arrayed in 'scarlet and pearls, gold and precious stones.' He thus applies, in a literal sense, to the thing which he supposes to be symbolized, that, which is spoken literally in reference to the symbol; and in so doing he furnishes strong ground for believing, that the symbolization is not applicable in the true,—the symbolic sense to the Papacy. And if it be, it is only because it is of so loose and general a character, that it might be applied to any persons in an exalted station.

1132. *Holding in her hand a golden cup.* So, also, "in the hand of the Lord there is a cup," &c. (see on 957). 'The worshippers of the beast shall drink of the wine, ... which is mixed undiluted in the cup of His wrath' (14:10). In particular, "the golden cup of Babylon is in the hand of the Lord" (Je. 51; 7); and 'in the cup which she hath mixed, He will mix to her double' (18; 6).—The propriety of placing a symbolic cup in the harlot's hand is manifest. Whoredom and drunkenness are vices, which commonly go together.—The whore's cup, apart from its contents, may have been designed to refer to the 'sorceries,' which formed so essential and principal a part of all idolatrous rites (Nu. 22; 7: 2 Kgs. 9; 22),—which were so emphatically forbidden and denounced by Jehovah (Ex. 22; 18: Le. 20; 27: De. 18; 9–15: 1 Sa. 15; 23: Je. 14; 14: Ez. 13; 6, 7: Ga. 5; 20),—and which are made 'the head and front' of the guilt of Babylon (18; 23, cp. 9; 21). Joseph's cup, "whereby he divined," may have been the precedent followed. At any rate, "it is certain, e.g., from Pliny, l. 30; c. 2, that the ancients had a sort of divination by cups" (see *divination* in Cruden). There is also a precedent in the prototype for introducing divination in this symbol; for it is said in Eze. 21; 21; "The king of Babylon stood to use divination: ... at his right hand was the divination for Jerusalem." In the passage before us, the mystical Babylon is exhibited, as using divination at once against the old and the new Jerusalems,—the Jewish and the Christian Churches. Nahum 3; 4 sa., too, appears to have been had in view; "Because of the multitude of the whoredoms of the wellfavoured harlot, the mistress of witchcrafts, that selleth nations through her whoredoms, and families through her witchcrafts."

—**Full of abominations.** Cp. Lev. 18; 22, 23, 27, and see on C. 21; 8, 27. Perhaps we should also compare Ro. 1; 26, 27; "God gave them up unto vile affections," &c. Every figure, that could be incidentally derived from the principal symbol, would doubtless be used to form a picture, that would present the thing signified, as of the most hateful character, and chargeable with guilt of the utmost enormity.
1133. And [holding] the unclean [things] of her fornication. Some copies have and of the uncleanness of the fornication of the earth; but in critical editions the final variation at any rate is rejected.—I have adopted the construction (suggested by Wolfius) of making the subject dependent on holding, instead of on full; for I consider Stuart’s method of regarding (as he says) the unclean things, as being in opposition with cup (though in his translation he really puts the phrase in opposition with abominations), to be quite inadmissible. The effect is, that, instead of the unclean things forming with the abominations the ingredients in the cup, the cup of abominations should be regarded as being held in one hand, and the unclean things in the other. In illustration of what is primarily intended by the latter we may refer to Is. 30; 22; "Thou shalt cast them away as, &c." Cp. also Eze. 23; 8, 17. As to the real meaning, Hengstenberg says; "The abominations and filthiesses are the shameful transactions of that artful policy, by which Rome reduced the nations to a state of utter impotence. We cannot think of the abominations of idolatry, but only of political enormities. For the root of her conduct was not false religious zeal, but despotism." In my opinion, Hengstenberg assigns to the symbolization a sense too exclusively political; while many, on the other hand, have restricted it too much to a religious significance. He seems, too, to forget, that what is despotism, politically considered, may be persecution for religion, ecclesiastically viewed. And certainly Rome operated by force more than by artful policy. Lust for conquering and coercing others, whether politically or religiously, is in general held up to the deepest detestation by every strong figure, that could be accumulated around the great harlot.

XVII; 5. 1134. And on her forehead a name written. Cp. 13; 1, 16: 14; 1: 22; 4.—The name is a designation given to the whore, for the purpose of indicating who she is, and what is her character.

1135. MYSTERY. Stuart supposes this word to be in opposition with name; and he translates thus:—a name mysteriously written, BABYLON THE GREAT; and then places the rest of the sentence in a parenthesis, as being “an exclamation of the author.” For myself, I am not satisfied with the reasons he gives for making these alterations. And I think, that the usual rendering may be fully justified on the following grounds. 1. ‘Name’ may unquestionably be used in the sense of ‘title;’ and so, as Hengstenberg says, ‘the name consist of a whole sentence.’ 2. The title put on the cross is a precedent for such a construction, as the received version exhibits. 3. That mystery was meant to form part of the name or title is rendered highly probable by two considerations. First, the sum of the letters composing the Hebrew equivalent for it is 666, or “the number of the beast.” By having this word, therefore, as an initial or keyword in her name,
the whore is in a mystical manner linked to the beast on which she rides, and shown to be for substance identical with him in signification. And, that such an approach to identity between the two is in accordance with the things signified may be seen from what Hengstenberg has remarked. "The close connection between Rome and the imperial dignity is manifest alone from this, that the same temple was erected at once to Rome and to Augustus, and also from Hadrian building in Rome itself a temple to the city." Secondly, the Greek word has a secret or mysterious meaning according to Achilles Tatius (vis. pudenda feminae), which would be in keeping with the symbol, and would at the same time attach to the whore, who bore the word on her forehead, the stigma of the most disgusting obscenity and horrible effrontery; and I have already shown, that it was the author's object to depict her in the worst colours. The last clause of the title, however, is the only part, in reference to which Stuart advances anything like an argument to justify his novel construction: and it amounts to no more than asking; "Is it probable, that Babylon would thus openly and shamelessly wear a frontlet, proclaiming such a character?" This question might be answered by citing the first line in Hengstenberg's comment; "The name is not a title, which she takes to herself, but the expression of her nature." But I would prefer to answer it by alleging, that the author has intended us to conceive of the whore, as taking to herself this designation and descriptive title; and that he has adopted this symbolization for the express purpose of exhibiting her in the worst possible light, as a monster of shamelessness, who can even glory in her shame.—If, now, it be asked; In what respects was the whore a mystery? several answers might be given, any one of which might suffice; though, indeed, the mystical meanings of the Greek word, which I have just adverted to, would sufficiently account for the introduction of the term, without its being necessary to seek for any solution at all of this query. 1. The whore might be so described, as being a mystical representative of Rome. "As Babylon is not the proper name of the city intended, so the name is mysteriously employed, and requires some investigation to find out its true sense" (Stuart). Hengstenberg, however, objects, that "this is no mystery in the Scripture sense." And Wordsworth says (p. 56), that "the word is never applied in the N. T. to any object openly infidel, but always to something sacred." But the Greek word in its ordinary use means anything, that is secret or concealed under a veil: see the LXX. of Dan. 2; 18 sa.: 4; 9: Tob. 12; 12. And hence it may be applied to the representation of anything under a symbolical disguise. In the phrase, "the mystery of the woman and the beast," an anti-christian power is confessedly designated; and this is sufficient to
establish the principle, that that which is hostile to the Lamb may be designated by the term. See on 76, and cp. Ro. 11; 25:1 Cor. 15; 51:2 Th. 2; 7 ("the mystery of iniquity"). 2. She might be so described in reference to her connexion with the beast. That Rome, which for centuries had been distinguished for her love of freedom, whose greatest pride and glory had been her free and republican institutions, who had been jealous to a fault of any apparent encroachment on her liberties, and who abhorred the very name of king,—that she should have become in reality a most abject slave to the diademed despotic beast, while he was professedly her subject and servant, might well be deemed an unaccountable 'mystery.' 3. Again, the whore might be so designated in allusion to the change, which had come over Rome in respect of religious toleration. In previous times she had, not only allowed all the conquered nations to follow their own superstitions, but was ever ready to admit their gods into her own Pantheon. But now she had joined that cruel beast, with whom she is here associated, in persecuting even to the death a pious and peaceable people, for no other reason than that they would not 'worship the beast,' give him divine titles, and prostrate themselves before the images which he set up. Rightly to estimate, how strange and inexplicable a thing this must then have appeared, we must remember, that it is the first persecution that is had in view. "Nero," says Lactantius, "was the first to persecute the servants of God." "In your annals (the Roman) you will find," says Tertullian, "that Nero was the first who raged against this sect, which then flourished chiefly at Rome." And we should consider well in how different a light persecution for religion would appear, when it was a new thing, to that in which it would present itself, after it had become a matter of common occurrence. The effect, which in point of fact it did produce, is abundantly shown by the many references to Nero's persecution in some of the earliest Christian writings, quotations from which may be seen in Stuart's Com., esp. Exc. III. Regarded, then, from the author's point of view, the whore Babylon must have appeared a mystery indeed; and the seer's great wonder in contemplating her, as 'drunken with the blood of the saints,' is fully accounted for. And, indeed, this mention of her intolerance in the very next sentence seems to show conclusively, that persecution for religion was at least a reason for the whore's bearing the word 'mystery' on her forehead. And so Hengstenberg makes the mystery to lie in Babylon's "pressing with frightful weight on the confessors of Christ by reason of the greatness of her power." He goes on to say, that the showing of the mystery lies in making known, that Babylon's greatness will not be abiding. This, however, is taking too limited a view of the matter. The 'telling' or discovering of the
mystery does not relate exclusively to the end or denouement, but has reference to the whole history of the whore on the beast (see on 1144). Besides, the mystery alluded to in ve. 5 is not absolutely identical with that spoken of in ve. 7. In ve. 5 the word is used in reference to the whore exclusively, but in ve. 7 it has respect to "the woman and the beast."—Let me suggest here, that in branding this title as it were on Rome's forehead, there may have been an intention to return the stigmatizing compliment, which Rome by her representative affixed to the founder of Christianity, when she crucified him.—

Babylon the Great. See on 948.

1136. The mother of the fornicatresses and of the abominations of the earth. It may be thought, after what has been already shown, that nothing could add to the stigma attached to the whore; yet the clause before us is the climax of all, as will be seen as I proceed to open its full meaning.—It will be convenient to inquire, in the first instance, in what sense the term earth is used here; since on its signification the extent of the charge against Rome depends. The term may be used either symbolically to denote Judæa, or literally to denote the whole known world; and either sense would be admissible here. From the circumstance, however, that the design obviously is to make the charge as comprehensive and extensive as possible, I incline to think, that the latter is the use here.—The next question is; Should the word earth be connected with both the preceding terms, so as to read the mother of the fornicatresses of the earth, &c., or with the latter term only. The A. V. may possibly lead the reader to suppose, that the latter is the true construction; but the correct rendering, as given above, seems to leave no room for doubt, that the former is really the right connexion.—If the reader has fully understood what is conveyed by the term abominations, as intimated under No. 1132, he will readily perceive, that, to be described as the parent of the prostitutes and abominable deeds of the whole world, implies a charge, which comprehends in itself all the most horrible and detestable crimes, which it ever entered into the mind of man to conceive and commit. As harlots denotes the female, so abominations may be a technical term for the male offenders of the same description,—Sodomites, and the like. See further on 1456.—Hengstenberg, in explanation of "the mother of harlots," says; "—as much as "the great whore" in ve. 1; the arch-harlot, she who practises, through the widest bounds, a policy the most cunning and destructive to the nations. All, who practise the same within narrower bounds, are, as it were, her daughters. The abominations here also can only be political enormities." Doubtless the offenders are contemplated as the sons and daughters of the whore, after the precedents in Is. 49; 23, and in Ga. 4; 26, in which a city is spoken of as 'the mother'
of its inhabitants. It is true, also, that this woman is viewed as being herself the arch-harlot. But the principal part of the meaning is lost sight of, if it be not brought out clearly to view, that she has laid to her charge, not only the guilt of her own acts, but of all those who come after her who do the like. She is charged, not only as the arch-perpetrator, but also as the arch-originator. If this be clearly recognized, it will be seen at once, that 'cunning political policy' cannot have been exclusively, nor even principally, the charge made against her. Whether or not Rome used 'cunning policy' to any unusual extent, she was certainly not 'the mother,' the originator and propagator of it. There was nothing new in it in the author's time. But there was in persecution for religion. The world had just seen "the first persecution." The woman was, even then, at the time of writing and the epoch of this scene, "drunk with the blood of the saints." This persecution introduced a new precedent, and from it emperors in succeeding ages took example, and strove one after another to extirpate the infant Church. How, with these plain indications before his eyes, any one can deny, that aiding and abetting the beast in compelling the saints of God to worship him, religiously as well as civilly, and now for the first time in the Roman world introducing the principle and practice of persecution on religious grounds, is the offence laid to the whore's charge, I cannot understand. This, I maintain, is the new and heinous crime, of which a beast is the father, and a whore the mother.

DIV. 2. THE WOMAN'S ACTS. The Neronic persecution, and war against the Jews, A.D. 64-68.

XVII; 6. 1137-1140. And I beheld the woman intoxicated with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the testifiers of Jesus; and, beholding her, I wondered with great wonder.

1137-8. In 1124 the dwellers on the earth are said to have been made drunk by the woman's fornication-wine. Here she herself is represented as being in the same condition: and the cause of her drunkenness,—the blood of the saints, may be thought to show what is meant here by fornication-wine; for it would seem, that the blood of the saints must be the literal equivalent (in part at least) for that, of which fornication-wine is the symbolical expression.—Stuart says; "The phraseology is derived from the barbarous custom (still extant among many pagan nations) of drinking the blood of enemies slain, in the way of revenge. Here, then, the fury of the persecutors is depicted in a most graphic manner. Blood is drunk by them even to intoxication, i.e., copiously, in great quantities." Cp. 16; 6.

1139. And with the blood &c. Are two distinct classes of persons intended, or only one class? The repetitive form of this latter clause
indicates, that two classes are meant: cp. 16; 13: and see on 428, 848, 966. If so, the woman must be presented to view, in respect of the whole of her history, as an abettor of the beast in persecuting (that is, from A.D. 64 to 70 at the least); because the saints will in that case be the Jews who suffered for the sake of their religion, and the testifiers of Jesus those who suffered in the Neronic persecution. The close connexion here between the whore and the beast, coupled with the beast’s being said in C. 13; 5–7 (see on 875) to ‘blaspheme those who tabernacle in the heaven,’ and to ‘make war on the saints 42 months,’ favours this view. The clause before us will then indicate, seeing that the epoch of this scene is shown by ve. 10 to be the time present, that the date of writing cannot be earlier than an advanced period of the Jewish war.—Testifiers of Jesus will mean here those who both testify of and belong to Jesus. Μαρτυρον by no means necessarily signifies a martyr; and, though the word ‘blood’ may be thought to carry with it this meaning, yet, if due allowance be made for the latitude in the use of terms in this mystical work, even in a professed explanation, it will not be thought, that the intention must certainly be to include only such as suffered death for their religion. Inspired teachers,—‘prophets and apostles,’ have doubtless been had prominently in view. Cp. 11; 3, 18; 18; 20, 24; 19; 10: and see on 6, 18, 708.

1140. I wondered with great wonder. This is a Hebraistic mode of expression. The highest degree of wonder is expressed by it.—It has often been said in effect (as, e.g., by Wemyse): “Had Rome Pagan persecuted the saints as the whore did, it could have excited no astonishment in the apostle’s mind; but he might well greatly wonder, as Lowman observes, that Rome Christian, once so famous for purity of faith, should become another Babylon for idolatry and persecution. From hence Protestant interpreters may with reason infer, that this vision does not represent the persecution of Rome heathen, but of Rome antichristian.” This argument has already been incidentally refuted under 1135. That the first persecution on account of religion is had in view is sufficient to account for all the wonder that is expressed. But the argument may not only be refuted, but turned against those who advance it. The remark called forth from the angel; ‘Why dost thou wonder?’ implies, that the astonishment, which the seer manifested, exceeded the occasion. This, the antipapistical interpreters themselves being judges, it might well have done, if pagan persecutors were meant, but not so, if Christian.—As the seer here wonders greatly on beholding the woman drunk with the blood of the saints, so the dwellers on the earth wonder (ve. 8) on “seeing the beast, that he was, and is not, and shall again be present;” and so also ‘the whole earth had wondered (13; 3) on seeing the first
beast slain and revive again.' If we set up ourselves as judges of the
degree of propriety, with which a term is used in a mystical represen-
tation, may not some think with equal reason, that wonder was as
little called for in the two last-cited instances as in the first?

DIV. 3. EXPLANATION OF THE BEAST: (1.) AS A WHOLE; THE DYNASTY
OF THE CAESARS.

XVII; 7-8. 1141-1153. And the angel asked me; 'Wherefore
didst thou wonder? I will declare to thee THE MYSTERY OF THE WOMAN
AND OF THE WILD-BEAST THAT BEARETH HER, WHICH HATH THE SEVEN
HEADS AND THE TEN HORNs. The wild beast which thou didst behold was
and is not, and is about to come up out of the abyss, and to go into per-
dition. And they who dwell upon the earth, whose name hath not been
written on the roll of life from the world's foundation, beholding the wild-
beast, will wonder; because he was, and is not, and shall be present.'

1141-2. Wherefore didst thou wonder? This question is similar to
that in Mt. 14; 31; "O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou
doubt?" See also Jo. 7; 21. Hengstenberg says, perhaps even too
strongly; "The wherefore shows, that the wondering is a groundless
or foolish one."

1143. I will declare to thee. Emphasis is thrown on the person
speaking by the insertion of the pronoun; and this probably in order
to point to the person, whom the angel symbolizes. Cp. C. 1; 8, 11,
17: 21; 6: 22; 13, 16; "I, Jesus."—'I will tell thee &c.' It is
plain, then, that what follows is an explanation of the symbol by
words, and not an exhibition of things by symbols; and hence the
terms used for explanation must be taken literally, or at any rate not
symbolically. It must be evident, too, that the showing of the whore's
judgment, promised in ve. 1, has been postponed; for nothing of the
kind has come before us as yet. And as the remainder of this chapter
is to be, and plainly is occupied with the explanation of the mystery,
it must follow, that the judgment is reserved for C. 18, to the refuta-
tion of Hengstenberg's view, that "the judgment is here already
shown to the Seer, and not, as some have supposed, first in C. 18."—
See C. 7; 13 ss. and 11; 1-13 for similar explanations.

1144. THE MYSTERY OF THE WOMAN, AND OF THE WILD-BEAST THAT
BEARETH HER. This is the third Apocalyptic Mystery: see on 76 and
683. The three Mysteries, being interpreted, are; The Mystery of
Judaism; the Mystery of Christianity; and the Mystery of Heathen-
ism, as upheld, concentrated, actuated, and directed by a despotic
and Satanic power.—It should be observed, that it is not said here
the whore, but the woman. This I suppose to be; because, when this
mystery is brought (as it tacitly is here) into comparison with the two
others, it is more suitable to leave out of view for the moment the
ideas of seduction and persecution, which have become temporarily
attached to it.—Hengstenberg says; "I will show thee the mystery." Accordingly, the mystery of the woman must be the object of wonder."
How he can thus leave out half the sentence, and then draw an in-
ference from the remainder, I cannot understand. It is "the mystery
of the woman and the beast," but "the judgment of the whore" alone;
and to this the contents of Cs. 17 and 18 correspond respectively.—
He further says; "The mystery of the whore is, that she is made
desolate (ve. 16): the mystery of the beast, that it goes into perdition"
(ve. 8). But, first, it is opposed to the text thus to separate the
mystery into two. And, secondly, wherein the mystery consists may
best, and with much certainty, be learnt from the explanation given
of it. Now, we find in the sequel an explanation, first, of the beast
in his entirety, of his heads, of a supernumerary addition to the things
signified by them, and of his horns; and then, of the relations of the
beast to the whore, and her real signification. The desolation of the
whore and the final perdition of the beast are only alluded to inci-
dentally, and in anticipation of the description of the former in C.18,
and of that of the latter in C. 19; 11–21. From this explanation,
then, it appears, that by "the mystery of the woman and the beast" is
meant the whole history of the two, during their alliance and in their
mutual relations, and not merely the desolation of the one, and the
perdition of the other.

1145. Which hath the seven heads and the ten horns. As this clause
was not needed for perspicuity, we may presume, that it has been
added to keep in view the heads and horns, as being of primary im-
portance, and to form a kind of basis for the explanation given of
them in vv. 9–14. The two articles point back to 1129; but at the
same time they throw a stress on the heads and horns, and thus also
indicate their importance. They show, that the heads and horns are
the salient point,—the essential feature in the symbolization.

XVII; 8. 1146. The beast which thou didst behold. The didst and
not doste shows, that we are to conceive of the symbol as having
passed away from the scene, so that there is nothing to distract the
seer's attention from the explanation.

1147–8. Was, and is not, and is about to come up out of the abyss, and
to go into perdition. In ve. 3 a general description of this beast's
color was given. Here we have a multum in parvo history of him.
It sketches his whole career. Let us, then, take our stand at the
time present to the seer, in order to contemplate it thence.—The beast
now is not. That this is not refers to the time of writing is clear.
True, as a general rule, each scene in succession is represented in the
orderly evolution of the Mystery, as present for the time being. But
it may be, that there is here an exception to the general rule. For
the three tenses, past, present, and future, may be thought to make it necessary, that the medium point of time should be the author’s present. Besides, the seer is not now beholding the evolution of the Mystery, but listening to an explanation of a symbol, which has passed away. Granting, however, that the Visional present is intended, the result will be the same; since the author’s present and the Visional present are shown by vs. 10 to coincide at this place. The writer tells us plainly enough in that verse, that the sixth of the seven Caesars of whom he speaks was then on the throne. The beast, then, is not at the time of writing.—But he was,—he had a previous existence, which was then terminated. Where shall we look for him under that former state? Having respect to the numerical identity between the heads and horns of this beast, and those of the beast from the sea,—to the blasphemous character common to both (cp. 13; 1),—and to the alliance in which this is found, we cannot doubt, that there is a generic identity between the two, and that we may see the history of this beast’s first stage of existence detailed in C. 13; 1–10. If so, then he appeared as the Julian dynasty of Caesars, and terminated his existence with Nero, the last of that dynasty. It will then follow, that the author’s present, and consequently the date of the Apocalypse is later than the time of Nero. And this leads me to make a brief digression, with the view to determine a point of great importance in Apocalyptic interpretation,—the precise time, that the work was written.

Stuart, although he recognises the existence at the time of writing of what he calls ‘the harioration respecting Nero’s death,’ and by it “solves the apparent enigmas,” yet, overlooking the fact that a rumour, to the effect that Nero who was believed to be dead was not really dead but would revive and return from the east, could only gain circulation after his death, contends for the Neronic date. I myself, being misled by his arguments, adopted this date at the time that I wrote the Guide to the Apocalypse (see pp. 24, 29). But I have since been unable to see any possible way of escaping the conclusion, to which this clause seems to lead. If the beast that ‘was’ be individualized to mean Nero personally (according to Stuart’s view), the case will not be altered. And, though Stuart speaks of ‘the harioration’ as being spread before Nero’s death, he can adduce no authority for saying, that any rumour or prediction existed in Nero’s lifetime to the effect, that he would come to life after a real or supposed death (see on 858). The only passage he quotes from any heathen writer is from Suetonius; and it contains no allusion to Nero’s death, though it does contain what might have furnished a basis for such a report, when doubts were raised as to the manner and reality of his death. The quotations from later Christian sources
are only such, as may have arisen from misinterpretations of the Apocalypse, under the influence of such a report. Stuart himself advances nothing more in support of his assertion, that "nothing important can be made out of this clause, either for or against the fact, that Nero was living or dead when the Apocalypse was written," than that "prophetic style pays little regard to the chronological order of events." But, in the first place, I challenge the production of any parallel example from the prophets. In the next, I observe, that we have before us now, not prophecy, but an explanation, and one, which, as to this clause, has respect to things past. And, thirdly, I affirm, that the very object of this statement is to define the chronological order of events; and to deny this is to assert, that the statement is utterly destitute of meaning. On the whole, if (as Stuart maintains) C. 13; 3, 10: 17; 8, 11, relate to Nero, and the question lies within so narrow a compass as this, namely, whether the work was written a few months before or a few months after Nero's death, I conceive that no one, taking the prevalent rumour into account, would hesitate to say, that the book must have been composed after Nero's death.—Beyond an alteration of a few months in the date, I am not aware, that any correction of what I have said in the Guide will be needed, unless it be in respect of the actual existence of a persecution at the time of writing. It has been said, that there are plain indications in the Apocalypse of the existence of a persecution, whereas Nero's ceased at his death; and hence the date could not have been subsequent to that event. But no statements can be adduced, which may not be fully accounted for from a state-persecution having been in force during the four preceding years, and from the propriety (since Christians were subsequently to be exposed to the like, and were always suffering more or less from local persecutions excited by the malevolence of Jews or heathens)—from the propriety of the apostle's availing himself of the occasion to furnish motives, encouragements, and exhortations to all, who might suffer under similar circumstances. Indeed, there are some passages, in which the persecution is spoken of as though it were past: for example, in C. 13; 5 the beast is said to operate 42 months (which may be thought to indicate the expiration of the 3 1/2 years of Nero's persecution); and in C. 17; 6 the woman is seen, as having already drunk to satiety of the blood of the saints. It must also be remembered, that the war upon the Jews is on my view included in the 'making war with the saints,' 'shedding' and 'drinking' their blood, and similar expressions; and this war would be at its height at the time of writing. On the whole, as I can see nothing of any cogency to the contrary, I feel constrained to yield to what appears to be required by this clause; and hence to conclude, that the work could
not be written until after Nero’s death. How soon after we may be able to learn from ve. 10.

We proceed now to the third clause in the statement before us,—This beast is about to come up,—a mode of speaking, which imports that his ascent was close at hand at the time then present: see on 237, 669, 789. Now from ve. 10 we learn, that the sixth king was then reigning; and if either of Nero’s next successors was that king, clearly none but Vespasian could answer to the description of this beast in the second stage of his existence.—The place from which he is to come is the abyss, that is, the division of Hades, in which the Satanic dragon is confined: see C. 20; 1, Vol. I.: pp. 12, 97; and cp. on 574, 613, and 726. The place of his origin, when he previously “was,” is not here stated. For that we must look to C. 18; 1, where we are told that he then came from “the sea.” Doubtless, “the abyss” is here assigned as the birthplace of the beast’s second state of existence to mark a specific difference (while a substantial identity between the two is at the same time recognized), and in particular to stigmatize this beast, or form of the beast, as even more odious than the former. Now, if the beast in his first state of existence symbolizes the Julian dynasty, in his second he can represent only the Flavian. And having in view the respective origins, in connexion with what has heretofore been shown, there can be no doubt, that the two bestial forms or eras of existence are here specially regarded, as being individualized in Nero and Vespasian. Hateful as Nero was to Jews and Christians, Vespasian, both as having been in the first instance the representative and agent of Nero in the war against the Jews (of whom it must constantly be borne in mind, that the Christians were regarded as being a sect), and also as having been subsequently “the destroyer of the pious,” may have been esteemed even more hateful. Indeed, that such was the case, and also how much the cause of the Jews was identified with that of the Christians, may be gathered from the work, from which the designation of Vespasian just cited is taken, namely, the fifth book of the Sibyline Oracles. This book consists of a variety of pieces, written about the time of the destruction of Jerusalem. Vv. 137–178 relate to Nero, and repeat the usual story of his flying to the east, returning thence with a great force, and laying waste the world. Finally, Rome, “which has destroyed the faithful saints of the Hebrews and the true temple [qy. Jesus], shall be brought to utter desolation.” Vv. 246–285 contain a Messianic passage, in which “the divine Jewish race” are represented as inhabiting a city in the centre of the world. To this city Jesus, who was crucified, will return, and address to its inhabitants words of consolation and peace. Vv. 342–385 denounce Italy in severe terms. “The luminaries of heaven will withdraw their
splendour, and God will punish with unrelenting and awful severity, unless the worship of idols shall be forsaken, and Himself alone be adored” [cp. Rev. 9:20; 16:9]. Here again comes in the man of sin, the son of perdition. “The matricide shall come from the ends of the earth, whetting his sharp teeth. He shall destroy all the land, have universal dominion, and devise everything with more cunning than all men. Her [Rome] by whom he was destroyed, he shall speedily seize upon, and destroy many men, and princes of high rank. All shall be burnt, as he formerly did in another condition” [alluding either to the burning of Rome or of Christians by Nero]. The extent and horrors of the war are then described. In vv. 386–433 warning is given, in the first instance, against the vices prevalent at Rome. The perpetual fires of Vesta will be extinguished [the temple of Vesta was burnt, when Nero set Rome on fire]. “The long-beloved house was burnt by thee [Rome], when I saw the second temple cast down headlong, wrapped in flames by an impious hand [that of Titus]: the house always flourishing, the temple dedicated to the service of God; the object of joy to the saints, evermore incorruptible, in soul and body the object of hope, &c. &c.” Then the writer proceeds to show, how “a crafty and vile king” [meaning Titus], with a great army, cast down the temple, and ranged through the holy land, “an unexpected sign to mortals.” Then comes “the man from the heavenly heights” [the Messiah], who restores all things, subdues all enemies, rebuilds “the city beloved of God,” and makes it “more splendid than the stars, or sun, or moon,” builds its tower so high that it reaches to the clouds, and makes it the glory of the eternal God.” “Evils shall no more come upon timid mortals; and all vices shall cease. These are the last times of the saints.” I cannot but think it probable, that in the allusions, which in this and similar works are apparently made to Nero as reviving and returning, Vespasian may have been had in view, at any rate inclusively (see on pp. 116, 117). That an expectation of Nero’s return to life should really have been entertained seems highly improbable, and also incompatible with the anticipated advent of the Messiah immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem; while, on the other hand, Vespasian actually marched to Rome from the east, and the circumstance of his being “the destroyer of the pious” may well have led to his being figuratively described, in order to cast the greater odium upon him, and at the same time to conceal the real reference to him,—the reigning emperor, as Nero come to life again. At any rate, there is enough in this passage to show with what detestation he and his son must have been regarded by Jewish Christians: and thus to account for his dynasty being stigmatized as ‘the beast from the abyss.’—To the clause we have been considering there is added and to go into perdition. Heng-
stenberg, however, speaks of a reading which would give and he goeth, &c. According to him 'it is from ve. 11:' but it may more probably have arisen from the accidental omission of the final letter of the Greek verb. Be this as it may, it is of so little value, that Griesbach, Stuart, Scholz, and Tregelles make no allusion to it.—To go into perdition must mean to perish finally (cp. Jo. 17; 12: 2 Th. 2; 3); and this is symbolized in C. 19; 20 by both the beast and the false prophet being cast into the lake of fire. Vespasian's dynasty lasted no longer than his son Domitian's lifetime; and with him the dynasty of Cæsars became extinct.—In the Sibyl. Or. VIII, p. 714, it is said; "The dog has produced a lion, which will devour the flock. But his sceptre shall be taken away, and he shall go down to Hades." By 'the dog' appears to be meant Nero, and by 'the lion' Vespasian, who obtained the throne in consequence of Nero having placed him in command of the army of Palestine.

If, now, we assume the time of writing or epoch of this scene to have been during the interval between Nero's death and Vespasian's obtaining actual possession of the throne, we may interpret the statement before us as follows. The Cassarian beast, under the Julian form in which it emerged from the sea of the nations, ceased to be in Nero. In the time present, it "is not." But it will speedily emerge from the hold of Satan under its Flavian form in the person of Vespasian, and in that form will become finally extinct.—I venture to add, that I have never yet seen, so easy and natural an explanation as this, of what is confessedly one of the most difficult passages in the Apocalypse.

I must not leave this statement, however, without adverted further to Stuart's explanation of it. He supposes it to refer to Nero exclusively, and to the rumour respecting his death, revival, and future return from the east, which has been alluded to. Now, this view appears to me inadmissible on the following grounds. 1. It is much less natural and probable than that just stated. 2. It has for its basis an absurd heathen vaticination, destitute of truth; and the result of resting on which must be the rejection of the Apocalypse from the Canon of Scripture. The statement we have been considering is not put hypothetically, or as in any way referring to a widely spread rumour; but it is positively affirmed, that the beast shall make his reappearance, and that his contemporaries shall wonder at his career. If, then, Nero is the beast, and his death is referred to in the two first clauses, his resurrection is vouched for in the third; and, as this never took place, the book cannot be inspired. Stuart himself, in saying that "the cause of wonder is, that the beast has as it were risen from the dead," grants my premises. The 'rising' must precede the 'wondering;' and he recognizes the occurrence of both. If,
indeed, Nero had ever returned from Parthia to Rome, this might have been accounted a symbolical rising from the dead; but as he never did so, the ‘harialation’ furnishes no basis whatever for the statement: at least, if it was the basis, its non-fulfilment involves the non-inspiration of the book. I may add, that the words “as it were” must be struck out of the above quotation from Stuart, as having no sanction from the text. 3. The actual death of the beast (whatever and whoever may be meant thereby) is virtually predicated in vv. 8 and 11. But the popular rumour did not originally presuppose Nero’s death; but, on the contrary, was based on the belief, that he was not dead.—Other arguments in refutation of Stuart’s view may be found in Hengstenberg’s Exp. II; 79–88.

1149. *And they who dwell on the earth* = the partizans of Rome during the Jewish war: see on 571, 880.

1150. *Whose name hath not been written.* Some copies have names. Cp. 881.

1151. *On the roll of life from the world’s foundation.* Cp. and see on 882–3.—In Lu. 10; 20: He. 12; 23 there is a similar expression: “names written in heaven.” See too Mt. 25; 34 (“inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the world’s foundation”); and also Hermas: Vis. II. (“the Church was constituted before the beginning of the world”); and other passages quoted under 389.

1152. *Beholding the wild-beast, will wonder.* The R. T. has the participle in the Nom., but the better authorized reading is in the Genitive. The former has probably arisen from the latter involving an unusual construction.—The occurrence, for substance, in C. 13; 8 in reference to the first beast, of the statement contained in Nos. 1149–52 may be thought to be another indication of the generic identity of the beasts from the sea and the abyss.

1153. *Because he was, and is not, and shall be present (or will make his appearance again, as Stuart renders).* The A. V., by rendering the beast that was, &c., gives the sentence a sense somewhat different from the true.—The reading of the R. T. in the last clause gives and yet is, or although he is. This reading, as Hengstenberg contends, is to be rejected on both internal and external grounds; and it is generally rejected by critics on the ground, that the best authorities have the other. Yet many Codices support the R. T.; and the great difficulty presented by the apparent contradiction in saying, that the beast ‘is’ and ‘is not’ at one and the same time, is strongly in favour of this reading. Hengstenberg’s first argument against it is, that “it gives properly no right sense.” Now this is in truth the strongest reason in its favour. For the opinion, which Hengstenberg himself has formed respecting it, shows what opinion would be entertained by any ordinary critic or copyist. Such an one, seeing no sense but a
palpable contradiction in the original reading, would be very apt to
conclude, that an error must have crept into the text; and would in
consequence correct it according to his own opinion of what the reading
should be. And, that such attempts at emendation have been made
is strongly indicated by the fact of there being three rival readings,
differing from one another only in a letter or two. On the other hand,
that any one should introduce the received reading, as an emendation
of either of the others, is in the highest degree improbable. I am
therefore, on the whole, strongly inclined myself to give the prefer-
ence to the received reading; though in the text I have adhered to
the rule of following the most ancient of the extant Codices. Their
text makes this number identical with 1146–7, excepting that the
place and more exact time of the beast’s emergence is not noticed
here, as not being pertinent (it may be supposed) to the object imme-
diately in view, which is to speak of the beast’s two stages of existence.

We have in this verse a parallelism with two places in C. 13. That
with ve. 3 is especially striking, as being one of facts as well as of
symbolical wonderment. When the beast was first slain in ‘one of
his heads’ (Caligula) and revived again, the whole earth wondered in
secret: and just so here, when he is again slain in another head (Nero),
and is about to appear again in one, in whose dynasty he will go into
perdition, the renegades of the earth wonder on beholding such un-
looked-for events. The same parties,—those whose names were not
written in the book of life, had not indeed wondered at, but they had
worshipped the beast under the last-named head (13; 8).—Observe,
that the wonder is said to be called forth by beholding the whole
career of the beast, and not merely (as Stuart and Henstengeberg seek
to make it appear) by his ‘having as it were risen from the dead.’
The death of the beast in Nero was as much a cause of wonder, as
his revival in Vespasian’s accession.

DIV. 4. EXPLANATION OF THE BEAST: (2.) OF HIS HEADS; SEVEN CAESARS.

XVII; 9–10. 1154–60. ‘Here [is] the mind which hath wisdom! The
seven heads are seven mountains (upon which the woman sitteth), and
they are seven kings. The five have fallen, the one is, the other hath not
yet come; and, when he shall come, he must abide a little [while].’

1154. Here, &c. Inasmuch as in each instance, in which this or
an equivalent sentence occurs (cp. 13; 9, 18: 14; 12), it precedes an
explanation or clue to a mystery, I consider it to be a mystical for-

mula tantamount to saying, that now such information is about to be
given, as will enable any one who has discernment to penetrate into
the real meaning of the mystery. Consequently I do not (with
Stuart) conceive, that it refers primarily “to what precedes,” though it
must necessarily contain a subordinate reference thereto. See on 917.
1155. The seven heads are seven mountains. "Mountains," says Hengstenberg, "are the common symbol of kingdoms." And again; "In the Apocalypse mountains uniformly denote, not particular kings, but kingdoms." Yet again; "That the mountains are to be understood spiritually is evident alone from C. 13; 3, where it is said, that one of the heads was killed, which does not suit a natural mountain." This is also "plain from the term 'seven kings' or kingdoms, added by way of explanation." And, "it is clear as day, that there is not a double signification ascribed here to the heads, but that the second only serves as an explanation of the first." These citations contain all that I find said, and therefore, we may presume, all that can be said, in support of this view. And the following are the positions maintained, assumed, or implied in the above extracts. 1. The term mountains is here used symbolically, or (to use his expression) "spiritually;" whence it follows, that heads and mountains are symbolical equivalents. 2. Kings, on the other hand, is the literal term, which corresponds to these; but it means not kings, but kingdoms. 3. There is not a double signification ascribed to the heads, but "the term seven kings, or kingdoms, is added by way of explanation."—

Now, all these positions I deny wholly or in part; and will proceed to disprove, only observing in the first place, in order to clear the way, that I do not question, that mountains, when symbolically used (as in C. 8; 8: 16; 20), denote kingdoms. The point on which the whole turns is, whether mountains is used here symbolically or literally. 1. Now, in refutation of the assertion, that "in the Apocalypse, mountains uniformly denote kingdoms," I can refer to five out of the eight places in which it occurs as not giving that meaning. For I suppose it will not be maintained, that the kings of C. 6; 15, 16 called on the kingdoms to fall on them: nor that the 144000 of C. 14; 1, or the seer in C. 21; 10, stood on a kingdom. 2. The argument from C. 19; 3 is a mere petio principii, dependent on assuming, that the heads have only one signification, which is the question now at issue. 3. The argument from the clause, 'added by way of explanation,' refutes instead of sustaining Hengstenberg's view. For if that clause be indeed explanatory, then kings is the literal meaning of mountains, and not kingdoms, as he maintains; for the identity between kings and kingdoms has not been and cannot be proved, as I shall show under the next clause. 4. Hengstenberg subsequently resolves his term kingdoms into nothing more than "phases of the ungodly power of the world." On such a mode of proceeding the text may be frittered away, and made to mean anything. So much for the arguments in support of a view, which is said to be as "clear as day."—Let us now see, what may be said on the other side. 1. The word mountains is manifestly used as an explanatory term; for its
introduction into the sentence can only thus be accounted for. Now, the fact that it is so used, and that too in a professed explanation, is a proof so strong in support of the opinion, that it was intended to be taken literally, that this is in itself conclusive, and such as no argument to the contrary can contravene. And hence it follows (kings being allowed to be an explanatory term), that both mountains and kings must be explanatory terms, and independent of one another; and consequently, that a double signification is assigned to heads.

2. The statement itself, when put in the most concise and plain terms, appears to me to be so clear, that I cannot believe, that any one, to whose system a particular construction is not essential, can entertain a doubt as to its meaning. ‘The seven heads represent seven mountains on which the woman sitteth, and they represent seven kings.’ The verb appears to have been repeated for the purpose of making it clear, that two meanings were intended to be assigned to the one symbol. I mean not, however, to contend, that the copula are must necessarily signify represent. On the contrary, I have shown on 79 and 711, that it may connect two symbolic terms. But I maintain, that it is quite unreasonable to suppose, that it does so in the present instance; because, if such were the case, it would be used, at one and the same time, to place both a symbolical and a literal term in connexion with a symbol. The purport of the statement would then be; ‘The symbolical heads are symbolical mountains, and they represent literal kings.’ I can see no propriety or sense in such a declaration.

3. I have already noticed, that the second meaning is kings, and not kingdoms; and if I prove that the former cannot be put for the latter, this will be conclusive against kings being used to explain mountains.

4. The view, that it is so used, renders the insertion of the latter term perfectly absurd and unmeaning. For what purpose can mountains in that case have been introduced? Merely to be explained? In a work remarkable for no single word being used needlessly, this view supposes, that a prominent symbolical term has been thrust in incongruously, without the slightest relevancy, and merely to encumber the text.

5. But, even if I were to grant, that mountains may here mean kingdoms, my opponent’s case would not be in the least nearer to demonstration. For see how the clause, when put in literal terms, would then stand. ‘The seven heads are seven kingdoms, over which Babylon, that is, Rome, ruleth’ (for ‘sitteth’ can only mean ‘ruleth’ in relation to kingdoms). Can it be pretended, that Rome ever ruled over seven kingdoms?

6. Not a shadow of a difficulty, nor even of an incongruity, arises from supposing two significations to be attached to the symbol. Precedents may be found, as well for a symbol having two meanings, as for a thing being
symbolized by two symbols, when it was desired to represent different functions or aspects of it (see on 79). But examples of the former must, from the nature of the case, be rare; and it would be generally necessary in respect of them, that an explanation, similar to the one before us, should be given. 7. Moreover, in the present instance, while on the one hand such a double signification was imperatively called for, on the other it could naturally be given to the symbol. It was called for; because, besides indicating that the primary and essential meaning of the heads was kings, a mode of connecting those kings with the locality over which they reigned, so as to indicate their kingdom, was required. And it could easily be supplied; because, as elevation over the rest of the animal was the point, that made the heads a suitable symbol of kings (who in like manner hold an exalted position in relation to their subjects), this would be equally applicable in the case of mountains (which are similarly raised above the country around them). The former remark may suffice to indicate, how little foundation there is for Hengstenberg's assertion, that 'the seven hills of Rome and the seven kings have nothing properly to do with each other:' the latter to show, that there is as little ground for his statement, that 'between the image and the object represented by it there exists no natural connection.' Let me add here, in reference to his remark to the effect, that "Vitrings himself must admit, that 'all the properties of the heads, as they are found in the two visions respecting the beast, cannot be pointed out in the hills,'" that there is not the smallest occasion that they should, one point of similitude between a symbol and the thing symbolized by it being all that is requisite or usual: and, with reference to his inference from the clause, Here is the mind, etc., that that inference has been incidentally refuted by what I have said on that clause. On the whole, I venture to think, that, despite all Hengstenberg's efforts to refute Vitrings's argument, few readers will be found, who will not say with the latter, 'the seven heads denote, as every one must see, the seven-hilled city of Rome.' —Wordsworth says (p. 17): "'In St John's time Rome was usually called 'Urbs septicollis,' the seven-hilled city. She was celebrated as such in an annual national Festival. And there is scarcely a Latin poet of any note, who has not spoken of Rome as a city seated on seven mountains. Virgil, Horace, Tibullus, Propertius, Ovid, Silius Italicus, Statius, Martial, Claudian, Prudentius,—in short, the unanimous voice of Roman poetry during more than 500 years proclaimed Rome as 'the seven-hilled City.' On extant imperial medals, too, of the apostolic age, Rome is displayed as a Woman sitting on seven hills, precisely as she is represented in the Apocalypse." Inasmuch, then, as Rome has ever been known as 'the city of the seven hills,' the number seven shows clearly, that Rome is the city that is meant.
—We ought not, however, to lose sight wholly of the secondary symbolical significance of the number. It is the number of perfection; and, when joined with hills, denotes the perfection of strength or power. On this account, doubtless, Rome was called 'the city of the seven hills,' rather than because it was actually situated on seven distinct hills. In point of fact, it is not easy to distinguish between the hills designated. And it is self-evident, that the site of the city has, and necessarily must have varied in the different ages of its history, according as the population increased or diminished. So that the assignation of seven hills, neither more nor less, must have been in a great degree arbitrary, and true only in respect of one particular epoch. Plenitude of power was, doubtless, the idea primarily intended to be conveyed by the designation. And here we may note by the way a contrast with Babylon. The literal Babylon was 'the city of the one hill' (Je. 51; 25): the mystical Babylon 'of the seven:' —an appropriate indication of the relative power of the two.

1156. On which the woman sitteth. Sitteth in this connexion can mean only is located. The word is used, for greater congruity with the literal term mountains, in a quasi literal sense.—The statement, that the woman Babylon is located on the seven hills, contains a further indication, that Rome is meant, a woman being the usual symbol of a city.—We have now seen, that the woman is symbolically said to sit on the mountains (ve. 9), on the waters (ve. 1), and on the beast (ve. 3). All the three statements have the same generic reference with specific differences. They may be put into literal terms thus. 'The authority of the Roman empire is located in the city of the seven hills, extends over many nations, and is administered by the Caesars in the name of the Senate and people of Rome.'

XVII; 10. 1157. And they are [i.e. represent] seven kings. In the A. V. the rendering is, And there are, etc. The seven kings on this rendering appear to be wholly independent of and disconnected from the seven heads. Yet there can be no doubt, from the nature of the case, that the two are intended to be most intimately connected, and to stand to one another in the relation of symbol and thing symbolized. On any other view, the kings would appear to be introduced without the slightest relevancy; and the angel be made to leave his explanation of the beast, in order to indulge in an unmeaning and inexplicable digression.—It is commonly said that kings here is equivalent to kingdoms. And as this is a most important point (since its decision one way or the other must be fatal to many schemes of interpretation), it will be proper to examine it here fully, though the question has been briefly considered in Vol. I: p. 310 sq. In the ordinary use of the terms, the two are unquestionably not synonymous; and consequently the onus probandi lies on those who contend for an exceptional use;
and, inasmuch as the substitution of one of two correlative terms for
the other is in itself so highly improbable, and so greatly calculated
to lead to misconceptions and to frustrate the purposes of language,
nothing short of the most conclusive proof of so strange a proposition
ought to be deemed sufficient.

We proceed, then, to inquire what is advanced in support of this
assertion.—But, first, it may be well to observe, that this is not a
point, in which the symbolical use of language can be brought into
the question. The use of the term kings here, as being for the purpose
of explanation, is, as I have virtually shown under 1155, literal; and
consequently the use must be similar in any precedents, that may be
adduced in support of the assertion. At the same time, a literal use
does not preclude that wide acceptation, in which all substantives are
sometimes taken more or less, and especially in such a work as the
Apocalypse (see on 1079, 1087, 1122). For example, kings may be
extended to include any persons who rule, but this will not justify
the extension of it to things, such, e.g., as kingdoms.—The following
extract from Hengstenberg on C. 13; 18 will be found, I believe, to
contain the substance of all that can be said in support of the position,
that kings is put for kingdoms. “The kings are not individuals, but
ideal persons, personifications of kingdoms, the king of Babylon, of
Rome, &c. Such phraseology occurs very frequently in the higher
style of prophecy. For example, in Da. 7; 17; “The four beasts
are four kings;” Vulg. regna: in vv. 23, 24, the Hebrew word for
kingdom is substituted for that for king. [To give Hengstenberg’s
argument the utmost weight of which it is susceptible, I add, that
the LXX. use the Greek word for kingdoms in ve. 17; and on the
other hand they put kings for kingdoms in C. 8; 22.] In C. 8; 21,
it is said; “The rough goat is the king of Greece, and the great
horn is the first king.” [In the verse before instead of, “The
ram having horns (an equivalent expression for “the horns of the
ram”) are the kings of Media and Persia,” the LXX. have, “The
ram . . . is a king of Media and Persia.”] Is. 23; 15; “Tyre
shall be forgotten seventy years as the days of one king,” on
which Michaelis remarks, ‘Not one royal personage, but one king-
dom, g.d. so long as the Chaldean empire lasted.’”—Before proceeding
to answer the argument of this passage I would call attention to one
out of many instances, in which Hengstenberg seeks unfairly to
strengthen his position by the introduction of comprehensive phrases,
which convey impressions, that have no foundation in truth. He
says; “Such phraseology occurs very frequently.” Now, if there be
any other text than those quoted above in which it occurs (which I
do not believe), there is certainly not one, which would add to them
an iota of weight. It should, therefore, be clearly understood, that
the reader has the whole of the Scriptural argument on that side of the question before him. 1. In proceeding to reply to it, I would first observe, that Hengstenberg's mode of putting his case would make the use of the term kings to be symbolical. Now, as I have proved the use of the word here to be literal, he must either give up his position, that the kings are "ideal persons, personifications of kingdoms," or admit, that his precedents, in the light in which he places them, are inapplicable to the case before us. In either case the basis of his argument will be cut away. 2. Though I should admit, that Daniel uses the term kings in the way, that Hengstenberg's argument assumes, namely, as a synonyme generally for kingdoms, it would not at all follow, that John must do the same. This may be a peculiarity of Daniel's; and certainly the use of a term by a single writer cannot safely be made a rule for all others or for any other. Even to give to the texts cited such small weight as may rightly be accorded to them as precedents, they ought to present similar cases (in particular, in respect of the number of the kings), which these do not. 3. But, I deny that, as a general rule, Daniel uses the word kings, when he means kingdoms. He does so only in one particular case, namely, when the kings spoken of are the founders of the kingdoms. Those kings—not "ideal persons," but "individuals"—are then made representatives or "personifications" (if the term be preferred) of their kingdoms, so that they are spoken of as equivalent to them. This appears from the circumstance that kings is put for kingdoms only in this case. It appears, too, from Da. 2; 38, 39; "Thou (Nebuchadnezzar, the founder of the first kingdom) art (equivalent to or doest represent) the head of gold (the first kingdom) and after thee shall arise another kingdom." It appears, also, from the two terms being alike interchangeable in such a case. In Da. 7; 17 we read; 'The four beasts are four kings.' Now, strictly speaking, a beast represents a kingdom: cp. vv. 23, 24. Consequently, kingdoms must be really meant, and there is no doubt that they are; but, the founders of the kingdoms being primarily had in view, kings is here put for kingdoms; and hence the LXX., having doubtless taken this view, have translated the Hebrew word for kings by the Greek term for kingdoms, and the Vulgate by the Latin regna. The same is the case in Da. 8; 20, 21. Also, in Is. 23; 15; where "the days of one king" may perhaps mean the days, during which one king or kingdom kept the Jews in captivity, the king who founded the kingdom, and also carried the Jews into captivity, being made the representative of his kingdom: but the allusion in this text is far too uncertain to admit of anything being built upon it, see Palmolii, ¶ 469. On the other hand, in Da. 8; 22, if in the clause "whereas four [horns] stood up for it, four kingdoms shall arise," we are to consider "king-
doms" as an equivalent for kings, implied in horns (as the LXX. appear to have considered by rendering the Hebrew word by the Greek for kings), then it will appear, that, when the kings really contemplated (cp. ve. 23; "their kingdom")—when they are the founders of the kingdoms (for such is the case in this instance also), kingdoms may be put for kings equally as kings for kingdoms (see Vol. I: p. 312). This mutual interchangeability Hengstenberg has prudently kept out of sight. For it is fatal to his argument; since it is impossible, that such an interchangeableness should exist without restriction, and the limitation which it implies, to such a single case as I have pointed out, renders the precedents valueless for the purpose, for which they are adduced. To have any force or pertinency they must go at least to the extent of the case in hand. If, for example, the word kingdoms had anywhere been put for the kings signified by the ten horns in Da. 7; 24, then the precedent would have been pertinent. But, inasmuch as this is not the case:—inasmuch as, on the one hand, no instance can be adduced, where the words are used interchangeably, in which founders of kingdoms are not contemplated (to say, may not be, would suffice for my purpose); and as, on the other, it cannot be pretended, that in the case before us founders are spoken of, the precedents adduced are wholly inapplicable and worthless.—Hengstenberg, however, advances elsewhere another argument to the following effect. "That we are not to think of individual kings is plain from the whole character of the Apocalypse, which never has to do with single human individuals, but everywhere represents the future only in its most general features." This is obviously a mere reflection from, and for any force it may be supposed to have is wholly dependent on, Hengstenberg's particular interpretation. My exposition from beginning to end is a refutation of the argument.—It must now, I think, be generally admitted, that Hengstenberg has failed to make good his position. Consequently, no exception being proved, the general rule must be admitted to hold good, and kings be taken to mean kings.

This conclusion will prove a deathblow to the largest class of interpretations,—those, I mean, of the Historico-presbyterian or antipapistical school: though indeed, even putting the conclusion now arrived at out of the question, they build on an unsound foundation. For, conceding to them that kingdoms are meant here and in ve. 12, still different "forms of government" in one kingdom are not kingdoms, neither are barbarous Gothic tribes, which have no defined locality proper to each, kingdoms. 'Different forms of government' makes the essence consist in diversity, whereas both the signification of horns, and the diadems on all alike, imply uniformity. A series of different forms of government is equivalent to a series of diverse series
of rulers. So that one king, on this interpretation, becomes equivalent to a series, i.e. one = many!—I may add by the way, that the diversities, which exist among interpreters of this school (a list of some of which may be found at the end of this heptad),—these diversities ought alone to form a bar to the reception of their schemes of interpretation, since the latter are by these shown to be perfectly arbitrary, and founded on no sound basis.—But, with regard to the adoption of the word kingdoms as being equivalent to the kings of the text, the truth is, that the substitution of the former word is contended for, because the term is loose and indefinite, and admits of contraction or expansion to an extent, that will allow of the text being adapted to any hypothesis whatever. Thus, one theorist converts kingdoms into 'phases of the ungodly power of the world;' and by this means makes the seven heads to represent seven powers, extending from that of Egypt to that of the ten arbitrarily selected Gothic kingdoms. Another turns them into 'seven forms of government' of the one kingdom or empire of Rome, arbitrarily selecting the forms (for 'there were fifty successive governments during the republic'), and untruly representing them as measuring (with the eighth king) the period from the foundation of Rome to the present day. In one place, kings are made to mean a number of petty tribes or hordes of barbarians: in another, a company of merchants, or the tribes of the Jews, or kingdoms in general, or the risen saints, and I know not how many more things. And all this diversity arises from perverting the meaning of the term king, from signifying a person, to denoting a corporate body or an abstraction. When the ordinary meaning of the term is adhered to, the application of the principal symbol of the Apocalypse is necessarily brought within definite and limited bounds, the duration of the thing signified being restricted to the reigns of seven individuals. But, when this is not the case, a door is opened to the wildest speculations and conjectures; and it is scarcely going too far to assert, that the whole interpretation of the Apocalypse has by this means alone been made to float in utter uncertainty (cp. e.g., Hengstenberg, Vol. II: 8).

To make good my position, it has sufficed to disprove the exception contended for. But I can go further, and adduce evidence on the positive side to show, that kingdoms cannot, not only here, but in any instance, be directly symbolized by the heads or the horns of a beast.—A beast symbolizes a kingdom, or more properly speaking a series of kings (Da. 7; 3, 23: Re. 13; 1). The head of a beast is interpreted to mean a king (17; 10). So also is a horn (17; 12). As, then, it would be absurd to account a head or a horn to be equivalent to the beast of which it forms a part, so it is absurd to make one king equivalent to a series of kings. The case is virtually the same, when the
same result is arrived at by sophistically converting kingdom into king. Cp. Vol. I: p. 18.—Further, the very use of the heads and horns is to indicate the duration of the beast’s existence by showing what number of kings is included in the series. But this object would not be attained, if each item in the series were capable of such indefinite expansion or contraction as would be the case, if a term having the sense of kingdom were used.—Another proof may be derived from the use of the word king in the Apocalypse. It occurs 23 times. And in every instance, as I maintain, a person and not a thing is denoted by it; and probably in scarcely a passage besides that before us could it be denied, that a person is intended. See esp. C. 1; 5, 6: 6; 15: 10; 11: 16; 12, 14.—But perhaps the most conclusive proof of any arises from the fact, that the point of similitude necessary to constitute the symbolization does not exist in respect of a kingdom. What qualifies a head or a horn to be a symbol of a mountain or a king is elevation above that, to which it stands related. But the corresponding qualification is not found in a kingdom. A head is raised above the animal: a horn above the head: a mountain above the surrounding country: a king above his subjects. But a kingdom or form of government has no relative elevation: it can stand related only to other kingdoms or forms of government, with which, as such, it is on a par.—It may be added, that the early Fathers appear to have understood, that kings and not kingdoms were meant. They always use the word reges, never regna.

1158–60. The five have fallen, the one is, the other has not yet come; and, when he shall come, he must remain a little [while]. The article in the Greek points to a particular five kings, namely, the first five. Its gender shows, that neither the heads nor the mountains, but only the kings can be meant. Kings “was a customary name given by Greek writers to the Roman chiefs.” Cp. John 19; 15: 1 Pe. 2; 13, 17.—Hengstenberg says; “Of peculiar importance is the expression fallen. This does not at any rate suit those of the five emperors, who died a natural death. It indicates, that, not individuals, but rather kingdoms are to be thought of, for whose overthrow the term falling is the standing expression in Scripture: cp. 14; 8: 16; 19: 18; 2: Is. 21; 9: Je. 51; 8: Am. 5; 2. Falling is used in regard to individuals, only if they have perished in war; not of persons, who may have met a violent end in some other way.” A writer must be greatly at a loss for an argument, when he is driven to lay so much stress on the use of a term of such wide application, and that too in a work distinguished by using words in a very wide sense:—greatly at a loss indeed, when he is driven to eke out the weakest of arguments by statements, which are destitute of truth. In not one of the texts referred to by Hengstenberg is a kingdom primarily contemplated.
Cities are directly bad in view. And the term fallen is of course used figuratively; as it is also here, the falling of the kings from their thrones (that is, their ceasing to be kings) being the prominent idea rather than their deaths, and Ho. 7; 7 having perhaps been the precedent; "All their kings are fallen." How little ground there is for Hengstenberg's statements in reference to it may be seen in Mt. 10; 29: Lu. 21; 24: 1 Cor. 10; 8: He. 3; 17: cp. Nu. 14; 32: 1 Chr. 21; 14: Eze. 6; 11, in which texts the deaths of individuals, not slain in war, are spoken of: though the distinction between 'perishing in war,' and 'meeting a violent end in some other way' is in such a case absurd. Can it be said, that the word fallen may be used with any more propriety, or accordance with the primary sense of the term, in reference to a kingdom's ceasing to exist than to a king's?—That the stress in the last clause is to be laid on little, and not on remain, so as to make it equivalent to only a little while, appears from the circumstances, and from parallel examples. See, e.g. C. 12; 12; "knowing that he hath [but] a short time:" 20; 3; "he must be loosed a little season," and only a little season: and cp. C. 9; 4: 21; 27. Indeed, the meaning is so clear, that I should not have thought it necessary to say a word on the point, if I had not seen an attempt made (by Jenour: II; 288) to prove the contrary. His only argument (not derived from his own scheme) turns on the force of the word remain. The word denotes of course continuance, but to what extent must entirely depend on the context and circumstances. By itself it determines nothing.—This statement shows beyond dispute, that the seven kings are contemplated as following one another in succession. Indeed, I recollect only one scheme, in which they are made to be contemporaneous; and this is saying a great deal in reference to Apocalyptic interpretation, in respect to which writers seem to consider, that they have a license to put forth every possible absurdity. If, then, these are consecutive kings, and one of them was reigning at the time the work was written, the dynasty of Caesars must be meant.

Such being the case, we must next proceed to inquire, by the help of history, and under the guidance of the premises laid down, What Caesars are had in view in this statement? and why seven of their number are specially symbolized? But, as it will be convenient, that I should at the same time elucidate all the connected questions relating to the heads and horns, it will be necessary in order thereto to set forth in the first instance certain preliminary facts, which are the bases of my exposition.

1st. It was the practice of ancient chronologers, so to frame their list of kings, as to make them accord with certain mystical, or at any rate predetermined numbers. Ten was in general held to be the regal or dynastic number. But sometimes, either because the historic
number could not be made to accord with that number, or from some special reason, the ten was expanded into twelve. In some instances, probably when the object was specially to denote perfection or completeness, the number seven was adopted. And there was, besides, a practice of carrying out one number into another, e.g., seven into an eighth, this being a mystical method of denoting the _se plus ultra_ of completeness, in respect of the number so carried out. See Vol. I: pp. 24, 31-33, 36, 38.

2dly. Inasmuch as historic numbers would not naturally coincide with others arbitrarily selected, it is self-evident, that some methods must have been resorted to in order to produce coincidence. Whether the necessary adaptations were always founded on some grounds, or were sometimes perfectly arbitrary, may be doubted; but certain grounds on which they were made may be pointed out. In some cases doubts would exist, whether certain names ought to be included in a list of kings. Thus, for example, it was doubtful, whether the list of Roman emperors ought to be reckoned to begin with Julius Cesar, or with Augustus. Suetonius, Dio, Sib. Or. Bk. V, 4 Ezra XII, Josephus, Chronicon Paschale, G. Syncellus, and Nicephorus are appealed to as having begun the computation with Julius Cesar: Tactitus, Ptolemy, Victor, Sosibius, Sextus Rufus, J. Malalas, and Sib. Or. Bk. XII, as having reckoned Augustus to be the first emperor. Again, in many instances it might be doubted, whether certain competitors for the throne had sufficiently established their authority to be accounted kings; and in others questions between _de jure_ and _de facto_ right would exist. Certain it is, that many kings were omitted on the ground, that they had not a Thoth or New-year's day (the epoch of computation) in their reigns. But, on whatever grounds kings might be excluded, it is unquestionable that many were omitted in some lists, as Ptolemy's Canon shows. This celebrated list of kings furnishes so many illustrations, which support the view I take, that it will be quite pertinent, that I should exhibit here its composition.

The _Astronomical Canon_ consists of four divisions. In the Babylonian there are twenty kings: in the Persian ten: in the Grecian Alexander, his brother, son, and ten Lagides: in the Roman twenty-seven: thus making of Greeks and Romans together forty; and in all seventy.—The thirty Babylonian and Persian kings fall into two equal divisions at the name of the monarch, in whose reign Judah was subjected. From this king to the one in whose reign the full restoration of the Jews took place (thus including those, who may be designated 'the despots of the captivity'), there will be, if all the names are reckoned, eleven kings (see _Palmoni_, p. 278); or, beginning with Nebuchadnezzar (who conquered Judea in the time of his joint reign
The whore on the beast.

with his father), ten. But, in the Canon, three (Labosordacus, who reigned 9 months; Darius the Mede, 2 years; and Smerdis, 1 year) are omitted. And thus the number of the Captivity-despots may have been made to be either seven, eight, or ten, according to the view taken. On the full reckoning, the seventh king will be ‘Darius the Mede’ of Daniel: the eighth Cyrus, the first restorer of the Jews: the tenth Darius Hystaspis, the full restorer of God’s people, in whose reign the second temple was finished. If (following the Canon) Darius the Mede be omitted, Cyrus will be the seventh. According to the reckoning of the Canon, Darius Hystaspis is the seventh from Nebuchadnezzar.—The remainder of the Persian division of the Canon comprehends the period of Jewish liberation, but subjection to Persia. In this period there were in all ten kings (see Palmoni, p. 280); but the Canon has only seven, as it omits Artabanus (7 months), Xerxes II. (2 months), and Sogdianus (7 months). In the full reckoning Artaxerxes II. is the seventh.—The Grecian division comprehends the period of the Jews’ subjection to the Grecian rulers of Egypt and Syria, and of their independence under the Asmoneans. In it are found twelve kings, exclusive of Alexander the Great, who is separated from the rest, a new era (the Philippine) being reckoned from the accession of his brother. The seventh from Alexander is Ptolemy Philopator, who attempted to intrude into the Holy of Holies. Of the twelve Philip Aridaeus and Alexander II. might be omitted, as having been kings only in name: and there will then remain ten Ptolemies, though there were in point of fact fifteen from P. Lagi to Cleopatra, if Berenice be reckoned, or fourteen without her. In accordance herewith it is said in the Instructor, vi. p. 174; “Lathyrys [qu. Auletes] is reckoned the twelfth Ptolemy, because the three Alexander Ptolemies, though usurpers, are placed in the list of the Egyptian kings.” The first seven kings in the Philippine era of the Canon ruled over Judea.—Leaving now the Canon for the present, let us advert to the parallel line of the Syrian Seleucidae. Beginning with Alexander as the founder, and including his two universal, but nominal successors, there will be twelve kings completed at the epoch, at which the Jews threw off the Syrian yoke. Excluding as before the two nominal kings, there will remain ten; or, reckoning only the Seleucidae, there will be nine, Antiochus Epiphanes being the eighth. The results will be the same, if the computation be made to include the Egyptian and Syrian kings, who reigned over Judea. Only then, as some doubt may exist, whether Antiochus III. should be reckoned, Antiochus Epiphanes might be accounted either the seventh or the eighth. This is the computation had in view in Daniel. On the full reckoning Epiphanes holds the eleventh place in it. He thus answers to the little horn of Dan. 7; 8, which came up after the ten horns of
the fourth beast. Before this horn three of the ten are said to have been rooted out (see Vol. I; p. 316 ss.), by which is symbolized, that by the omission of three kings (Alexander, his brother, and son), that is, by limiting the reckoning to the Egyptian and Syrian kings, Epiphanes may be made the eighth. He might also be made the tenth by omitting only Alexander on the full reckoning. And thus he is in every respect a precedent of Vespasian, who is made one of the ten horns, and one of the seven heads of the beast, and yet an eighth king.—Again, the number of the Asmoneans is reckoned to be ten (see Palmonsi, p. 395); but, as the complete independence of the Jews was only established by the fourth, their number might be accounted to be seven.—Returning now to the Canon, we find in its Roman division twenty-seven reigns and twenty-eight (four times seven) names between Augustus and Diocletian. But within this period there are fifteen kings omitted. So that on a full reckoning there would be forty-two (six times seven) reigns. Confining our attention to the "twelve Caesars," we find that, by the exclusion of Julius Cesar and the "three rebels," their number is reduced to eight, Nero being fifth, Vespasian sixth, Titus seventh, and Domitian eighth. When the first Cesar is reckoned, Vespasian becomes seventh; and when the three rebels also, tenth. [As to the mystical character of the chronological computation of the Canon see Palmonsi, pp. 660 ss.]

Many illustrations of a similar kind may be found in Palmonsi (see, e.g. pp. 72, 161, 423 ss., 554); but it seems to me, that those found in this Canon are alone sufficient to show, that it was the practice of ancient chronologers to bring dynasties of kings into conformity with certain mystical or predetermined numbers, and that those numbers were seven, going out into completeness in an eighth, and ten, perfected in twelve. [Cp. Vol. I: pp. 214–224, 232, 234.] I will therefore pass on to illustrate this doctrine of the procession of one number into another (being a method of indicating the ne plus ultra of completeness), only remarking further on the point we have been considering, that the early Church seems to have been cognizant of the practice of reducing the decad of kings to a heptad. Irenæus, Victorinus, and Cyril say, that three of the ten kings will be uprooted by Antichrist, who will become himself the eighth. Lactantius, too, says, that the dissolution of the Roman empire would ensue, when ten kings should arise; and an enemy from the North should come against them, and overthrow the three Asiatic kings.

It will suffice for my present purpose to illustrate the going out of seven into completeness in an eighth. And in order to do so I first remark, that there are various reasons for thinking that a mystical character would be, and was attached to the number eight. It is the double of four, the number of universality. It is the lowest cube above
unity. It presents various convenient combinations, and facilities for computation. And the circumstance, that Irenæus thought it worth his while to publish a treatise on the number eight may alone be deemed sufficient proof of this. So, also, the extraordinary retention of the octaeteris cycle in the early Church, and even so late as Bede’s time, may most probably be accounted for by the superstitious veneration, with which the number eight was regarded. In the Sibylline Oracles, I. 325 ss. it is said; ‘His name (referring to Jesus) shall designate to sceptical men eight monads, eight decades, and eight hecatontads’ (= 888). And again in VIII: 368 ss.; ‘The end of the world would quickly follow the destruction of Rome: and then, on the opening of the first octad, another and a better world.’ Again, there are various indications to the same effect in the Scriptures. The tabernacle was to have eight boards and twice eight sockets (Ex. 26: 25); and eight wagons were assigned to Merari to carry them (Nu. 7: 8). Eight bullocks were to be offered on the sixth day (Nu. 29: 29). The foundation-stones of Solomon’s house were eight cubits broad. ‘Jeroboam ordained a feast in the eighth month.’ In Ezekiel’s temple the ascent was by eight steps on three sides, and there were eight tables for sacrificing. In the description of that temple, ‘the territory of Canaan is represented as divided into thirteen parts: seven of these are assigned to seven of the twelve tribes in order, from north to south; then follows an eighth, containing the four-square oblation, the land eastward and westward of which is assigned to the Prince; and south of this eighth part follow the portions of the five remaining tribes.’ But, to come more immediately to the point in hand, I observe, that there may be traced from the earliest times an including of eight particulars in a heptad, or a regarding of an eighth as the perfecting of seven. The Jewish child was to be brought into covenant with God, when a week old, that is, he was to be circumcised when “eight days old” (Gen. 17: 12; Lu. 2: 21); and great importance was attached to the περιεργον δεκαπεπεραμενός (Ph. 3: 5 cp. Lu. 1: 59; Acts 7: 8 Gk.). The seven lean kine were as an eighth to the seven preceding them, which they swallowed up. The great feasts of the Jews were each to be observed for a week, including two Sabbaths (Lev. 23: 39; Nu. 29; 35), that is, for eight days. So also “they sanctified the house of the Lord in eight days.” And, in accordance with this is the mode of expression used by St John (20: 19, 26) to denote the interval between two Lord’s days; “after eight days again His disciples were within.” Perhaps, too, the same period may be designated by the much-disputed phrase χαμίπορων δευτεροποιητῶν. This may have been a technical phrase, from which was derived, or to which corresponded the ‘octave’ in the Christian Church,—a period still retained, as may be seen in the proper pre-
faces of the Communion service, three of which prescribe eight days' observance, but the fourth seven days'. It was "an eight days after" the announcement of His approaching crucifixion, that our Lord was transfigured. Again, the pentecostal day or week was a sort of eighth (i.e., it involved the same principle) to the preceding seven times seven days; and so in like manner in the cases of "the sabbath of years," and the "seven sabbaths of years" or jubilee-period. These two cases are especially worthy of notice; because, inasmuch as during the eighth year the Israelites were to subsist on the fruits of the sixth, in that eighth the miracle was actually realized, and so the seventh year might be regarded as in some sort carried forward into it (see Lev. 23: 16; 25: 4, 8, 10, 22): and hence probably may have originated the idea of seven going out into completeness in the eighth. In 1 Chron. 2: 15 David is said to have been the seventh son of Jesse, but in 1 Sam. 17: 12, 14 the eighth. Such a mode of expression as the following, compared with others (as Job 5: 19; Prov. 6: 16) tends the same way; "Give a portion to seven, and also to eight" (Ec. 11: 2). So also; "He (the spirit) taketh with himself seven other spirits;" "He saved Noah, the eighth person."—Similar views may be found in the earliest Christian writings. For example: S. Barnabas says; "When the Lord shall make all things new, then shall be the beginning of an eighth day (meaning the eighth chilliad), which is the beginning of another world." In the Test. XII. Patr. the Lord is represented as having created man with seven spirits, to which Belial has added seven spirits of error. And in each case there has been superadded an eighth spirit, τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἐννοοῦ, apparently to modify the other spirits. In Enoch C. 92; 13; "The eighth week is a week of righteousness, in which the house of the great king [the Christian Church] shall be set up for ever." And St. Jerome speaks of the Christian sabbath as the eighth day. And again, in his letter 129 to Cyprian, speaking of the six chilliads of the world's duration, he says; "Afterwards will come the septenary and octenary number, in which the true sabbath will take place." Cyprian, too, speaks of "the hebdomads" or "mansions of the blessed," and "the opdoad" or "highest heaven, in which alone the Divine presence is manifested."—Among the heathen, the same idea is found. Thus, in the Egyptian mythology Pan was represented as connecting and uniting the seven inferior divinities, in whom were personified the seven original powers, and as being himself an eighth. —To come, now, more particularly to the case of kings. The way in which, in the dynasties to which reference has just been made, the most distinguished or notorious king is seen to be brought into the seventh or the eighth place, according to the view that might be taken, favours the hypothesis in question. Cyrus or Darius, the restorers,—Ptolemy Philopator, Seleucus Philopator, and Antiochus
Epiphanes, the profaners,—Antigonus, the last Jewish king,—Ptolemy
Epiphanes, the last of the Lagides who ruled over Judea,—Vespasian
and Titus, ‘the destroyers,’—and Domitian, the tyrant,—may all be
brought on different computations into the seventh or eighth places.
Again, there is a passage (5; 5, 6) in ‘the Vision of Micah concerning
Samaria and Jerusalem in the days of Hezekiah,’ which is very much
to our purpose. “And this man shall be the peace (or, the restorer),
when the Assyrian shall come into our land: and when he shall tread
in our land, then shall we raise against him seven shepherds and eight
principal men (lit. princes of men). And they shall waste the land
of Assyria . . . with her own naked swords (=the land of Assyria
shall be wasted in civil war). Thus shall he deliver (us) from the
Assyrian, when he cometh into our land, and when he treadeth within
our borders.” The immediate reference obviously is to the times
of the prophet. This portion of the Vision is assigned to n.c. 720,—the
seventh of Hezekiah,—the year following the captivity of Israel, and
seven years prior to the Assyrian invasion. Sennacherib’s is the in-
vasion alluded to; and, from the circumstance of his having been
slain on his return home by his two sons, it is probable, that his
invasion of Judea was followed by a civil war in Assyria. “This
man” is Hezekiah; and “the Assyrian” is Sennacherib. “The seven
shepherds” (a well-known designation of kings, see Vol. I: p. 214)
are Hezekiah’s seven successors down to the captivity; and the “eight
princes of men” (a mystical phrase, like the preceding designation)
are the same, with Hezekiah included. Thus Hezekiah, though the
first, is made (just as Noah elsewhere) an eighth; in order to which
an inversion of the computation must be supposed, having for its
object to bring Hezekiah (as being the most distinguished king)
under the octenary number, considered as the complement to the
septenary. And thus a going out of seven into completeness in an
eighth is made manifest; and that in close connexion with the first de-
struction of Jerusalem,—the octad indeed fills the interval between
the captivities of Israel and Judah. Observe too, that the number of
twelve kings was made complete up to Hezekiah, and that he and his
seven successors make up the twenty kings of Judah.—I will only
further notice here, that this practice of making seven go out into
completeness in an eighth may possibly have had an astronomical
origin. In Enoch, c. 71, there is an interesting account of the views,
which were current in the first century of the motions of the heavenly
bodies. We may thence deduce, that it was the practice to resolve
them all into sevens. But how was this to be effected in the case of
the solar month, which was supposed to consist ordinarily of 30 days?
Thus:—The 30 days were divided into two 15’s. Then each 15 con-
tained 7 + 1 + 7 days. And so each seven (the one reckoned forwards,
the other backwards) was accounted a heptad, having its completeness only in an octad.

I will now proceed to the application of what has been shown, beginning with the larger numbers, and briefly recalling to the reader's recollection in the first instance the facts connected with the heads and horns of the two beasts.

The two beasts of C. 13 have twelve horns between them, ten appertaining to the first, and two to the second. This number accords with that of the Caesars, as given by Suetonius; though, as the family of Caesar became extinct with Nero, it would seem, that the number must have been arbitrarily assigned, in order to produce a coincidence with the civil or political number (see Vol. I: p. 37). On this view, the computation that began with Julius was adopted, and the names were as follows. 1. Julius. 2. Augustus. 3. Tiberius. 4. Caius Caligula. 5. Claudius. 6. Nero. 7. Galba. 8. Otho. 9. Vitellius. 10. Vespasian. 11. Titus. 12. Domitian. But a difference is observable between the horns. The ten on the first beast were full-grown, but the two on the second were only nascent. This may be accounted for (as I have shown on 891) by the circumstance, that the reigns of the two last kings did not come within the period included in this trumpet-symbolization, though it was necessary formally to include them in the symbolization, in order to show the civil number. Again, it may be observed, that the horn which represents Vespasian is found, not on the Flavian, but on the Julian beast. This may be explained (see on 889), as to the symbol, by the necessity there was to bring it into accordance with the precedent in Da. 7; 7; and, as to the thing symbolized, by the call to make it accord with the proper dynastic or regal number ten: and it might be justified by the circumstance, that Vespasian acted in the first instance as Nero's representative, and subsequently became a second Nero in completing the work which the latter had begun; and hence might be accounted, in respect of God's ancient people, a member of the same beast as Nero.

I turn now to the seven heads. If it has been correctly determined, that Nero is included in the five that were fallen, the computation which began with Augustus must have been followed in C. 17 in respect of the heads; as that which began with Julius was in C. 13 in respect of the horns: at least, the reckoning could not have begun with an earlier, though it might with a later emperor than Augustus. Let us, then, consider the several hypotheses, that may be made.—1st. Suppose the same computation that is given in Ptolemy's Canon to have been followed. In it, Julius and 'the three rebels' being omitted, Vespasian answers to the sixth (the head that "is"), Titus to the seventh head, and Domitian will be the eighth or supernumerary king. The recommendations of this view are the following.
(1). In it an actual computation of coeval date is adopted. The omission of Caesar is supported, as I have shown, by other authorities. The omission, also, of three kings has the sanction of many precedents, which show it to have been a common practice to strike out that number; and the exclusion, in particular, of Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, in the present instance, is accredited by the passage cited under No. 920 from the Sibylline Oracles. On whatever grounds these three chiefs may have been excluded, the fact of their omission is unquestionable: but it may be observed, that the designation which Suetonius applies to them appears to show, that they were left out as being accounted 'rebels,' and not emperors. In accordance with this view are Browne's remarks (O. S. p. 678); "Three of the typical ten horns give way before Vespasian, the tenth of their order. The 'rebellio trium principium' sinks before the man, who was raised up to preenact the vengeance, which will be wielded hereafter by one greater than he."

(2). On this computation the twelve Caesars, represented by the twelve horns of the two first beasts, are reduced so as to leave eight kings, corresponding to the seven heads and an eighth king, or to the eight heads of the two beasts. (3). Titus, the destroyer of Jerusalem, appropriately enough appears as the seventh head; and Domitian, the tyrant, as the eighth. (4). The short reign of Titus accurately corresponds to the duration of the seventh head, which was to continue only a little while; and the termination of the dynasty of Caesars in Domitian suite the beast's going into perdition in the eighth king. On the other hand, it may be thought, that a strong objection to this view is presented in the circumstance, that Vespasian is made to be the reigning emperor, contrary to what has been shown on 1147-8. Yet this would seem to be satisfactorily obviated on the following hypothesis. Suppose the author to have written after the time, when Vespasian was proclaimed emperor (in July 69), but before the contest between him and Vitellius had been decided. The matter might then be regarded and exhibited by the author as follows. If the three rebels are to be left out of the account, and the accession of Augustus is to be esteemed the era of the empire, then Vespasian will answer to the sixth and reigning head, Titus to the one of short continuance, and Domitian will be the eighth king, in whom the dynasty of Caesars will go into perdition. On this view it may be said, that the beast 'was and is not;' inasmuch as the dynasty of the Caesars proper ceased to exist in Nero—that he 'is not and yet is;' inasmuch as the restorer of the Cessarian dynasty is now a competitor for the throne, but has not yet succeeded in obtaining it:—and that he 'will ascend out of the abyss, and go into perdition; inasmuch as Vespasian will obtain the throne, and in his dynasty 'the Caesars' will become extinct.—2dly. The computation of the seven heads
may have begun with Caligula. On this view, Vitellius would be the sixth and living emperor, and Vespasian the seventh. The recommendations of it are the following. (1). The author himself may perhaps be thought to give an intimation of it, in the distinction he has made in C. 13; 2 (see on 858) between the first three emperors and the rest,—a distinction, which may be supposed to indicate, that, while those three are to be reckoned in the number of the horns, in order to make 'the twelve Caesars' complete, they are not to be taken into account in any other point of view. (2). On this hypothesis, the reckoning of the heads would appropriately begin with the emperor, who first blasphemously strove 'to place himself in the temple of God, showing himself as God.' On the other hand, the following objections lie against this view. The statement, that the seventh head would continue but for a short time does not accord so well with the duration of Vespasian's reign, as with that of Titus. But perhaps it may be thought, that this objection is obviated by the consideration, that the statement may have reference only to that portion of Vespasian's reign which preceded the termination of the old Mystery in A.D. 70, thus much only being included in the trumpet we are considering. Again, when Vespasian is made to be the seventh head, the statement, that 'the beast that was and is not, even he is an eighth king, and is of the seven, and goeth into perdition,' is satisfied only in respect of his being 'of the seven.' But perhaps the following explanation of this difficulty may be accepted. When Vespasian, from being symbolized by the tenth horn, is brought under the symbolization of the seventh head, the head of the second beast, which represents his dynasty, may be held to denote an additional king, that king being Domitian, in whom the dynasty of Caesars came to an end.—3dly. One other view only, I believe, can be taken, namely, that different modes of computing have been taken in turn, according as the production of the mystical numbers, seven and eight, required. And this is not an improbable view; for the circumstances were such, as would make easy and be thought to justify its adoption. Sealiger justly complained, that the statements of the ancient authors relating to Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, are very confused and contradictory. Josephus's statements are not self-consistent; and they differ from those of the Roman historians, who also disagree among themselves. Certain it is, that Otho had no Thoth in his reign; and on this account would rightly be excluded from a computation. On the same ground, too, Vitellius may have been omitted; for Dio Cassius states, that the whole duration of the reigns of these three emperors amounted only to thirteen months and two days; and Vespasian had become a competitor for the throne at a date, which would allow of the Thoth of A.D. 69 being reckoned to his reign, which, as
he proved to be the successful candidate, it probably would be. Or Vitellius might be excluded, on the ground that he was only one of three competitors for the throne, and did not obtain undisputed possession of it. All the three were, as a matter of fact, excluded (as we have seen) from some computations. And hence it appears, that three, two, one, or none of these emperors might be included in a computation, as happened to suit the immediate purpose of the computator. Now, if the author wrote in the reign of Galba, he may be thought to have intended to put the matter thus. If Otho and Vitellius are both excluded from the reckoning, as having no Thoth in their reigns, then Vespasian will become the seventh king; but if Otho only be omitted on this account, then Vespasian will be the eighth. Under this doubtfullness as to the mode of reckoning, Vespasian may be brought into the number of the seven heads, and yet be accounted as an eighth king. Some such variation in the computation as this must unquestionably have been contemplated; for in no other way can the same king be made to be one of seven, and at the same time an eighth in addition to that seven.—Having now stated the arguments for and against the several hypotheses that may be made, I leave the reader to judge which view is most worthy of acceptance, only observing, that any one of the three is, in my opinion, more unobjectionable in itself, and has better claims to be received, than any that I have seen propounded by Prescientist expositors. The difficulties attending the exposition of this passage are very great on every view of it; and no interpretation has ever been made, to which weighty objections might not be taken. All that we can do is to adopt that view, which presents the fewest difficulties,—is best supported by the scheme as a whole,—and accords best with the notions and modes of computing, which prevailed at the time.

DIV. 5. EXPLANATION OF THE BEAST: (3.) OF A SUPERNUMERARY KING.

XVII; 11. 1161–63. 'And the wild-beast which was and is not, he is both an eighth [king], and is of the seven [heads], and goeth into perdition.'

1161. Which was and is not. This appears to be a concise way of designating the beast in his entirety, after the manner in which he was spoken of in ve. 8, the clause and is about to come up from the abyss being omitted, in order to avoid cumbering the text with so many words. I cannot think, that the intention is to distinguish between two parts of the beast (that is, either between two dynasties, or two individuals, or the same individual at different times), and to represent the earlier of the two, as becoming subsequently an eighth and final king; for, while it is said here, that the eighth king goeth into perdition, according to ve. 8 it would be the second of the two.
parts, if any distinction were made between them, which would go into perdition. At the same time I admit, that this clause has, primæ fæciæ, such a bearing, that, in conjunction with the rumour relating to Nero, it may easily have received that application to him, which was given to it in some ancient writings. If, as Stuart maintains, an individual is exclusively had in view here, and that individual the king of whom it is said in ve. 10 "he is," how could it be said of him here, "he was and is not?" Both statements could not be true in reference to the same individual. And consequently one or other of Stuart's interpretations must be erroneous. I take the following, then, to be the literal purport of the declaration before us. 'The Cesarian beast is specially representative of a king, who may be regarded as being at once an eighth in reference to the seven, and at the same time one of the seven.'—Which of the emperors is had in view? is the next question. To a solution of it we must be guided by the hypotheses considered under Nos. 1158–60. If we adopt the first of the three, Domitian will be the king. He has been shown to be 'an eighth;' but it has not appeared, how he can be considered to have been 'one of the seven.' Under the second hypothesis, Domitian holds the ninth place. But, by omitting first two, and then one of 'the rebels,' he might be brought in succession into the seventh and eighth places. Under the third hypothesis, Vespasian would be the king; and he, as I have shown, might be accounted 'an eighth, and one of the seven.' The only difficulty that attends this view is, that the beast did not go into perdition in Vespasian. But this difficulty may perhaps be obviated in either of two ways. It may be considered, that the beast's becoming extinct in Vespasian's dynasty suffices to satisfy the statement. Or, it may be thought (comparing ve. 8), that the statement should be read thus:—'The beast which was and is not and goeth into perdition, he is both an eighth, and is of the seven.'—On a point of so much difficulty as this statement presents on any and every scheme of interpretation, far from dogmatizing, I would scarcely venture to offer an opinion. I will, however, under the next number lay before the reader the view, which seems to me to be on the whole the most probable.

1162–3. *He is both, &c.* Stress is thrown on the *he* by the insertion of the Greek pronoun.—The *αια, and, must in this place be rendered both, even, or also.—Not *the eighth,* as the A. V. has it, but *an eighth.*' By the former and erroneous rendering some undue censure is given to the antipapistical scheme, which makes "the eighth *head*" (as they are pleased to speak) everything. But in truth there is no such thing as an eighth head spoken of here. The gender of the adjective shows beyond dispute, that it refers to *king* and not to *head.*—It will be convenient to place in juxtaposition with
the clauses of the verse before us, the similar ones in ve. 8, in order to observe their points of resemblance and difference.

"The beast... was and is not, and is about to come up out of the abyss, and to go into perdition."

"The beast... was and is not, and shall reappear" [or, "and yet is'].

"The beast... which was and is not, he is both an eighth and is of the seven, and he goeth into perdition."

From the identity in the first clauses in all three examples, and between the third in the first and third examples, and from the similarity between the first two of the second clauses, we may with much probability infer, that the third of the second clauses is intended to correspond substantially to the first two, that is, that it relates to the same party and epoch as they do, namely, to the beast [or dynasty], the distinguishing characteristic of which was its coming up as a new and yet the same beast [or dynasty], and whose distinctive designation was, that it was 'from the abyss.' This will conduct us to the following interpretation of this statement of the angel-interpreter, and make it appear easy and natural. 'The beast that was and is not, &c., symbolizes in particular Vespasian, the founder of the Flavian dynasty, who as such superadds a king, Domitian, who, being an eighth, is necessarily not one of the seven symbolic heads, though in respect of the founder of the dynasty he may be considered to be included in the seven; and in whom the Cæsarian dynasty goes into extinction.

DIV. 6. EXPLANATION OF THE BEAST: (4.) OF HIS HORNS; TEN CAESARS.

XVII; 12–14. 1164–73. 'And the ten horns which thou didst behold are ten kings, who have not received kingly authority as yet, but are receiving authority as kings at one hour with the wild-beast. These have one purpose; and their might and authority they give to the wild-beast. These shall war with the Lamb; and the Lamb shall conquer them; because he is a Lord of Lords and a King of kings; and they who are with him [are] called and elected faithful [ones].'

1164. The ten horns are ten kings. Elliott and other expositors of his school, while they take the heptad of kings to mean a series of diverse forms of government succeeding one another, interpret this decad to be ten kingdoms (meaning thereby so many tribes of barbarians) existing contemporaneously. That kings does not mean kingdoms I have shown on 1157: and a further confirmation of the fact may be derived from the signification of a horn, which in Vol. I: pp. 18, 19, 310, I have shown not to denote a kingdom, but, when used emblematically power in the abstract, and when used symbolically
a king. Here, therefore, it will only be necessary to inquire, whether there is any ground for taking these to be contemporaneous kings. And there is the more occasion to investigate this question; because Stuart and other expositors of the Præterist school, and also Hengstenberg, take the same view with the Præsentists. Now, in point of fact, every indication in the Apocalypse itself and in the book of Daniel is opposed to this view; and therefore I am justified in saying, that it is nothing else than a reflection from the schemes of expositors, who, being unable to make a series of kings square with their views, have taken advantage of the absence of any explicit statement to the contrary to make the text mean what would suit their schemes. 1. In ve. 10 it is said; "The seven heads are seven kings." Why should not these be taken to be contemporaneous kings, if the ten are? With equal reason they might be, and perhaps would have been, if statements did not follow, which show that consecutive rulers were meant. How little ground is there, then, for construing the precisely parallel statement before us, merely from the absence of a declaration to the contrary, as speaking of contemporaneous rulers! 2. Again, the ten-horned beast of Daniel is on all hands allowed to have been a precedent of the ten-horned beast of John. Whatever, therefore, is true of the horns of the former may be expected to be true of those of the latter: nay, on the view of Præsentists, must be true; since they hold that these two beasts represent the same kingdom. Now I have shown in Vol. I: pp. 310 et seq., that the fourth beast of Daniel represents the Grecian kingdom, and that his horns denote the kings, who reigned in succession after Alexander. The presumption, therefore, is that the ten here are also successive kings. 3. The generality of the precedents support the view I take. The following are all the instances which occur. (1) The four parts of Nebuchadnezzar's image. (2) The four beasts which came up together. (3) The four heads of the third beast. (4) The ten horns of the fourth. (5) The two horns of the ram. (6) The four horns of the he-goat. (7) The four horns of Zec. 1; 18. (8) The four carpenters of Zec. 1; 20. (9) The four chariots of Zec. 6; 1. (10) The four winds of Ez. 37; 9. (11) The seven heads of the dragon. (12) The ten horns of the same. (13) The seven heads of the beast from the sea. (14) The ten horns of the same. (15) The two horns of the beast from the earth. (16) The seven heads of the beast from the abyss. (17). The ten horns of the same. Of these it is generally agreed, that the 1st, 2nd, 5th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, 13th, and 16th, represent things which were consecutive. With regard to the 3rd, 4th, 12th, 14th, 15th, and 17th, I maintain consecutiveness, while the Præsentists contend for contemporaneousness. The sixth I allow to be a doubtful case:—doubtful; because, if the four horns of the he-goat symbolize (see Vol. I:
p. 311) the four kingdoms, into which Alexander's empire was divided, these may still have been regarded, as not having been wholly contemporaneous, but as having risen up one after another. It appears, then, that in ten instances all parties admit consecutive significations, while in none is an unquestionably contemporaneous sense allowed by all, and only in one is it agreed, that there is room to entertain doubt. A rule, then, is hereby made out sufficient for our guidance; and it ought certainly to be allowed to settle the question in a case, in which no other evidence whatever, independent of particular and controverted interpretations, is to be had. When it may be said, that, in every other instance a number of horns denotes so many consecutive kings, the same ought, in the absence of proof to the contrary, to be assumed in the case in question. 4. Further, this beast being substantially identical with the first of C. 13, the horns of the two must be identical. But it is shown by the details in the chapter (see on 851 a e), that the horns of the first beast represent successive kings. So, then, must these. This I take to be a conclusive proof, that successive (and not contemporaneous) kings are meant here. And, if so, a deadly blow has been dealt on a fundamental point in almost all Preterist and Presentist schemes.—That by the ten kings are meant ten Cæsars I have already shown. And this interpretation is confirmed by the circumstance, that the diadems, which in C. 12 are assigned to the dragon's heads, in C. 13 are placed on the beast's horns. The dragon and the beasts being substantially identical in signification, this is a clear indication, that the heads and the horns of each symbolize the same line of kings.—As to the allocation of the horns on the heads I have already (on 785) intimated, that, as nothing is said on the point, the reasonable conclusion is, that it was not intended to come into consideration; but that, if some distribution must be made, that which would best suit the thing signified would be to allot one horn to each of the heads, excepting the sixth, to which three additional but diminutive horns for Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, should be assigned. Presentists, who assign the horns to a particular head, cannot agree among themselves, which should be the head. Thus, Faber contends for the first revivified: Cuninghame for the seventh: Elliott for the eighth or revived seventh.

1165-6. Who have not received kingly authority as yet, but are receiving authority as kings at one hour with the beast. That βασιλέα means sovereign authority as often as a kingdom is indubitable. Cf. and see on 1; 6: 11; 15: 12; 10: 17; 18. So Hengstenberg; "The word kingdom is used here in an active sense, of the government, the kingly authority. We are not to explain a kingdom, but rather which had not yet received kingdom or dominion."—The most ancient Codex and some versions have a reading, which, if adopted, would
cause the omission of as yet.—At one hour becomes equivalent here to at one and the same time with; as Vitringa also says, and Elliott has shown. The same phrase is used in C. 18; 10, 17, 19; but the difference of case in the two places shows, that there a point of time, but here duration of time is intended (cp. Mt. 26; 40).—There is a reading, which would require the rendering to be after the beast. But it is not one of the least value. Nor is the gloss of Stuart at all more worthy of reception, namely, with the aid, concurrence, or co-operation of the beast. This is nothing else than a distortion to suit his own view. In this and every other particular relating to the ten horns, he has found himself unable to give a particular interpretation and application on the hypothesis of their contemporaneousness. The true force of the preposition here is to express accompaniment, as may be seen by comparing C. 6; 8; “Hades followed with (i.e., accompanied) him.” see on 413, and cp. 20; 4; “they reigned with Christ.”—The first clause speaks of the kings as of a decad or corporate body complete in itself: and so indeed they are spoken of throughout. Hence the statement is not to be understood as setting forth, that none of the kings have received sovereign authority, but that they have not received it as a whole, or “collectively,” as Scott says. This clearly appears from the next clause, which states, that they are (that is, at the time of writing) in course of receiving such authority, and further, that they receive that authority at one and the same time with the beast, in other words, they measure the beast’s existence, or the beast represents the aggregate of their several reigns. The same appears from the clause in ve. 13; “They give their authority to the beast,” and again from that in ve. 17; “to give their kingly authority to the beast.” The horns are never mentioned separately or individually (as the heads are), but always as a decad. And it has already been noticed, that the majority of them have been introduced merely in order to the completeness and identification of the dynasty. Hence, various things are predicated of them as a whole, which are true only of a part: just as things are repeatedly said to be done by the beast, which are done by one only of his heads, each head being pro temp. the beast.—This verse only serves to make more clear the fact, that a dynasty then reigning was signified by the beast and his horns. Its general purport I take to be as follows:—

‘By the ten horns a decad of kings is symbolized, who have not yet completed their term of dominion, but are now in course of completing it during the short period that still remains of the beast’s existence.’—The one hour of this verse appears to correspond to the short time of the seventh head’s continuance: see ve. 10.—Hengstenberg remarks here; “Those, who understand by the beast heathen Rome [Hengstenberg has in view Bossuet’s interpretation], and those
likewise who understand by it the Papacy, are involved in no small perplexity by the expression here "with the beast," and also by ve. 13. They suppose, that the ten kings shall hold only at first with the beast (Bossuet, "with Rome which shall not lose all at once her power"), and that they shall afterwards rise up against her. But it is against this view, that in vv. 12–14, the matter of the horns is so far cut off, that in vv. 15–18, where the whore is the subject of discourse, nothing absolutely new can be introduced in regard to the horns, nothing can be brought in, which has not a point of contact with something in the portion preceding ve. 15. But such would be the case if the beast were heathen Rome, or the papacy. Then, here it would be friendship, there quite suddenly and immediately enmity. Not to mention that according to ve. 16, not merely the horns, but also the beast itself, shall hate and persecute the whore, Rome."

XVII; 13. 1167. These have one purpose; "for God hath put into their hearts to accomplish one purpose, and to accomplish His purpose" (ve. 17 lit.).

1168. And their might and authority they give to the beast. Ve. 17; "and to give their kingly authority to the beast."—The A.V., following the R. T., has they shall give.—If it be called to mind, that I take the salient feature in the symbolization of the beast to be, that he represents the imperial or despotic power in contradistinction from the republican or free constitution of Rome, the truth and pertinency of this statement will be apparent. It was the one object of the Cæsars to build up their own authority on the ruins of the Commonwealth, and to accomplish this object they devoted all their energies and power.

XVII; 14. 1169. These shall war with the lamb. That the servants of the lamb are meant to be included in the expression with the lamb appears from the clause at the end of the verse.—The author, still regarding the ten horns as constituting a corporate body,—as a decadal unit, attributes to them as a whole the acts of a part of the body. We may understand this war, either as including the attempt of Caligula to set up his statue in the temple of God, the persecution of Christians by Nero, and the war waged by Nero and Vespasian against the Jews, or as being limited to the latter. But indeed, if we call to mind, that it is the lamb of C. 5; 6,—the symbol of Christ as the Mediator and Saviour of his covenant-people from the foundation of the world,—that is spoken of, it will be seen, that the making war may be predicated in reference to the whole of the Cæsars; since the period of their sway may be said to have been co-extensive with Rome's dominion over the Holy Land.

1170. And the lamb shall conquer them. As Christ is represented (6; 2) as going forth at the beginning of the ages 'conquering, and in order that he might finally conquer,' so at the end (19; 11 ss.) we
find the completion of the conquest which is here announced symbolized. The nature of the conquest will be considered under the latter passage.—In Test. XII Patr. xi. is a passage very similar to this; "The virgin of Judah produced a spotless lamb, and all the beasts rushed with violence against this lamb; and the lamb overcame them, and trode them down."—Those who interpret the ten horns as representing ten tribes of Goths, find here a difficulty, from which they are not able to escape without leaving a fatal objection to their schemes. They can preserve no consistency of interpretation; but, while the ten tribes wage a war of physical force against Christ's Church, they have no alternative but to make the war on the part of the Church one of moral suasion.

1171. Because he is a lord of [all] lords and a king of [all] kings, he must necessarily vindicate his supremacy by ultimately obtaining the victory in the contest with this series of kings.—This clause, by its reappearance in C. 19; 16 as a designation of the conqueror, strongly connects this passage with that symbolization of Christ's advent, and shows, that the war here spoken of is that, of which the result is symbolized in that chapter. Cp. 1 Ti. 6; 14; . . . "until the manifestation of our Lord Jesus Christ, which in his own appointed times the blessed and only potentate, the king of those that reign, and a lord of those who exercise lordship, . . . will exhibit."

1172–3. And they who [are] with him [are] called and elected and faithful [ones]. Plainly the 144 chiliads of C. 14; 1–5 (cp. 938), the martyr-conquerors of C. 15; 2–4 (cp. 1005), and specially the 'armies,' which appear in C. 19; 14 arrayed as conquerors, are here had in view; and from a comparison of the several places clear indications of the virtual synchronism of the passages may be derived. These are, in particular, 'the called to the marriage-supper of the lamb' (19; 9), 'the chosen unto redemption from the foundation of the world' (ve. 8; 14; 4), and 'the faithful martyrs,' to whom, as they have been 'faithful unto death,' 'the faithful One,' even 'the faithful and true martyr,' 'gives a crown of life' (2; 10, 13: 3; 14; 19; 11).—Hengstenberg observes; "We must not say with Bengal, 'The victory belongs alone to the Lamb, and not to his associates. These must only follow; and, even if the attack is directed against them, must look on at the victory.' Believers are expressly represented as sharers in the victory, and they must also be regarded as sharers in the conflict." It is true, that the witnesses for Jesus are described as 'those who conquer,' and as 'those who gain the victory over the beast' (2; 7 &c.: 15; 2); and Hengstenberg's view is rendered the more probable by the circumstance, that the true rendering of this clause may be, and they who are with him, the called, elect, and faithful, shall conquer them: cp. Lu. 6; 3. Still, it is manifest, that it is only passively,
that the lamb's followers are engaged in the conflict: their part is to 'resist unto their own deaths.' They are not represented as taking any part in the war symbolized in C. 19; 11 ss.; but are present merely as spectators. In that war Divine Providence alone operates.

DIV. 7. OF THE WHORE'S RELATIONS TO THE WATERS, AND TO THE BEAST AND HIS HORDS. Rome, the peoples, and the Caesars.

XVII; 15-18. 1174-88. And he saith to me; 'The waters which thou didst behold, where the fornicatrix sitteth, are peoples and multitudes and nations and tongues. And the ten horns which thou didst behold and the wild-beast, these will hate the fornicatrix, and will make her desolate and naked, and will eat her flesh, and will burn her with fire. For God hath put into their hearts to do his will, and to keep one purpose, and to give their kingly authority to the wild-beast, until the words of God shall have been brought to an end. And the woman whom thou didst behold is the great city, which exerciseth sovereign authority over the kings of the earth.'

1174. And he saith to me. The three repetitions of this clause (vv. 1, 8, 15) appear to be designed to mark so many of the divisions. Hengstenberg is of the same opinion.

1175. The waters, etc. Cp. Je. 47; 2: Is. 8; 7: 17; 12: Lu. 21; 25, and see on 1121. Strictly speaking, no waters had been described as beheld. Allusion had only been made to them, in ve. 1, before the seer was carried into the wilderness to see the whore. Here the woman is again appropriately designated the whore; because the subject is the domination which she exercises.

1176. Are peoples, etc.—the formula of universality: see on 700.—The substitution here of multitudes in place of the tribes of C. 5; 9, 13, and of the kings of C. 10; 11, is manifestly appropriate; for the Greek word signifies a crowd of people in a state of uproar and commotion.—Inasmuch as the whore is here virtually said to have authority to the same extent, that the beast is said in C. 13; 7 to have, the substantial identity of the things signified by the two is hereby established.

XVII; 16. 1177. The ten horns and the beast. The R. T. has 'upon the beast;' but this reading is generally rejected in critical editions. The purport of the true reading will be 'the beast in his corporate capacity and in his several members.'

1178. These. As in C. 14; 4 this word occurs three times in reference to the 144 chiliiads, so here it is used three times in reference to the horns. In its gender we may again note a constructio ad sensum, which alone might suffice to show, that kings and not kingdoms are had in view; for the Greek pronoun is neither put in the neuter to agree with horns, nor in the feminine to agree with king.
dons, but in the masculine to agree with kings.—Shall hate the whore, 
&c. Four modes of tormenting or destroying,—hating, desolating, 
eating, and burning, are here introduced with the view rather to 
denote, that every kind of calamity will be brought on the whore by 
the horns and the beast, than that so many different kinds will be 
used.—If it be recollected, that I take the beast and his horns to 
denote the imperial régime under the Cæsars collectively and 
individually, and the whore the republican constitution of Rome, the inter-
pretation will be seen to be obvious. The corresponding literal state-
ment will be this. 'The Cæsars, as a body and as individuals, will use 
every possible means to subvert and destroy Rome's free and 
ancient constitution, and to establish a despotic monarchy in the 
place thereof.'

1179. And make her desolate and naked. Appropriately to her 
being made desolate is the scene laid in a desolate place: and so in 
C. 18; 16, 19, it is said of Babylon; “In one hour she is made des-
olate.”—Cp. Eze. 23; 29 ss.; “They shall leave thee naked; . . . 
because thou hast gone a whoring after the heathen, and art polluted 
with their idols.”

1180. And shall eat her flesh. Flesh is put in the plural to denote 
the great quantity that is eaten: cp. C. 8; 3; “many incenses.” 
In like manner flesh is in the plural in C. 19; 18, 21, and repeated 
six times, with the same object.—In Is. 17; 4: Mi. 3; 2: Zec. 11; 
9 ss.: Da. 7; 5, flesh is interpreted by the Targum and the Oneiro-
critics as meaning 'riches and substance.'—Cp. James 5; 3.

1181. And shall utterly burn her with fire. So of Babylon in C. 18; 
8 it is said; “she shall be utterly burnt with fire.”—Cp. Le. 21; 8; 
“If the daughter of any priest profane herself by playing the whore, 
she shall be burnt with fire.”

1178–81. In these four numbers an alternating application to the 
two symbols,—the woman and the city, appears to be designed, as 
thus: 'hate the whore; 'desolate the city; 'make naked the whore; 
'burn the city.'—There is, too, a contrast manifestly intended to be 
made with the previous account of the whore in vv. 1–6. 'The kings 
shall hate her, whose love was once sought by kings: make her des-
olate, who before was decked out in gold and pearls: strip her naked, 
who before was arrayed in purple and scarlet: eat her flesh, who was 
bloated with blood: burn her with fire, who was seated on many waters.' 

XVII; 17. 1182–84. For God . . . their kingdom to the beast. These 
three numbers are for substance a repetition of ve. 13: see on 1167–8. 
The only difference worthy of notice is, that what was there said to 
be the purpose of the ten kings is here traced up to God, as being 
originally His purpose. While the kings purposed to do only their 
own will, they were in reality accomplishing God’s will.—We have
now seen, that the whore sits on the beast, and that she is torn by
the horns, who give their kingship to the beast. On the antipapistical
scheme, which interprets the whore to be the Church of Rome, the
beast to be the Roman empire (from Romulus to Augustulus) and the
Papacy, and the horns to be ten Gothic tribes, this ought to be
rendered literally thus. The Church of Rome is ostensibly the ruling
power in relation to the Roman empire and the Papacy, is destroyed
by the Goths, who give their authority to the Roman empire and the
Papacy!!—It should be observed, that the whore sits on the beast
equally under all his heads. This gives another blow to the anti-
papistical theory.

1185. Until the words of God shall have been brought to an end, sc.
by receiving their accomplishment: see on 683, 725, 1032. But,
what words? Doubtless, the word, that 'the hour of God's judging
hath come' (11: 18: 14: 7), and also the word of 'the good news of
the bringing to an end of the Mystery of God' (10: 7), are referred to.

XVII; 18. 1186–8. The woman is the great city, which is reigning [or
hath kingship] over the kings of the earth. This sentence is appended
by way of a final and crowning explanation, which shall leave no
room whatever for doubt as to the thing signified. And it certainly
ought to have done so. But, as it has not, it will be necessary to
establish its true meaning and reference at some length.—I will first
quote Hengstenberg's remarks; "It is the city, which had dominion
in the time of the Seer, that is spoken of. In vain have Bengel and
others employed their ingenuity on the has. It never once means:
which then has. In the presence of the great city, which then had
dominion over the kings of the earth, John must necessarily have
expressed himself otherwise, if he had not meant that city, which all
his first readers would naturally think of, but another one. Besides,
if the kings are worldly kings, then the kingdom, which the woman
has, will be a worldly kingdom. Papal Rome, too, has never had for
the papacy the same importance, which heathen Rome had for the
Roman empire. The pope has never been, like the emperor, only
the representative of Rome, so that the dominion might be attributed
not to him, but to Rome, as is done here."—Is reigning must neces-
sarily mean 'at the time of writing.' As I have shown on 1147, this
phrase cannot rightly be taken to mean 'at the time, at which the
Vision in its evolution hath arrived,' because the portion before us,
and especially the declaration in which this phrase occurs, is not
properly a part of the Vision, but an explanation of one of its symbols.
At the same time, if the phrase be so taken, the result will be the
same; because the Vision has here arrived at the time present to the
author. Since, then, the whore represents the city which was reign-
ing in St John's time, it must be heathen Rome that is meant.—The
epoch at which the whore is said to be reigning (that is, of the scene in C. 17) being that of the sixth king (ve. 10), the following questions may properly be proposed to those, who say, that the whore represents the Church of Rome, and the sixth king all the emperors of Rome. How can the whore (the Church of Rome) be said previously (ve. 2) to ‘have committed fornication with the kings of the earth,’ that is, before some date in the time of the empire? Or (ve. 4), to have then filled to the brim ‘the cup of her abominations?’ Or (ve. 5), to have then become ‘the mother of the harlots of the earth?’ Or (ve. 6), to be then ‘drunken with the blood of the saints?’ Or (ve. 9), to be then located on the seven hills of Rome?—Again, to reign must mean, in this connexion at any rate (if not invariably in the Apocalypse), to reign as a king reigns, that is, by the power of the sword; but a pope reigns as a priest, as ‘Pontifex maximus,’ as Christ’s vicar, that is, by the power of the keys: the one rules by physical, the other by moral force. On account of this dissimilarity, also, papal Rome cannot be meant.—Again, if the term earth be taken as it was used literally in the apostle’s time, and still more, if it be taken (as I conceive it ought to be: see on 1123) in its symbolical sense as meaning Judea, it will suit only heathen Rome.—The final and conclusive argument, however, may be derived from the term city. On this word the hypothesis of the antipapistical theorists rests. It is solely, because the pope happens to have his residence in the city, in which the heathen emperors formerly ruled, that they have any apparent basis for their scheme. The city is with them everything. But in the view of the seer it was in truth nothing. City, as he uses the term (in accordance with its very common use), means in its literal and true meaning the state,—the power, not the place. Though the metropolis is necessarily contemplated and included, it is merely as being the place in which the power of the state is practically resident. To suppose that the town, exclusive of its inhabitants, or of the state of which it is only the head quarters (so to speak), or of the particular power which gives to it its supremacy, and from which it derives that dominion in consequence of which alone it comes into view at all, were absurd. What the antipapists have to do to obtain a locus standi for their view is to establish an identity with the power contemplated by the writer. To allege an identity of bricks and mortar or of locality is of no account; since it is the power rather than the place, which the writer has in view. They cannot, however, pretend to make out such an identity. No two things can well be more diverse than the physical-force power of heathen Rome under the Caesars, who had no spiritual power, and the moral or rather spiritual power of Christian Rome under the popes, who have no temporal power worthy of notice. This statement then, whether we literalize it directly or indirectly (as having primarily this signifi-
cation, 'The woman Babylon is identical in meaning with the symbolical city Babylon, which thou seest reigning over the kings of the earth') will ultimately have this as its real meaning; 'The woman represents that great state, which is now ruling over the rulers of the earth.' Thus read, it presents nothing that can connect it with the papacy. And consequently the antipapistical theory is left destitute of support.—If there were any advantage in doing so, it would be easy to show, that all early writers understood heathen Rome to be meant by the whore. But it is self-evident, that they could not do otherwise. And we may say that, inasmuch as the author knew, that those for whom he immediately wrote could put no other construction on his words, if this be not the true meaning, he is justly chargeable with misleading his readers.

Synoptical interpretation of the fifth heptadal tableau of the seventh trumpet. XVII. This heptad forms an Introduction to 'The judgment of the whore' contained in the next chapter. Its chronological epoch is A.D. 69. And it mainly consists in the explanation of a symbol, which is presented to the view of the seer in the first instance. 1. One of the plague-angels is brought forward to act as hierophant of this series, for congruity with the judgment to which it is an Introduction; and also (by his acting in the same capacity in reference to the new Jerusalem tableau) to indicate, that the two are companion-pictures in a way of contrast. Invoking the seer's attention, this angel proposes to show him the fate of the great heathen power, which was then ruling over the nations of the known world. This state he depicts by the same figure, that had been used in reference to the heathen enemies of Israel in old times, (viz., to Assyria, Babylon, Egypt, and Tyre), as one that was striving to seduce or coerce God's people into compliances derogatory to their allegiance to their Lord. 2. And he declares, that the rulers, civil and ecclesiastical, of Judea had already been guilty of treason against their God and king by compliances, which were politically, if not religiously idolatrous; and that 'the heathen had raged and the people imagined a vain thing against the Lord' (Ps. 2). 3. Then he seemed to transport the seer in his ecstatic state into a desolate place, such as would be appropriate both for beholding the contrast between the whore's personal splendour (that is, the magnificence of the city, which she symbolized), and the desolation she had made around her, and also for exhibiting more forcibly the desolation, to which she herself was about to be assimilated. There the prophet sees this city and state symbolized as in close alliance with that imperial and imperious power, which had twice before (Chs. 12 and 13) been brought to his notice under different aspects, as the great heathen world-
power, which then tyrannized over the people of God. This power is exhibited as being bloody, despotic, and impious; located on seven hills; and having a duration measured by the reigns of seven kings. The alliance between the state and the power symbolized is one, in which the supremacy is nominally conceded to the former, but really possessed by the latter, which is the point of unity, the mainstay and concentration of the whole. 4. The state at large is portrayed as vainglorious, ambitious, grasping, covetous, tolerant of every iniquitous idolatry, and intolerant only of the people of God and the true religion, which it seeks by every means to undermine, corrupt, and exterminate. 5. It glories in its shame, and blazons forth its most disgusting iniquities and vices with more than the effrontery of the commonest prostitute; and in doing so identifies itself with the despotic dynasty which it abhors, and adds the guilt of the latter's crimes to those proper to itself. 6. It appears satiated to repletion with the blood of those devoted servants of God, whom it has sacrificed in its profane ambition to usurp the throne of Deity. Such a sight, by reason of its then being a thing new and never before known, excites the deep astonishment of the seer. 7. Whereupon the interpreting angel demands what there was, in the circumstance of a licentious heathen people, unaccustomed to brook any opposition to their will, and unable to comprehend why opposition should be offered in a case, in which, mutatis mutandis, they themselves would have rendered a ready compliance,—what there was to call forth so great astonishment, at such a nation's persecuting as traitors to Cæsar those, who refused to render to Cæsar the things that are God's? And, to show how little ground there was for wondering, he offers to expound the Mystery of the symbolic woman and of the beast that carries her. 8. He then proceeds to give an exposition, which, while generally applying more or less to the beast as a whole, has a special reference to certain of his members, and to a particular epoch of his existence, namely, to that of the persecution and war against the saints, Christian and Jewish, carried on by Nero and his 'image' Vespasian, who, partly on this account, are in some sort regarded as being one, and as constituting the beast par excellence. This beast, the angel tells the seer, was in the Julian dynasty in general, and in Nero in particular. He is not at the time of the seer's writing, the state of things being such, that it was doubtful, whether the interregnum which followed Nero's death should not be regarded as still existing. Nevertheless, he was on the point of coming to life again in Vespasian and the Flavian dynasty, under which form he would prove himself 'tenfold more the child of hell than before,' and would be destroyed. And, at beholding the unexpected extinction of the dynasty of Cæsars, and its no less unexpected reviviscence, its
supporters would be filled with astonishment. 9. Mark well, how-
however, what follows; for therein especially will the clew to the Mystery
be found to lie. The seven heads of the beast represent seven hills,—
those, namely, on which is built the city, wherein dwells the power
and authority of the Roman state. 10. They represent, also, seven
kings, namely, a heptad of the Caesars. Five of these have passed
away. The sixth (Vespasian), at the time at which the seer's ecstatic
Vision had arrived, and which was the epoch of his writing, might,
on account of his having as good as obtained the throne, be accounted
to be then reigning. And the seventh (Titus) had not yet attained
the rank of king; and, when he should do so, his reign was destined
to be but a short one. 11. The dynasty that is especially had in
view (while, in respect of its founder and principal member, Vespas-
ian, belonging to the heptad) appends to the seven an eighth and
unsymbolized king, namely, Domitian, in whom it goes into comple-
tion, the dynasty of Caesars becoming extinct in him. 12. The
ten horns which thou sawest,—these, also, represent kings; and, as
forming part of the beast, they must define the dynastic duration of
his kingdom or sovereignty in relation to this Mystery, or as limited
by the epoch to which the seventh trumpet extends. According to
the computation followed in C. 13, the ten horns will represent the
first ten Caesars from Julius to Vespasian. This decad of kings has
not as yet completed its term of sovereign authority, but is in course
of completing it at one and the same time with the beast. 13.
These kings keep one object steadily in view,—their own aggrandize-
ment. And to this (which is in fact giving all their power and
strength to the beast,—the autocratic and despotic principle), all
their efforts are steadily and with one consent directed. 14. Their
attitude towards the Lamb of God and his faithful followers is one of
defiance and hostility; but he must of necessity finally subdue them,
inasmuch as he is a 'lord of all lords, and a king of all kings.' 15.
The angelic hierophant then further explains to the seer, that the
great state symbolized was represented as being possessed of universal
dominion. 16. But these ten emperors would individually and
collectively conspire to subvert her ancient form of government and
her free institutions, and would substitute a tyrannical despotism,
under which her peoples would be plundered, persecuted, enslaved,
and oppressed, until they would be utterly enervated and prepared to
fall an easy prey to the tribes of barbarians, who would in the end
complete their desolation. 17. And these kings would thus com-
bine to set up a despotic power in fulfilment of the purpose of God,
and through the secret operations of His Providence, working to
bringing about the accomplishment of the declarations and promises,
which He had made to His servants. 18. In order to guard
against mistakes, and to render such inexcusable if they should occur, the angel added, in conclusion of his explanation of the Mystery of the whore on the beast, that she symbolized that great city or state, which, at the time he spoke, ruled with sovereign authority over the rulers of the chosen land.


—Adherents of Antichrist [Aquinas].—Seven chief vices [Berengaud].
MYSTERY OF GOD IN A SEVEN-SKAL ROLL. [H. XXII. PREL.


Introductory remarks. This sixth heptad stands related to the one that immediately precedes it, in the same way, that the third and fourth do respectively to the second and first, namely, as a supplement of crisis. There is even a closer connexion between the fifth and sixth than between the preceding pairs; for this, the sixth, contains the actual portraiture of the judgment of the whore, in fulfillment of the promise made by the angel in the first verse of the preceding chapter. So that the one before us may be regarded as a conclusion of the fifth, or that as an introduction to this. At the same time, the division of the two into distinct heptads is doubly indicated: 1st, by the commencement of the second with the technical break, Μην ταύτα; and 2dly, by the introduction of a heptadal prelude in parallelism with those prefixed to the preceding supplements. Each
of these preludes (we may observe by the way), when it is regarded as a division of the principal heptad, serves to make the latter an octaval heptad, that is, a seven going out into an eighth, with the object stated on 1160.—This heptad will be found to differ considerably from the rest of the work. It is neither so directly symbolical as most other parts, nor so literal as some; but it presents more of the features of a properly poetical composition, especially in the parallelistic repetitions, and in the similar terminations of the paragraphs, which mark them out as it were as stanzas. See Guide, p. 158.

HEPTADAL PRELUDE. Preludial announcement of the fall of Babylon.

I have shown in the Guide, p. 157, that this prelude is capable of division into seven parts; and, if the preludes to the parallel crises were so divided, doubtless this also was. But its conciseness makes it inconvenient to notice the divisions separately.

XVIII; 1–3. 1189–1202. After these things I beheld another angel coming down from the heaven, having great power. And the earth was illuminated by his glory. And he cried with a strong voice, saying; ‘Fallen, fallen is Babylon the great, and is become a dwelling-place of demons, and a hold of every unclean spirit, and a hold of every unclean and hateful bird; because through the wrath of her fornication all the nations have fallen, and the kings of the earth have fornicated with her, and through the might of her wantonness the merchants of the earth have become rich.’

1189. The initial and of the R. T. is not found in the most ancient authorities.—The technical break after these things (see on 285) is clearly used here to point out, that another heptad commences at this point. If it had not been introduced, the distinction between the two heptads would not have been observable in consequence of the close chronological sequence, which appears to subsist between this and the last. If this break has any chronological bearing, it must be in reference to the epoch, at which the seer is supposed to see the whore on the beast, and not to the time, to which the angel-interpreter in his exposition is supposed to have brought their history down in the last chapter: but more probably it has reference only to the last symbolic scene, and is used merely to distinguish this from that.

—The R. T. omits the word another, which is unquestionably a genuine reading. It has been inserted to show, that this angel is a different one from him, who gave the interpretation of the last chapter. And there are plain indications, which enable us to identify this angel with the one, that, in C. 10, announced the approaching end of ‘the Mystery of God.’ This is ‘another:’ so was that. This angel cries ‘with a strong voice:’ and that was a ‘strong’ angel. This was seen ‘coming down from the heaven:’ and so was that. This has

vol. ii.
"great power:" and so had that. This "illuminates the earth by his glory:" "the countenance of that was as it were the sun." This cries "mightily:" that "cried as a lion roareth." This proclaims Babylon's fall: that symbolized the same by thundering against her. That brought 'good news' for God's people: and the tidings announced by this forms the basis for a call on the saints to "rejoice." If, then, this angel be identified with that,—the angel of the covenant, this must also be identical with the 'strong' angel of C. 5; 2, who made proclamation for the opening of the Mystery; since the identity of the two last was shown on 657. And if the three be identical, inasmuch as the two earlier ones were shown to be special representatives of the Lord Jesus, this must be so likewise: and we may conclude with Hengstenberg, that "Christ as Rome's conqueror proclaims here the victory."

1190. Coming down. If this descent may be taken as virtually synchronizing with the time present of C. 17; 10, the epoch to which this angel's proclamation primarily refers would seem to be indicated. —From the heaven. The descent from the heaven being specially mentioned without any apparent occasion, it may be thought, that the intention was to indicate, that the angel's mission is specially on behalf of Christianity, that is, to encourage Christians by the prospect of the downfall of their persecutors.—Cp. C. 21; 2.

1191. Having great authority. Such as Christ possessed (2; 26: Mt. 28; 18); and as such an errand as his required, seeing that his adversaries were possessed of "great authority" or "power" in their degree (13; 2, 12). The clause does not, as Stuart asserts, "designate the rank or order of the angel."

1192. And the earth was illuminated by his glory. Cp. Eze. 43; 2, where it is said of Jehovah, "The earth was enlightened by his glory." See also Mt. 24; 30; "They shall see the Son of man coming... with power and great glory."—If we take the term earth symbolically, the import may be, that the abode of God's people was lit up, as by an illumination of rejoicing, through reflecting the radiance of the Messiah's glory. Then, just as of old the pillar of the cloud gave light to God's people, while it spread darkness over their enemies, so here there will be a bright as well as a dark side. While the angel proclaims; ‘Babylon is fallen,' a voice from the heaven calls aloud; ‘Come out of her, my people,' and, ‘Rejoice over her; for God hath avenged you on her.'—But perhaps the word glory, from the connexion in which it is used elsewhere, may be thought rather to connect this clause with the Lord's getting himself glory by the punishment of His enemies. Cp. 14; 7; "Give him glory; for the hour of His judging is come:" 15; 4; "Who shall not glorify thy name;... for thy judgments are made manifest:" 15; 8; "The temple was
filled with smoke from the glory of God." 16; 9; "Men were scorched, and repented not to give Him glory."

XVIII; 2. 1193. And he cried with a strong voice, saying. Some read, he cried in strength: the B. T. has, in strength with a loud voice. Emphasis is of course the object of inserting the last words. Cp. Ps. 29; 4. It has been noticed (on 442, 657, 948), that the selection of the term strong seems to point to Rome.

1194. Fallen is Babylon. A repetition of No. 948, which see. The identity of the two places may be taken as an indication of synchronistic reference. And the substantial identity of C. 16; 19, also, shows that that place synchronizes with these; and thus the parallelism of the three heptads is established.—Most probably the intention is, that the reader should conceive of a scene being presented to the view of the seer, representing the city Babylon in a fallen and ruined state. Thus he would be shown the judgment of the whore, as was promised in C. 17; 1. And thus the change from preterites to futures and futures to preterites (cp. vv. 2, 8, 20, 21, 24) may best be explained, the former being used in reference to the symbolic scene, and the latter to the events in the future symbolized.

1195-6. And is become a dwelling-place of demons, &c. Demons were supposed by the Jews to have their habitations in desolate places. Hence, this statement is equivalent to a declaration, that Babylon is removed into 'a desert' (17; 3), and 'made desolate,'—in short, had become a scene of utter ruin. "In Is. 13; 21-22, is a picture, which is a prototype of that before us. There, the forest-devils dance among the ruins of the ancient Babylon; and in Is. 34; 14, 15, the like things are said of the desolate cities of Idumea. In the latter case, not only the demon, but also the sprite or hobgoblin of the forest, is represented as finding its place of abode amid the ruins. So in the text before us; not only the demons proper, but all the lower and baser sprites, the canaille (sit venia!) of the demon-world, find a hold or prison-house in ruined Babylon." [Stuart.] In Lev. 16 Satan has the name of Azazel, the separated; and the he-goat is sent to him into the wilderness, as his proper place of abode. In Mt. 12; 43 waste and dry places appear pre-eminently as the abode of evil spirits. See also Lu. 8; 27. The heathen, too, held the same belief: see Avian, fab. 29 and Virgil, Æn. 6; 27. And Maimonides, speaking of the Zabians, says; "They relate that, on account of the wrath of Mars, desert and desolate places are without water and trees, and that horrid demons inhabit them." Wemyss supposes, that the Shedim or demons of Scripture were the satyrs and fauns of the Gentiles, whom the Israelites idolatrously served.—There is a difference between dwelling-place and hold. The latter denotes a prison or guard-house, and is used in this sense in C. 2; 10: 20; 7. Here it seems to be
used rather in the sense of a strong-hold.—As to demons and unclean spirits cp. on 650 and 1084–5.—The demons, spirits, and birds represent generally every kind of rapacious, cruel, and detestable occupant.

1197. And the hold [or cage] of every unclean and hateful bird. Some copies of no authority have beast instead of bird, and vary the arrangement of the words.—Birds of prey are meant: such as in C. 19:17 are summoned to eat the flesh of the armies of Babylon. Cp. Je. 5:27.—"The prototype of this is in several passages of Isaiah just cited above. There, according to this prophet, the cormorant and the screech-owl and vulture find their place amid the ruins of cities. So here, the object of the writer cannot well be misunderstood. It is to paint, in the most graphic manner, a scene of entire desolation, frequented only by horrid and detestable creatures."

[Stuart.]

XVIII; 3. 1198. Because through the wrath of her fornication. Cp. and see on C. 14:8, 10:16; 19:17:2. The similarity of this and the next clauses with those texts, and especially with the last, is sufficient to show identity of reference; and thus to establish the parallelism of the four chapters.

1199. All the nations have fallen. The R. T. has have drunk. The precedent in C. 17:2 may be thought to favour this reading; but we ought not to assume, that the author would reproduce the same expression on every occasion. And no material difference is made, whichever reading be adopted, as the one indicates the effect, and the other the cause.

1200. And the kings of the earth have fornicated with her. If earth be used symbolically, Judea is meant: see on 1122. The contrast with the nations or Gentiles may be thought to support this construction.

1201–2. And the merchants of the earth are enriched through the power of her wantonness [or the abundance of her luxuries]. Her wantonness would at any rate include her ‘clothing herself in purple,’ &c.: cp. 17:3–4.

In 1198–1202 three classes are specified, who have been seduced by the corrupting influences of the whore and city Babylon. No doubt, in parallelism to these, the three clauses of evil effects (1196, 6, 7) have been introduced.—Few probably will receive Hengstenberg's statement, that "we have in ve. 3 only one reason for the downfall of Rome, viz. her oppression of the nations."

Here ends the prelude: in which, as we have just seen, the number three (the numerical symbol of division or destruction) comes prominently into view; and this will be found to be an earnest of its appearance throughout the chapter. This prelude has the character of an anticipatory or miniature dirge over Babylon: and in this it
forms appropriately a contrast to the triumphal songs of the parallel preludes in C. 14; 1–5 and C. 15; 2–4.

DIV. 1. CALL TO GOD'S PEOPLE.

XVIII; 4–8. 1203–21. And I heard another voice from the heaven, saying; 'Come out of her, my people, that ye be not fellow-partakers in her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues; because her sins have been builded together even unto the heaven, and God hath remembered her unrighteousnesses. Render to her even as she hath rendered; and double [to her] double according to her works: in the cup which she hath mixed, mix to her double. In how much she hath glorified herself and waxed wanton, in so much give to her torment and mourning. Because she saith in her heart, I sit a queen, and am not a widow, and shall not see any mourning; therefore in one day shall her plagues come,—death, and mourning, and hunger, and she shall be utterly burned with fire; because strong [is] the Lord God who hath judged her.'

This first division of the heptad contains a call to God's people, which is taken up again and concluded in ve. 20, the object in dividing the call having apparently been to mark out, and bind together as it were, the three laments or double woes, which come between its two parts.

1203. I heard another voice. The voice last mentioned (and to which, therefore, the word another may be supposed to refer) was that, which pronounced the doom of Babylon in the solemn word, 'It is done.' Thus another link is found, which, by connecting this chapter with the seventh bowl, indicates the parallelism of the two heptads in general, and that of this with the seventh bowl in particular in respect of chronological reference.—Most appropriately in this instance, as in that of Sodom, the destroying angel is represented as addressing himself in the first place to the Lord's people, and saying with a like urgent call; 'Escape for your lives.'—The words, "my people" (cp. 11; 3), show, that this symbolic voice is to be understood as representing that of Christ. So that the words in effect proceed from the same party, as those just uttered by the angel.—From the heavens may perhaps indicate, that the warning results from Christianity.

1204. Come out of her, my people. As precedents see Ge. 19; 15; "Arise, lest thou be consumed in the iniquity of the city:" Is. 48; 20; "Go ye forth of Babylon:" Je. 50; 8; "Remove out of the midst of Babylon:" 51; 6, 9, 45; "Flee out of Babylon: ... be not cut off in her iniquity." "Forsake her; ... for her judgment reacheth unto the heaven." "My people, go ye out of her; and deliver every man his soul from the fierce anger of the Lord."

1205. That ye be not partakers in her sins. This is said to mean
(e.g., by Stuart) ‘sharing in the punishment due to her sins.’ But such an explanation makes the next clause altogether tautologous. I would therefore rather suppose, that the meaning is, that to continue after this warning would entail the being accounted Babylonians, and the partaking in the guilt of their sins. The poet Mantuanus wrote;

"Vivere qui sancte cupitis discodite: Roma
Omnia quum licesant, non licet esse bonum."

1206. And that ye receive not of her plagues. ‘The seven last plagues’ of C. 16, and especially the seventh, may be thought to be had in view.

1204–6. Hengstenberg remarks; ‘The call here, as in the fundamental passages, is not meant to be taken in a strictly literal sense, as is evident alone from this, that Rome is not mentioned here as a particular city, but as the representative of the Roman empire. The object is more immediately to point to the certainty and greatness of the destruction that threatened Babylon,—to give a powerful blow to that fear of Babylon, by which the minds of men were then so much moved. Why should they be afraid of that, which itself had to fear the worst?’

XVIII; 5. 1207. Because her sins have been built together even unto the heaven. The reading of the R. T., which is not sanctioned by the most ancient authorities, gives have reached. This sense is included in the better authorized reading, and in addition the idea of systematically heaping up is conveyed.—Having in view the received reading, Hengstenberg has written thus:—‘It marks the highest degree of sin, when it is spoken of as reaching to heaven, pressing in before God’s throne, and calling down his vengeance,—cp. 2 Chr. 28; 9, where the prophet Obed says of a heinous transgression, that “it reaches to the heavens;” Ezra 9; 6; “our guilt is great unto the heavens;” Ge. 4; 10: 18; 21: 19; 13: Jonah 1; 2. The fundamental passage is Je. 51; 9, “for her judgment reaches unto heaven, and extends even to the clouds.” Hengstenberg adds; “It is said here literally, her sins have adhered even to heaven. This is a pregnant construction for: ‘they reach to the heaven and adhere to it.’ The sticking fast of guilt to heaven is an aggravating mark of its greatness.”

1208. And God hath remembered her unrighteousnesses. Cp. C. 16; 19; ‘Babylon was remembered before God,’—another indication of chronological parallelism.

XVIII; 6. 1209. Render to her even as she hath rendered. The addition of the R. T. to you is not warranted by the authorities, and it is out of place. No doubt the Greek word has been inserted on the
supposition, that it was necessary in order to complete the sense, and
that the Lord's people were addressed. But the latter is not the
case; though at the same time there is no ground whatever (outside
his own scheme) for Hengstenberg's assertion, that the kings repre-
sented by the ten horns are addressed in particular; nor yet for
Stuart's, that angels are contemplated. This is simply a poetical
mode of declaring what shall take place: or it may be regarded in the
light of a decree; Let it be rendered.—The precedent in Je. 50; 29
was spoken of the literal Babylon: "Recompense her after her deeds:
after all that she has done, do to her."

1210. And double [to her] double according to her works. The to her
of the R. T. is not sanctioned by ancient authorities.—Cp. Is. 40; 2;
"double for all her sins:" 61; 7; "for your shame ye shall have
double:" and the doubling to Job (42; 12): also Je. 16; 18; "I re-
compense double their iniquity:" 17; 18; "with double destruction
destroy them."—This clause stands in contrast with the preceding
one, as though it were said; 'Repay her on the principle of the
Jewish law, "an eye for an eye:" but no, adopt a new rule, and
reiate in double measure,—on the principle of two for one.'—The
principle of doubling runs through this symbolization. Thus, we
find two woes on Babylon (vv. 9, 16, 19) for each one (8; 13), that
she had contributed to bring on 'the dwellers on the earth.'

1211. In the cup that she hath mixed. See on 1132; "holding in
her hand a golden cup."

1212. Mix to her double. Not merely 'fill,' but fill a mixture of
the most bitter and deleterious ingredients. The potion, which the
Lord gives to his adversaries, is "mixed unmixed," i.e., undiluted.
Mix ye = there shall be mixed, sc. by the avenger,—the Lord (as
may be inferred from C. 14; 10): and so we must understand through
this passage, though strictly speaking, according to the opening of
the address (ve. 4), the Lord's people are spoken to. What He does
for them, it would seem, that they may be regarded as doing: cp.
17; 14.

XVIII; 7. 1213. In how much she hath glorified herself, i.e., at the
expense of others, in arraying herself in gorgeous apparel, and in
saying, 'I sit a queen,' &c. Cp. 14; 7; 15; 4; 'Give God the glory.'
—And waxed wanton. Cp. 1201: "the merchants were enriched by
her wantonness."

1214. In so much give to her torment and mourning. Cp. on 589,
958.

1215. Because she saith in her heart. This because manifestly stands
connected with the therefore which follows, according to the frequent
precedents in the prophets: see, e.g. Is. 30; 13. Hence this clause
should not be connected with the context which precedes it, accord-
ing to the common method, but with that which follows it.—The use of the word because here may lead us to notice a peculiarity in this chapter. 1. Because commences the concluding clause in the angel’s cry. 2. It appears in the first and last sentences of the call to Christ’s people, in the latter with a duplication at the beginning and end of the sentence in alternation with therefore. Between these two sentences are three parallelistic double lines, there being six preceding these six, and six more preceding the last because. 3. It begins the last clause in each of the three laments, and also that of the first sentence in the middle one, where it has probably been introduced on account of the much greater length of this lament. 4. It begins the last clause in the resumed call to the saints. 5. It begins the two last clauses in the declaration of the mighty angel. On the whole, the Greek word is used, in the sense of because, twelve times in the judgment of the whore: and there is a sufficiently near approximation in my distribution to warrant the supposition, that in the original arrangement it may have been brought in at intervals of six or of a multiple of six lines.

1216–7. ‘I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall not see mourning.’ Babylon claims to be queen of the kings of the earth in rivalry with Him, who assumed the titles of ‘Prince of the kings of the earth’ (1; 5) and ‘King of kings’ (17; 14).—“The fundamental passage is Isa. 47; 8, where it is said of ancient Babylon; “Who says in her heart; I am, and none else beside me; I shall not sit as a widow, neither shall I know the loss of children.” By the widowhood is denoted, not the loss of empire, but the state of desertion, helplessness, humiliation—cp. Lam. 1; 20; Bar. 4; 12. Widows appear even in the law as representatives of persona miserables.”

[Hengstenberg]—The word translated widow means bereaved; and, though generally applied to widows, it is not limited to such. In this instance the precedent favours the opinion, that bereavement of children is had in view, the city being regarded as the mother, and the inhabitants as her children. Hence the sentiment is (as Stuart says); “I shall never become depopulated, and therefore shall not be called to mourn!”

XVIII; 8. 1218. Therefore in one day shall her plagues come. In one day, according to Stuart, is equivalent to “unexpectedly;” but some may think, that ‘in one short period’ would more accurately express the meaning.—That the plagues symbolized in C. 16, or at least the first six of them, are not referred to here appears from the specification which follows.

1219–20. Death, and mourning, and hunger, and she shall be utterly burned with fire. These terms are not to be regarded separately, but rather as a whole. By the four,—one from each corner of the earth
as it were, a universality of judgments is denoted. These answer to
‘the four sore judgments’ of Ezekiel, which we find brought forward
in the fourth seal, as ‘the sword, and hunger, and death, and wild
beasts’ (see on 4:15-6). Similarly, the whore suffers from the ten
horns in four ways:—‘hatred, desolation, devouring, burning’ (17:16).
On the other hand, the holy city, new Jerusalem, is free from the four

1221. Because strong [is] the Lord God, who hath judged her. Cp.
Ps. 24:8; “The Lord strong and mighty.” 45:3; “Gird thy sword,
... O most mighty;” 89:13; “Thou hast a mighty arm, strong is
thy hand;” vs. 19; “I have laid help upon one that is mighty.”—
Bengel pertinently remarks; “Rome means strong, but her strength
is nothing. Strong is the Lord, who judges her.” See on 948.

DIV. 2. THE FIRST LAMENT: BY THE KINGS.

XVIII; 9-10. 1222-8. ‘And the kings of the earth shall weep and
wail over her, they who with her have fornicated and waxed wanton, when
they see the smoke of her burning, standing afar off through the fear of
her torment, saying; Woe, woe, the city, the great Babylon, the strong
city; because in one hour hath thy judging come! ’

The hierophant of the judgment of the whore remains on the scene
(as appears from C. 17; 1 and 19; 9) during the exhibitions in Cs.
17, 18, and 19; and from the change of manner it appears probable,
that we ought to conceive of him as reciting the three laments.
Then, at the end of them, the voice from heaven resumes its call to
the Lord’s people. The three laments form an expansion of the first
utterance of the voice, just as the whole chapter does of that of the
glorious angel, which furnishes the prelude to it. The three parties
introduced, kings, merchants by land, and traders by sea, are of
course brought in only poetically and for scenic effect.—Notice
should be taken of the appropriateness of each lamentation.
The kings lament over the burning of the city: the traders by land over
the destitution of consumers of their goods: those by sea over the
loss of purchasers for theirs.—It may be observed, that the verbs
introducing the first lament are in the future tense; those of the
second in the present; and those of the third in the preterite. This,
in respect of the symbol, may be attributed to the wish to make
variety, or it may be looked upon as a mystical way of saying,
‘Babylon’s destruction shall be,—is,—hath been,’ and this with the
view to throw emphasis on the certainty and completeness of it.

1222-3. The kings who have fornicated, &c. This looks back to the
prelude, 1200-1.—“They bewail the downfall of the mistress, because
of the advantages which they, as faithful vassals, had derived from
their connection with her.”
1224. *When they see the smoke of her burning.* Cp. 1181, 1220.—
"In the superscription of Jeremiah's prophecy against ancient Babylon in C. 50; 1, "The word which the Lord spake of Babylon, the land of the Chaldeans," (not, 'and the land,') the land of the Chaldeans is mentioned along with Babylon; whence it is clear, that the city was referred to merely as the representative and centre of the kingdom. So here Babylon comprehends in itself the whole kingdom: cp. C. 17; 18. On this ground alone, therefore, we cannot take the burning literally, but must regard it as the emblem of the whole destruction:"

Hengstenberg.—Yet it will not be inapposite to notice the sentiments, which were entertained at the time in reference to the burning of the Capitol in the conflict between the adherents of Vitellius and those of Vespasian. Tacitus states, that the destruction of the Capitol was considered to be an omen of the ruin of the empire. "The Gauls," he says, "had taken heart, supposing that the Roman arms had everywhere met with the like ill-fortune. Their head-quarters in Moesia and Pannonia, it was commonly reported, were beset by a host of Sarmatians and Daecians. The same rumour took wind respecting the state of things in Britain. But nothing had so much incited the belief, that the empire was soon coming to an end, as the confagration of the Capitol. Once before had the city been taken by the Gauls: but the temple of Jupiter was untouched, and the empire remained. Now, a doomimg fire had been sent, to signify the anger of heaven, and portend universal sovereignty to the Transalpine nations" (Hist. iv: 54).

XVIII; 10. 1225. *Standing afar off.* This is said of all the three, —kings, merchants, and mariners: cp. vv. 15, 17.—*Through the fear of her torment,* that is, through the fear, which the sight of her torment inspires in them. Cp. 1214.

1226. *Woe, woe.* All the three parties begin their lamentation with these words. By the thrice-repeated doubled 'Woe,' the woe of this, the seventh trumpet, is exhibited as sixfold: cp. 8; 13. *Woe* is commonly used for imprecation; but here on the contrary in lamentation, and greater emphasis is thrown on it by the use of the plural form.

1227. *The strong city* "plainly alludes to the name of Rome. The strong is here, as in ve. 8, to be regarded as written large:" Hengstenberg.

1228. *Because in one hour hath her judging come.* The last clause in each of the three laments begins with the same words.—*In one hour* may with more reason than *in one day* (see on 1218) be taken to mean unexpectedly, or, as we say, 'in a moment.' Cp. 14; 7: 16; 14.—*Her judging* means the judging of her; while, in 14; 7, "*His judging* means the judging by him."
DIV. 3. THE SECOND LAMENT: by the traders by land.

XVIII; 11-16. 1229-55. 'And the merchants of the earth do weep and mourn over her; because no one buyeth any more their merchandize—merchandize of gold and of silver, and of costly stone and of pearl, and of fine linen and of purple, and of silk and of scarlet; and every citron wood and every ivory article, and every article of most costly wood, and of brass, and of iron, and of marble; and cinnamon and spice and odours, and ointment and frankincense, and wine and oil, and fine flour and wheat, and cattle and sheep; and of horses and of mule-chariots and of bodies; and souls of men. (And the fruit-harvest of thy soul's desire hath gone from thee: and all splendid and brilliant things have perished from thee; and they shall not find them any more at all.) The merchants of these things, who have become rich by her, shall stand afar off through the fear of her torment, weeping and mourning, saying; Woe, woe, the great city, which was clothed with fine linen and purple and scarlet, and gilded with gold and precious stone and pearls; because in one hour so great riches have been made desolate!'

1229-30. The merchants of the earth. As the earth here stands contrasted with the sea in ve. 17, these are to be regarded as traders by land.—'As preparation is made for vv. 9, 10 by the declaration in ve. 3, the kings have fornicated with her, so it is made for v. 11 ss. by the immediately following declaration, 'the merchants have become rich through the power of her wantonness or luxury;'.—Hengstenberg.—Precedents may be found in Is. C. 23 and Eze. Cs. 26-27.—Vitringa perceived quite well, that the features described here did not suit papal Rome, which was never at any period the centre of merchandize. He found refuge in the allegorical exposition. Rome appears as the storehouse of spiritual wares. But the one consideration, that the merchandize of Rome, different from that of Tyre, appears here as entirely of a one-sided passive kind, is decisive against this view: She does not sell the wares, but they merely serve for her use and consumption;:'—Hengstenberg.

XVIII; 12-13. 1231-44. The changes in the cases are all that is worthy of notice in these two verses. Doubtless these changes have not been made without design, but the object in view is not very apparent. Perhaps it was to indicate or to form the stichoiatical distribution; as would seem to be the case from the manifest numerical computing, there being 16 acc. and 16 gen. cases, of which ve. 12 contains 4 acc. and 12 gen., while ve. 13 has 12 acc. and 4 gen. cases. The sentence, too, is divided into 16 stichs. 'The wares,' says Hengstenberg, 'are divided into different classes, making in all seven. The hard materials are four: so also the soft. There are four aromatic substances, and then articles of food in three pairs. In the two last clauses the bodies are by the construction united with the horses, and
separated from the souls of men. However, they naturally lead on to this latter class.' By the latter slaves in general may be meant. By the former grooms, sedan bearers, and the like may be specially had in view. In Eze. 27; 13 among the goods in which Tyre trafficked are mentioned souls of men.

XVIII; 14. 1245-7. The fruit-harvest of thy soul's desire, &c. In this verse the hierophant, with considerable poetic beauty and energy, makes an abrupt transition to the second person, thus apostrophizing, parenthetically as it were, the fallen city. Cp. Is. 14; 10 ss.: 47. In the next verse he resumes the use of the third person. But perhaps we should rather conceive of the voice from heaven as interposing these words.—The soul's desire is an expression for any thing that is greatly valued. Cp. Is. 26; 8: Eze. 26; 16, 21: Ro. 10; 1.—The fruit-harvest may represent the harvest of luxuries, and the 'much goods laid up for many years.'

XVIII; 15-16. 1248-55. "Ve. 15 would possess the character of a needless repetition, if ve. 14, as some have supposed, stood in the wrong place."—Clothed. Cp. 17; 4.—In one hour. Cp. 1218, 1228, 1267.—Desolate. Cp. 17; 3, 16: 1267.

DIV. 4. THE THIRD LAMENT: by the traders by sea.

XVIII; 17-19. 1256-67. 'And every captain, and every passenger, and sailors, and as many as traffic by sea, seeing the smoke of her burning, stood afar off, and cried, saying; What city is like to this, the great city. And they cast dust upon their heads, and cried, weeping and mourning, saying; Woe, woe, the great city, by which all were enriched who have the ships in the sea by reason of her costliness; because in one hour she hath been made desolate.'

Every captain. Lit., the person who directs the ship's course, the steersman.—Passenger. Lit. 'every one who sails by a place,' instead of the reading of the R. T., 'the company in vessels.'—Four classes are specified to indicate universality.—Traffic. Lit. plough or ply the sea.—Cp. Is. 23; 3: Eze. 27; 32-3.—What city, &c. An exclamation to be contrasted with that in 13; 4; 'Who is like to the beast!' Who is like to him in his revivification! What is like to her in her desolation! The things signified in the two places, be it remembered, are substantially the same, or at the least intimately connected.—They cast dust, &c. This is said only in this third lament; and here as a climax. Precedents may be found in Eze. 27; 30, cp. 33: Job 2; 12.—The costliness means her pomp and glory, her luxurious mode of life.—One hour. Cp. and see on 1218, 1228, 1255.—Babylon's judgment is said to come in reference to the kings (ve. 10); her desolation in reference to the traders by land and by sea (vv. 16, 19): this is appropriate.
DIV. 5. CALL TO GOD’S PEOPLE TO REJOICE.

XVIII; 20. 1268–70. ‘Exult over her, O thou heaven! and ye saints and apostles and prophets; because God hath judged your judgment by her.’

Here, I imagine, the voice from heaven is to be conceived of as resuming its call to ‘my people.’—Exult. It must be remembered, that this is nothing more than a poetical representation of what would be a natural ebullition of feeling. There is nothing contrary to true benevolence in the feeling invoked.—O heaven! i.e. ye glorified saints; or perhaps Christianity may be poetically addressed. Heaven occurs here only in the singular. It stands in contrast here to the earth of vv. 9 and 11, and the sea of ve. 17 (as it does also in C. 12; 12). That which is a cause of lamentation to inhabitants of the earth and the sea is one of rejoicing to the denizens of heaven. To make this contrast may have been a reason for the introduction of the sea and mariners in this place, where, as both Babylon and Rome had so little to do with maritime affairs, an allusion to them would not have been expected. In Jer. 51; 48, heaven and earth rejoice over Babylon.—The better authorized reading converts holy apostles into saints and apostles.—By apostles may be meant either ‘the twelve’ (21; 14), or generally teachers of distinction, as in Acts 14; 4, 14: Ro. 16; 7: 1 Co. 12; 28: 2 Co. 8; 23. The order of the words is in favour of the latter sense; since, as the series is an ascending one, the twelve would probably have been named last, if they had been intended.—By prophets is not meant foretellers of future events, but inspired teachers, as elsewhere: see on 698.—Cp. Ep. 2; 20; ‘built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets:’ 3; 5; ‘as it is now revealed to His holy apostles and prophets.’—From the next clause (cp. ve. 24) it plainly appears, that these are parties, who had suffered at the hands of Babylon: and therefore, as papal Rome never condemned apostles and prophets in any sense, she cannot be had in view.—Observe, that the saints respond to this call in C. 19; 1 ss.—God hath judged, etc., i.e., hath punished her for the punishment she inflicted on you. See on 1228, and cp. 17; 1: 6; 10.

DIV. 6. THE STRONG ANGEL’S DECLARATION.

XVIII; 21–23. 1271–82. And a single strong angel lifted a stone, as it were a great millstone, and cast [it] into the sea, saying; ‘Thus with violence shall the great city Babylon be cast, and shall not be found any more at all; and no voice of harp singers and of musicians, and of pipers and of trumpeters shall be found in thee any more at all; and no artificer of any art shall be found in thee any more at all; and no voice of a millstone shall be heard in thee any more at all; and no light of a lamp shall shine in thee any more at all; and no voice of bridegroom and of bride shall be heard in thee any more at all: because thy
merchants were the grandees of the earth; because by thy sorcery were all the nations deceived.'

This setting forth of the utter ruin of Babylon should apparently be regarded as a sequel to the three laments. By the latter thus going out into completeness in a fourth exhibition of her desolation, the totality of the ruin is represented in the strongest manner possible.

1271. A single. See on 569. This epithet helps to exalt the idea of the angel's strength. — This is the fourth time, that the word strong is used in this tableau (vv. 2, 8, 10); and thus, as coming under the number four, the idea of universality of strength is attached to this angel. The so frequent repetition of this term in a heptad, which is devoted to depicting Rome's destruction seems to show indubitably, that an eye has been had to the meaning of Rome, viz. strength. — If the angel of ve. 1, who has 'the strong voice,' be rightly identified with 'the strong angel' of C. 5; 2, and also with 'the strong angel' of C. 10; 1, doubtless this 'strong angel' is also identical with the same, that is, he specially symbolizes the Lord Jesus. — As it were a millstone. It should be remembered, that the mills of the ancients were hand-mills.

1272. And cast it into the sea: perhaps because the sea is the symbol of the Roman empire; or the sea may be here a part of the necessary machinery.

1273. Thus with violence (alluding to the weight of the stone, and the strength with which it was thrown) shall Babylon be cast down. — Je. 51; 63–4 is the precedent had in view: "When thou hast made an end of reading this book, thou shalt bind a stone to it, and cast it into the Euphrates, and say; 'Thus shall Babylon sink, and shall not rise from the evil that I will bring upon her, but shall vanish away.'" The connexion with the preceding verse makes it probable, too, that an eye has also been had to Mt. 18; 6 and Mk. 9; 42; "Whoso shall offend one of these little ones, &c."

1274. And shall not be found, &c. The parenthetical apostrophe of ve. 14 (which has a striking similarity both of purport and form to this angel's address, and especially in respect of both being thrown into the form of an address to Babylon) concludes in a similar manner. And as six lines in succession here end with this phrase, there are in all seven repetitions of it; and by this number seven the idea of completeness and finality is attached to the passage. A peculiarly mournful cadence is given by so many terminal repetitions of the same phrase. — Observe, that the verb in every alternate clause is heard. — Hengstenberg remarks; "According to C. 17; 18 Rome is brought into view here only as "the great city," which has dominion over the kings of the earth, — as the heathen mistress of the world. As such, it has completely, and without a trace perished."
1275-6. And no voice of harpsingers, &c. Cp. 14; 2. Here four kinds of musicians, as representative of every description of hilarity, are mentioned.

1277-80. And no artificer, &c. In these four numbers four classes,—the artificer, the tradesman, the student or inventor, the bridgroom and bride, are brought forward as representative of the various commercial and social interests and pleasures. These convey, at the same time, a lively idea of the busy hum, which ordinarily prevails in a city, but which is now in respect of Babylon at an end; and instead thereof a dead silence reigns.—The fundamental passage is Jer. 25; 10; "I destroy from them the voice of mirth and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridgroom and the voice of the bride, the sound of the mill-stones and the light of the candle:" so also in 7; 34: 16; 9: 33; 11: Is. 24; 8: Eze. 26; 13.

1281-2. Because thy merchants were the grandees of the earth; because by thy sorcery were all the nations deceived. Hengstenberg asserts, that these two clauses are "not coordinate." Stuart, on the other hand, says, that they contain "separate and coordinate reasons for the ruin, that had just been predicted." I think it certain, that Stuart is right. For, first, the construction of the sentence appears to me to leave no room for doubt on the point. Secondly, the latter clause being allowed to contain such a reason, the parallelism that is manifestly intended to be made between them requires, that the former should also be construed in the same way. Thirdly, the consideration, that on this view the earth (that is, the Jews) and the nations or Gentiles will be comprehended in the two clauses, tends to confirm the opinion. Fourthly, the use of the word, which I have rendered grandees in the only other place in which it occurs, viz., C. 6; 15, will also be seen to confirm it. The word occurs there as one of seven, which are used to describe those Jews, who, having brought their country to ruin, were involved in her destruction by the literal Babylon. It stands second in the list, being next to "the kings of the earth." And hence it may be supposed, that it is used as a designation of those, who were oppressors of the people. Lastly, this construction will be found to give an excellent sense in the passage itself, and one quite in congruity with the figures which are made use of, and tending also to elucidate them.—Hengstenberg rightly says, that 'the merchants are here not the master-merchants in Rome itself, but the commercial people who deal with her; as is shown by the corresponding words in vv. 3, 15.'—According to my view 'the kings of the earth' of vv. 3, 9 will be the Herods, the Roman presidents, and others of the highest rank, who ruled in Judea; 'the merchants of the earth' of v. 11 the High Priests, and other Jewish functionaries, who were in the interest of Rome: and 'the traders by sea' the Roman procurators and gover-
nors, who had local authority in Judea. Then 'her merchants' in general may be a designation for the two last classes, or more probably for all three. The result as to the meaning will be this: Ruin shall be brought on Rome; because those with whom she trafficked, and who were her instruments and agents, were the oppressors of God's people; because all the heathen nations were induced by her machinations to become partakers in her guilt.—Throughout this chapter the figure, which represents Rome as a harlot, is intermixed with that, which symbolizes her by a city. Now we have seen on 1120, that the being a trader was an idea intimately associated with a harlot. And hence it is, that traders and trading affairs occupy so much of this chapter, and that Rome's emissaries and partizans,—those, who, for their enrichment and aggrandizement, trafficked with her to obtain places of honour and emolument, are symbolized as merchants.—The utterance of the strong angel (which brings this heptad towards its conclusion) in the two clauses before us substantially repeats two of those, with which the prelude concluded, and the heptad introductory to 'the judgment' commenced (17; 2), namely: "by the wrath of her fornication have all the nations fallen," and "the merchants of the earth are enriched by the power of her wantonness." Thus (when the middle clause in ve. 3 relating to the kings is included) the prominent features of the whole are indicated. The terms fornication, wantonness, and sorcery are used figuratively, with closely allied, if not with nearly synonymous significations: cp. 654-5.

DIV. 7. CLIMACTIC DECLARATION: by the seer.

XVIII; 24. 1283-4. And in her was found [the] blood of prophets, and of saints, and of all who had been slain upon the earth.

I am so far from regarding this (as Stuart and Hengstenberg do), as being intended to be a reason for Babylon's ruin, coordinate with the two in ve. 23, that I consider it to be, not only a distinct statement, but one made by a different party. If it had been a third, coordinate reason, because would certainly have introduced this, as it did the two preceding clauses, and not and. The change to the third person is another indication to the same effect, and one designed also, I think, to indicate a different speaker. Who the speaker is can be only matter of conjecture; but to me it seems likely, that either the hierophant of the whore's judgment or the seer himself is to be conceived of, as putting the finish to the whole by adding what may serve as a climax, indicating the sum and substance of the charge against Babylon,—'the head and front of her offending,' and the real cause of her ruin. If this view be correct, there will be seven changes of the speakers in this chapter. 1. The powerful angel: vv. 1-3. 2. The voice from heaven: vv. 4-8. 3. The interpreting angel: vv. 9-19.
4. The voice from heaven parenthetically in ve. 14. 5. The same
voice in conclusion of the call: ve. 20. 6. The strong angel:
vv. 21–23. 7. The hierophant or the seer: ve. 24. The number
seven adds to the probability of this view of the structure.—According
to the true reading the Greek word for blood is in the plural. This
is, as in other places (see on 359, 529, 1226, 1180), to indicate the
vastness of the quantity.—As to prophets, &c., see on 771–2, 1055,
1269. There is room for doubt, whether we should not read blood of
prophets and saints, even of all, &c., thus making two classes instead
of three.—The blood is said to be found in Babylon (as though it were
accumulated there in a vast lake); because it was shed by her or
under her authority. The meaning is of course, that the guilt of its
being shed was laid to her charge.—This statement forcibly calls to
mind the similar words of our Lord in Mt. 23; 29–39; ‘I send unto
you prophets, &c.; and some of them ye shall kill, . . . that upon
you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the
blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, whom ye slew
between the temple and the altar. All these shall come upon this
generation.’—As to the meaning of the term earth here, the general
rule of assuming (if the context permit), that the use is symbolical
requires, that we should give the preference to the symbolical sense,
and consequently understand Judea to be meant. Every consideration
supports this view. 1. The best and most easy sense is thus given.
2. To charge on Rome the guilt of shedding the blood of all the
righteous men, who had ever been slain on the earth in a literal sense,
would be so palpably unjust and untrue, that a construction which
would give such a sense cannot be entertained for a moment, where
another not involving such a charge is admissible. 3. The analogy
of the passage just cited from S. Matthew’s Gospel leads to a sym-
bolical construction here. ‘The earth’ there is manifestly ‘the land,’
sc. of Judea; for it is clear, that only ‘the righteous blood’ shed
among the chosen people is contemplated. We may regard the pas-
sage before us as supplemental to that in Matthew. In that passage
it was virtually declared, that the guilt of shedding the blood of the
prophets, whom God had sent to them, from Abel to that Zacharias
who was slain in the temple by the zealots (see Guide, pp. 94, 203),
should, in consequence of their having ‘filled up the measure of their
fathers,’ be visited upon that generation of the Jews in ‘the destruc-
tion of their place and nation.’ In this it is said, that that blood was
found in Babylon (inasmuch as Judea at this epoch formed part of
Babylon); and, by implication, that she should be made to answer for
it. And this was, because the filling up of the Jews’ iniquity was
done, not only under the sanction and authority of Rome, but Rome
was also an active participator in the same. At the same time, in
vol. II.
the destruction of Rome, on account of her being the destroyer of both Jews and Christians, would be fulfilled the announcement of the prelude to this trumpet (11: 18); "that thou shouldest destroy those who destroy the earth." We may, however, take the meaning of the declaration before us to be this:—As the blood of all the martyred prophets was to be required of that generation of the Jews, so the blood of the inspired and holy men slain in Judea should be required of Rome.—The precedent of this verse may be found in Je. 51; 35, 49; "The violence done to me and to my flesh be upon Babylon, shall the inhabitant of Zion say; and my blood upon the inhabitants of Chaldea, shall Jerusalem say. . . . As Babylon hath caused the slain of Israel to fall, so at Babylon shall fall the slain of all the earth."—In the Sib. Oracles, Bk. viii. there is a passage (evidently founded on a misapplication of Rev. 17; 8 to the harriolation respecting Nero), in which the wailings of this chapter are imitated, and the casting of Rome into the lake of fire and brimstone is set forth.—The statement in this verse ought alone to prove fatal to the antipapistical theory; for in no legitimate way can it be shown, that the blood of inspired men, still less of those slain in Judea, could be said to be found in papal Rome.

Symptomatic interpretation of the sixth heptadal tableau of the seventh trumpet, and of its prelude. Before proceeding to the interpretation I have a few introductory remarks to make. The reader may have observed, that, in considering the details, I have not attempted to enter into particular interpretations of each one, in the way that I have done previously. The reason for this may be found in what I stated at the outset, namely, that this chapter is one sui generis, and of a different tone and character from all the rest. It has more of the nature of a poetical rhapsody, and its several parts have nothing answering to them in the real world. Unlike the other portions, which have been arranged to depict past or future events in chronological order, this has for its object to represent in a forcible and graphic manner a single fact or event, which it does in the form of a dirge over a fallen city. Most important is it, that the reader should fully perceive the exceptional character of this chapter, and also rightly distinguish between its symbolical and literal aspects. The intention appears to have been, that we should conceive of the seer as standing looking upon the ruins of a fallen and desolated city, while different angelic beings in succession (different, for the sake of aesthetic variety and effect) recite after a poetical manner what may be supposed to be the sentiments of those most interested in her fate; and, from time to time, a voice from heaven either calls upon the Lord’s people to escape from the devoted city before the destruction pictured be realized, or
Synoptical interpretation.

to rejoice over it when accomplished. Be it remembered, then, that
this is a symbolical picture, designed to exhibit what shall be the
condition of Rome at a future period; and hence that the present
tenses may be regarded as having more immediate reference to the
picture, but the future to the reality. It will then be clearly seen,
that no indication whatever of the date of Rome’s downfall is given;
but that her destruction is simply and without limitation placed in the
time then future. According to my exposition, indeed, it did take
place in one respect in the time then present. I have shown, that
the salient feature in the symbolization of the whore, in connexion and
contrast with the beast, is, that she represents the republican constitu-
tion of Rome, as distinguished from the despotism set up by the
Cæsars. Now, in this point of view, Rome was then being lacerated,
and her free institutions subverted, by the dynasty represented by the
ten horns, as I have shown on C. 17; 16. But this is only a small part
of what is symbolized in the chapter before us. Babylon is here
chiefly brought to view as a city, and as such must represent the state
of Rome in the full meaning of the term. Her fall, then, will be the
fall of Rome from her high position as the ruling world-power. And
this, it is well known did not take place, till some centuries after the
Apocalypse was written.—Passing from these few introductory re-
marks, I proceed to give the usual summary of the chapter; though,
inasmuch as in this instance it will not be desirable, nor indeed prac-
ticable, to make the interpretation versicular, I shall follow the hept-
tadal divisions.—The prelude (vv. 1–3) brings to view the strong angel
Jesus, the Mediator of the Covenant, as coming on behalf of the reli-
gion which he founded, invested with high authority, and illuminating
with joy the habitations of his saints, who have long been crying;
‘How long, O Lord! dost thou not judge for and avenge our blood?’
He announces the downfall of great Rome, and her being given up as
a prey to the most terrible foes of every description, in requital for
her having been the leader and instigator of the adversaries of the
Lord’s people,—the organizer of a world-wide confederacy in anta-
gonism to them.—1. The heptad itself, in its first division (vv. 4–8),
contains a call from Jesus to his people to flee for their lives from the
devoted Sodom, so that they may escape her doom, and she may
receive the punishment due to the enormity of her offences, and a
downfall proportioned to her former exaltation, self-glorification, and
security. Because it is a mighty God with whom she has to do, she
will be utterly prostrated by the calamities which He will bring upon
her. [Here this call is suspended, in order that three laments may
be introduced, and afterwards the call be resumed so as to bind
together as it were, and mark off the laments as having a unity be-
tween themselves.]

2. The second division (vv. 9–10) contains the
first lament,—that of the highest functionaries or rulers of Judea; who, having obtained their honours and emoluments from Rome, subserved her interests and obeyed her commands. 3. **The third division** (vv. 11–14) contains the second lament,—that of the Jewish officials, who, from similar motives of self-aggrandizement, truckled to the power and courted the favour of Rome. 4. **The fourth division** (vv. 15–19) contains the third lament,—that of Roman governors of local rank, who were similarly influenced.—These three laments have the same general outline or ground-work, which is filled up in a manner appropriate to the party mentioned, that is, each party is made to express such sentiments as might be supposed to be uppermost in his mind on such an occasion. In that of the kings, their delicate living and sensual indulgences with the whore are brought to view; and the climax is, ‘Alas, alas, that great city Babylon, that strong city: because in one hour is thy judging come!’ In that of the traffickers by land, the loss of their trade is dwelt upon in its several details; and parenthetically the loss never to be retrieved, which Rome had suffered, is adverted to: and then the climax is, ‘Alas, alas, that great city, that was clothed and adorned sumptuously; because in one hour the place of so much wealth is converted into a desert!’ In that of the traffickers by sea, the lamentation reaches its climax in ‘They cast dust upon their heads, and cried; ‘Alas, alas, that great city, through whose extravagant luxuriousness all owners of trading vessels were enriched; because in one hour she is converted into a desert!’ “So much,” says Hengstenberg, “belonging to the parts in common prevents the several representations from falling asunder, and marks them as so many pieces in one whole. Then, the particular features of each part are rendered more prominent by reason of the contrast they present to this common ground.” 5. **The fifth division** (ve. 20) resumes the call to Christ’s people. Christianity as a religion, and its faithful professors, chief rulers, and inspired teachers are called upon to rejoice; because God has retaliated Rome’s sentence of extermination upon herself. 6. **The sixth division** (vv. 21–23) brings to view another strong angel. Single-handed he lifts a huge mass of rock, and hurls it into the sea, saying; ‘Thus, as by one stroke of violence, shalt thou, O Rome, be cast down: and henceforth no sounds of harmony or joy, no busy hum of trade, no preparation of necessary food, no solitary toiling at the midnight hour, no marrying or giving in marriage, shall be found in thee; because those with whom thou hadst commerce were induced by thee to be ministers and upholders of thy tyrannies on God’s earth; because by thine iniquitous machinations all the nations were seduced into an unholy alliance against God’s people.’ 7. **The seventh division** (ve. 24) contains a climactic statement, either by the interpreting angel.
The great supper of God.

or by the seer himself. It declares, that Rome (which had now absorbed into herself the guamdam people of God, "Jerusalem," as I. Williams says, "being swallowed up in Babylon")—Rome was found guilty, directly or indirectly, of the blood of all God's martyred saints. So that to her might be applied the Saviour's words, 'upon you shall come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth.'

Interpretations of C. 18.—Depicts the destruction of the papacy [Vitringa, Bp. Newton, and others]. Describes the battle of Harmagedon [Pyle]. The fall of Rome in 476 [Bossuet]. Final destruction of the city of Rome by three angels [Brightman]. Relates to the Reformation [Gell].

HEPTAD XXIII: SEVENTH HEPTADAL BLAST OF THE SEVENTH TRUMPET. The marriage-feast of the lamb, and the great supper of God. Ch. xix.

Introductory remarks. This, the seventh and last tableau, is an odd one; and hence it is distinguished from those which precede it in having none with which it pairs. Nevertheless, it may be regarded as a companion-picture to the last, that being a dirge, and this a pean over the prostrated Babylonian whore. It is also the crowning consummation of this trumpet of crisis; for in it is celebrated the war of 'the great day of the almighty God,' when, on the occasion of consummating His union with His Church, He gives her enemies as a prey to be feasted upon by the fowls of the air.—This heptad being one of crisis has, like the three of the same kind which have preceded it, its prelude. This we must first consider.

HEPTADAL PRELUDE. Alleluia chorus, in celebration of the judgment of the whore, and in anticipation of the marriage of the lamb. A pean and an epitaphalium.

We have in vv. 1–8 a heptadal song of praise, corresponding to those in Cs. 14: 1–4: 15; 1–4. This song has a two-fold aspect, backwards to the whore, forwards to the bride. Three times is the Alleluia repeated in thanksgiving for the judgment. First, the host of saints, who have entered into their rest, give praise for the Lord's righteous judgments, and for their own avenging: and these double their Alleluia, just as 'the rendering' to the whore had been double (18; 6). Next, the representatives of the Church of all time, and with them those of the creation at large, send forth their Alleluia. Then, a voice from the throne calls for new praise. Whereupon all join in a fourth Alleluia of praise on account of the approaching marriage of the lamb to a new bride. Hengstenberg, indeed, with some appearance of reason at first sight, divides this portion into two
parts, considering the first four verses to belong to ‘the judgment of the whore,’ C. 18, and vv. 5–10 to be (as he says) ‘the poroh to the building of C. 19; 11–20; 15.’ But the following reasons will, I think, satisfy the reader, that the view I take is the true one. 1. There is no indication of so wide a distinction between vv. 4 and 5. So much otherwise, that in the paragraph-bibles which I have at hand, the paragraph is made to end after ve. 5. 2. A wide distinction is made between C. 18 and C. 19. First, by the way in which C. 18 is concluded. There is a falling cadence in its last verse, like the letting down of bells after a peal. Secondly, by C. 19 opening with the technical break, which I have shown in the Guide, p. 199, to indicate, that a space of more than ordinary length is to be placed before the passage which it introduces. 3. From the examples which have been brought before us, showing how much it is the manner of this book to place symbols in pairs and to present companion-pictures, it is a consideration of some weight, that, on the view I take, something of this kind will appear in the prelude. For then, the whore on the one side and the bride on the other,—the judgment of the one and the espousal of the other, will form the subjects of this song of praise. 4. Of still more weight is the consideration, that thus four Alleluias will be formed. On the other view, the last Alleluia is wholly separated from those which precede it; and thus as a whole they are deprived of all significance: while I cannot doubt, that the very object of making four was to denote a universality of praise. Clearly, these Alleluias were meant to bind together, and give a unity to the portion, in which they are found. 5. The voice of ve. 5, while it indicates a change in the ground for praise, has reference as much to what precedes as to what follows its utterance; since it addresses those, who had previously been giving praise. 6. The burden of what follows this voice has still an aspect towards Babylon, in the ‘many waters,’ and ‘the strong thunderings.’ 7. Lastly, a wide break is indicated at the end of ve. 8 by the widely differing purport of vv. 9, 10, and in particular by the introduction of the angelic hierophant as speaker. For these reasons I conclude, that there is no division between vv. 4 and 5, but that vv. 1–8 form a prelude to the heptad, in correspondence with the previous instances. See Guide, p. 159.

(1). The first Alleluia. XIX; 1–2. 1285–92. After these things I heard as it were a loud voice of a vast multitude in the heaven, saying; 'Alleluya! the deliverance, and the glory, and the might [are] our God's; because true and righteous are His judging; because He hath judged the great fornicatrix, who corrupted the earth by her fornication, and hath avenged the blood of His servants at her hand.'
1285. After these things. See on 285, 1189.

1286. As it were a loud voice of a vast multitude. On the parallel occasion, in connexion with the first destruction of Jerusalem, 'a vast multitude' was seen (7; 9). And, in the syllabus of this trumpet (11; 15), 'great voices in heaven' celebrated Christ's first advent, as these do his second. Cp. 12; 10.—In the heaven. On the former occasion it was not said 'in the heaven,' but 'before the throne.' This multitude symbolizes chiefly Christians, who had entered into their rest; but that of necessity Jews only. These are doubtless 'the saints, and apostles, and prophets,' who were invoked in C. 18; 20.—The as it were of the genuine text was doubtless inserted to keep in the reader's mind, that this is all Visional representation, and not actual reality.—The thanksgiving, as for a judgment accomplished, has of course reference entirely to the exhibition, which has been made of the fate of Babylon. The realization of the judgment is necessarily assumed poetically, though certain of the contents of the last chapter have shown it to be unaccomplished and future at the time of writing.

1287. Alleluia, i.e. praise ye Jehovah. This word is found in no other book of the New Testament, while here it occurs four times. Fifteen of the Psalms either begin or end with it.

1288. The deliverance. Deliverance means, as Stuart says, earthly "deliverance of the Church from its enemies," as it did also in C. 7; 10 and C. 12; 10.—Some copies read the might and the glory. Some add and the honour. Others have the Lord our God's.—The article before the nouns points to the particular 'deliverance, &c.,' spoken of or implied in the preceding heptads.—The threefold ascription here, as compared with the single one in C. 7; 10, indicates the pre-eminence of the present occasion.—The doxology of the Lord's prayer, as given in the R. T. of Mt. 6; 13; "thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory," has probably been had in view. If so, it has been varied to suit this Alleluia chorus, 'the kingdom' being exchanged for 'the deliverance,' because the former expression was virtually to be inserted in the final and special Alleluia in vv. 6 relating to the coming of the kingdom.

XIX; 2. 1289. Because true and righteous are His judgings. This because, and the one which begins the next clause, have, I conceive, alternate reference to the two preceding clauses. So that the connexion of the sense should be understood to be as follows. 'Praise be to Jehovah; because true, &c.:' 'The deliverance, &c., are our God's; for He hath judged, &c.'—This clause is a repetition of the altar's words in C. 18; 7 (cp. 15; 3).—These texts, and those which will be referred to under the following numbers, if carefully compared, will show plainly, that the several lines are parallel, and relate gene-
rally to the same series of events. Hence the heptads must be substantially synchronous.

1290. Because he hath judged, &c. Cp. 18; 5, 8: 11; 18: 15; 4: 16; 5.

1291. That corrupted the earth, &c. Cp. 11; 18: 14; 8: 17; 2, 4: 18; 3. In particular, by the identity of the terms used here with those in the syllabus of the trumpet (‘the time of the dead to be judged, and to give the reward to . . . the prophets and saints (cp. 18; 20), . . . and to destroy (lit. corrupt) those who corrupt the earth’), we see plainly, that the same parties must be had in view in the two places; and hence that C. 11; 15–19 has been rightly laid down as a prelude to the contents of Cs. xii–xix.—The precedent followed is Je. 51; 25; “Behold, I am against thee (Babylon), thou corrupting mountain, saith the Lord, who dost corrupt the whole earth.”—By her fornication, that is, by endeavouring to seduce the people by bribes and threats from their allegiance to Jehovah.

1292. And hath avenged, &c. Of course the symbolical representation of the whore’s judgment (the reality of which was yet to come) is alone contemplated.—This clause is nearly synonymous with that in C. 18; 20; “hath judged your judgment by her.” See also C. 14; 10 and 16; 6; “they have shed the blood of saints and prophets, and Thou hast given them blood to drink:” also 18; 24; “In her was found, &c.” Herein is an answer to such a cry as that uttered by the saints of old (6; 10; ‘How long dost thou not judge for, and avenge our blood on those who dwell on the earth?):—an answer to which was promised, as soon as the number of their fellow-sufferers from among their brethren should be made complete.—At or out of her hand means shed by her hand.—As precedents we may compare De. 32; 49; “He avenge the blood of his servants;” and 2 Kgs. 9; 7; “I avenge the blood of my servants the prophets, &c.”

(2). The second Alleluia. XIX; 3. 1293–4. And a second time they said; ‘ALLELUIA!’

As unto the whore had been “doubled double according to her works” (18; 6), so the saints double their Alleluias for judgment having been done upon her. This is to give emphasis: cp. Job 33; 14, and Ps. 62; 11; “God hath spoken once: yea, twice I have heard the same.

(3). The perpetuity of Babylon’s destruction. 1295–6. And her smoke goeth up throughout the aons of aons.

Hengstenberg says; “The and joins to that, which in vv. 1, 2, follows after the Hallelujah, and which is repeated here in thought, though not in words. We are not to suppose, that the heavenly
voices only utter the Hallelujah the second time; and that the words 'and her smoke,' etc., are added by the prophet. For he describes only what he hears and sees, and restrains himself from introducing any such intermixture of his own." This construction appears to me to be utterly incongruous. I doubt not, that the hymn of praise is intended to begin and end with 'Alleluia' (cp. 7; 12), and that this sentence is to be regarded as the utterance either of the seer or of the hierophant. The former is supposed to be still looking upon the smoking ruins of Babylon, with the latter by his side. And so far is the seer from not intermixing anything of his own, that the book presents many examples of statements proceeding from himself (see e.g. ve. 8). As, however, the addition for ever implies a knowledge greater than it would be consistent for a mere man to be represented as possessing; as, too, the angelic interpreter interposes with a declaration in ve. 9; and, as it would belong to the office which the latter had assumed to make such an explanatory statement, I should rather suppose, that he is intended to be conceived of as the speaker. At the same time, with reference to the remark which I have made on the words for ever, it must be remembered, that the declaration, that her smoke goeth up for ever, is only a symbolical mode of saying, that Babylon is destroyed never to be rebuilt, meaning, that the empire of Rome shall be subverted never to be re-established. Cp. 17; 16: 18; 8, 9, 18.—On the phrase unto the aons, &c., see on 25.—As precedents we may refer to the example of Sodom in Ge. 19; 28; "The smoke went up as the smoke of a furnace:" and to that of Edom in Is. 34; 9; "The smoke thereof shall go up for ever."

(4). The third Alleluia. XIX; 4. 1297-1300. And the twenty-four elders and the four living-creatures fell down, and worshipped God, who sitteth upon the throne, saying; 'Amen! Alleluia!'

In C. 11; 16 the twenty-four alone respond to the doxology, with which the heavenly voices open the prelude to the trumpet; but, while here they simply add their 'Amen: Alleluia,' there they expand the praise, so as in it to intimate the main purport of the trumpet. The difference is accounted for by the object had in view there. —Again, in C. 5; 6, 8, the living-creatures are mentioned first, while in C. 7; 11, as well as here, the elders are placed first. Probably the latter arrangement has been made in the passage before us, because the glorified saints having given praise first, it was proper that the representatives of the Church should come next to them, and afterwards those of the creation in general.—Perhaps we should translate the God, who sitteth upon the throne,—pointing emphatically to Jesus, who (as I have already shown, and as will appear in this heptad) is
he who takes the kingdom, that is, ascends the throne. Why the latter clause should have been inserted does not otherwise appear.—
The Amen: Alleluia is from Ps. 106: 48. The Amen refers to the doxology in vv. 1–2, and expresses the assent of all creation, and of the Church in particular, to the sentiment uttered by the inhabitants of heaven.

(5). A hortatory voice out of the throne. XIX; 5. 1301–4. And a voice came out from the throne, saying; ‘Praise our God, all ye his servants, and ye who fear him, the small and the great.’

No sooner have the representatives of the Church and of the living creation said their Alleluias to ‘the God who sitteth on the throne,’ than the throne sends out in response a call for a new Alleluia. From whom or what should this call be understood to have proceeded? Not from the Father, as ‘Praise our God’ shows. This expression is also opposed to the general supposition, that Christ is meant. For, though God is called the God of Christ, yet Jesus in speaking never said ‘our God,’ so as to imply, that the Father was so to him in the same sense and relation, that He is to us. On the contrary, when he had occasion to speak of Him in the relation of God and Father to both himself and us, he appears to have been careful to intimate, that the relationships to the two were not identical or on an equality by saying “my Father and your Father, my God and your God.” Moreover, if Christ be (as, I think, it is clearly shown, that he is) the God on the throne, it could scarcely be the case, that he is represented as calling for praise to himself. Can the four living-creatures, then, who are the supporters of the throne be supposed to be meant? If they had been intended, we might reasonably expect, that they would have been specified. Besides, “they are not upon the throne, and from their whole position they are not qualified for addressing such a call.” It remains, then, only, either that this is a part of the necessary machinery of representation, or that those Divine attributes of which the throne is “the habitation,”—judgment, justice, holiness, and covenant-faithfulness (see on 1100), are here personified, and represented as calling upon all God’s servants to come forward, and praise Him anew, on account of the new and complete manifestation, which is about to be made of them in His taking the kingdom, and espousing His Church. For, while the preceding Alleluias look back to the destruction of Babylon exhibited in the last heptad, that, with which this voice stands connected, will be seen to look forward to the coming symbolization of Christ’s advent. And it may be observed, that similar anticipative songs of praise occur in C. 11; 15–18: 14; 1–4: 15; 2–4. The propriety of this call being made to proceed from the throne will be more obvious, when it is thus viewed as connected with
Christ's coming to take the throne of his kingdom.—In the last clause, *his servants, &c.*, we have the very words used in the prelude: 11; 18. All such instances tend to confirm the opinion, that C. 11; 18–19 contains the syllabus of the seventh trumpet.

(6). The fourth Alleluia. XIX; 6–7. 1305–13. And I heard as it were a voice of a vast multitude, and as it were a voice of many waters, and as it were a voice of strong thunders, saying: ‘Alleluia; because the Lord our almighty God hath taken the kingship! Let us rejoice and be glad, and give to him the glory; because the marriage of the lamb hath come, and his wife hath prepared herself.’

1305–7. The threefold repetition of the *as it were* appears to be designed to keep in the reader's mind, that all this is symbolical, and not literal, nor even figurative. While the primary aspect is forwards to the coming kingdom, there is also in the many waters (cp. 17; 15), and especially in the strong thunders (in which the seven thunders of C. 10; 3 go out into accomplishment, see on 671), both a retrospective glance at the decreed destruction of Rome as symbolized in C. 18, and a prospective aspect towards that of the dynasty of Cæsars and their supporters as represented in vv. 17–21. The vast multitude is doubtless the same with the vast multitude of ve. 1. But to it additions are made here, which direct our thoughts to 'the voice from heaven, as it were a voice of many waters and a voice of loud thunder,' of C. 14; 2, which voice proceeded from the 144 chiliiads. The association can scarcely fail to lead to the conclusion, that this vast multitude is none other than the 144 chiliiads. If so, it is also identical with the martyred victors of C. 16; 2–4. And then, the parties symbolized in the three places being identical, these passages must be parallel, synchronical, and of the same character as preludes. This view is confirmed by the terms used in ve. 5 to describe those, who are called upon to praise their God. "His servants" and "they who fear Him" are technical designations (11; 18) of the saved at this crisis. There are, however, two slight differences, which it may be well to notice. In C. 14; 2 the Greek word for 'thunder' is in the singular: here it is in the plural, no doubt for greater intensity on account of this being the final and consummating scene. Again, in that text the epithet used is 'great' or 'loud:' here it is strong, this being the fifth time in this immediate connexion, in which this word is introduced, and doubtless with an allusion to the meaning of the Greek word for Rome.

1308. Alleluia. This is the fourth Alleluia: and it has respect to the fourth symbolization of the destruction of the Lord's enemies (14; 18–20: 16; 17–21: 18; 9–24: 19; 17–21),—the final and complete one over the beast. Hence the propriety of its being uttered
by 'those who had been redeemed from the earth,' and 'who had gotten the victory over the beast,' &c., is manifest.

1309. *Because, &c.* Op. in the Gk. 2 Cor. 6:18. We might perhaps read; 'Praise ye Jehovah; because a Lord, who is our almighty God, is become king.' But, take the clause how we may, there can be no doubt, that Christ is the person spoken of; since it is He, who was to take the kingdom at his second coming, and until he had put down every hostile power (1 Co. 15:23-25). Hence, when in reply to the call; 'Praise our God, all ye His servants,' the great multitude respond; 'Alleluia! because the Lord, our almighty God, hath taken the kingdom,' Christ must be the God and Lord intended: and we may perceive a great force and propriety in the word our, and that a connexion between the call and the response is indicated by means of it. The our of the clause before us, though omitted in the R. T., is unquestionably genuine. The Lord is called 'our God' only in vv. 1, 5, 6, of this chapter, and doubtless distinctively so here, as 'the God of Christians.'—In reference to the word 'hath taken the kingship,' as well as to the expression in the prelude, C. 11; 15; 'The kingship of the world hath become our Lord's,' we must bear in mind, that, inasmuch as a prelude has more or less of the nature of a syllabus, both of these preludes are to be regarded as necessarily placed in point of time after the portions of which they furnish a syllabus, that is, after C. 19, and consequently after the symbolization in vv. 11-21 of Christ's coming to take the kingdom.

XIX; 7. 1310. *Let us rejoice, &c.* Cp. C. 18; 20; 'Rejoice over her, &c.' Parallel to this doxology is that in the prelude; 'We give thanks to thee, O Lord! the almighty God! because Thou hast taken the kingdom.' The same words are used in Mt. 5; 12; 'Rejoice and be glad; for great is your reward in heaven.' But more to the present purpose is 1 Pe. 5; 13; 'Rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings; that, when his glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy.'

1311. *And give to him the glory.* Not merely glory, but the glory, that, namely, which all were called upon to give him (14; 7); "because the hour of his judging was come," and "because he would make all the heathen prostrate themselves before him" (15; 4)—that glory, which he sought to vindicate by the last plagues (15; 8; 16; 9).

1312. *Because the marriage of the lamb hath come.* The marriage of the lamb can mean only Christ's taking his Church into the closest union with himself (2 Co. 11; 2: Eph. 5; 25-27): while his taking the kingdom (ve. 6) has reference chiefly to his enemies, and to his putting down all rival 'authorities.' The two go together. Christ fully espoused his Church, that is, made it to the fullest extent the only Church of God, or people in covenant with Him, at the epoch of
the subversion of the Jewish polity in A.D. 70. Step by step the exclusive privileges of the Jews had been abolished: first, the exclusive offer of the Gospel to them: then, the abrogation of the law, which required those who would become Christians to become also Jews by receiving circumcision: then, the gradual disuse of Jewish ordinances. Still, up to the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, the Jews had a preference and precedence accorded to them (see on 875); and, if as a nation they had embraced Christianity, the Christian Church might have remained a Jewish institution, in which God's ancient people, as 'the seed of Abraham,' would have been pre-eminent. But, when the fist of destruction went forth against Babylon (in which Jerusalem, as having now become a limb of the great whore, was involved); and when, in consequence, the temple of God was levelled with the ground, the whole Jewish system was swept away, Christianity wholly took its place, and believers in Christ became the Church and covenant-people of God. Then, not merely were the branches of the old olive tree cut away, that others might be grafted in (Ro. 11), but the sentence against the tree itself; 'Cut it down: why cumbereth it the ground?' having been executed, a new tree, which had been nourished in the nursery of the Lord, was transplanted into its place.—Christ's espousal of his Church is alluded to only here, and in the interlude which immediately follows, and not in the principal heptad: and this (we may suppose); partly because these heptads of crisis are wholly devoted to the exhibition of Christ's judgments on the enemies of his Church, and in the first of them (C. 14) the judgment on the Jews necessarily implied the succession of the Christian Church to the place previously held by the Jewish; and partly because in the other Scriptures of the New Testament his taking his people into intimate union with himself is so closely associated with his coming, that the mere symbolization of that event would imply all that his Church was looking for or could desire.—Hengstenberg has expressed himself here in terms, which give a substantial, though not exact agreement with my view. "As soon as the enemies of God are cast down, the glorification of the Church breaks forth. Before this, immediately after the atonement of Christ, it is said in C. 12; 10; "Now is come the kingdom of our God." What existed there in the germ must now be developed and unfolded, and it is here anticipated in respect to this state of coming development and unfolding. C. 11; 17 is directly parallel. We have here no "new stage of what was announced there;" cannot possibly have it, as there already a time was spoken of, when not merely a particular phase of the worldly power, but this power itself was to fall under the heavy stroke of the Lord. There, however, the general plan only was announced, and here we have the plan filled up."—He says, again; "We may learn from C.
13; 8; the reason why Christ appears here under the name of the Lamb. It is in Christ's sacrifice, in his bloody atonement, that his whole relation to the Church has its root, that the state of glory to which he leads them, also has its root."—Stuart, also, has some remarks which are very pertinent. "The boldness of the imagery here is striking; yet it is nothing new. Everywhere in the prophets of the Old Testament, God is often represented as the husband of Israel or Judah; an image derived from two sources, first, from the fact that a nation is usually personified under the image of a female, and secondly, that the connection between husband and wife is the dearest and most sacred of all; Gen. 2; 24; The wife is by her very relation to her husband bound to faithfulness, purity, obedience, and affection; the husband is to protect, provide for, and cherish the wife. Hence the frequency of this imagery in the Old Testament; e.g., Is. 50; 1: 54; 5: Jer. 3; 14: Is. 62; 5: Hos. 2; 19, 20. The whole of Canticles exhibits this idea greatly enlarged, and as it were individualized, if it is to be understood in a spiritual sense. It is frequent also in the New Testament; e.g., 2 Cor. 11; 2; Eph. 5; 22-32; Rev. 21; 2, et al. Undoubtedly we may call such imagery oriental; for the poems of Hafiz among the Persians, and many of the religious poems of the Arabians, assume the same imagery, in order to express the ardour and purity of affection which is due to God. If any reader is offended at this, it is but the part of candour to suggest that the Bible was written in the East, and for the East, as well as the West; and surely in oriental countries no one would think of taking offence on the ground of tropical language derived from such a source. Besides, Rome has already been repeatedly introduced as a harlot in a gaudy and meretricious dress; the church therefore is introduced here, on the contrary, as a chaste virgin betrothed to Christ. The antithesis between the two is thus made striking."

1313. And his wife hath prepared herself. The preparation consists in 'clothing herself with righteousness as with a garment.' This will appear from the next verse. At present let us notice, that, on the occasion of the Lamb's renewed espousals to his bride on her Reformation and purification from the black spots, which had accumulated on her garments during 'the dark ages,' she is said to come "prepared by God, as a bride adorned for her husband" (21; 2). In one point of view the Church wholly 'prepares herself,' that is to say, insomuch as none of her 'righteousnesses' could be wrought without her concurrence and cooperation. In another she is wholly 'prepared by God,' namely, in that He works all her good works in her, and adorns her with every grace that makes her acceptable in His sight.—Hengstenberg remarks; "The marriage here is not the marriage-feast, as Vitrinna falsely infers from ve. 9. Here, where the
subject of discourse is the Lamb and His wife, or the church in its entire fulness, the marriage is in its proper place. There, where individual believers are spoken of, it is fitly the marriage-supper.” According to the analogy of other places, the marriage should represent Christ’s taking his Church into full and complete covenant with Himself: the marriage-supper the participation by believers in all the blessings which he has prepared in his kingdom.—Hermas, Vis. IV, contains a symbolization, which may serve to illustrate this passage. The following is an abstract of it. “There met me a virgin well- adorned, as if she had been just come out of her bride-chamber; all in white, having on white shoes, and a veil over her face, and covered with shining hair. Now I knew by my former visions, that it was the Church. She said to me; ‘Did nothing meet you?’ I replied; ‘There met me such a beast as seemed able to devour a whole people; but by God’s mercy I escaped it.’ ‘The Lord sent his angel, who is over the beast, whose name is Hegrin, and stopped his mouth. This beast is the figure of the trial that is about to come.’”

(7). The bride’s preparedness. XIX; 8. 1314–16. And it was given to her, that she should be clothed with fine linen, bright and pure; for the fine linen is the righteousnesses of the saints.

The fourth Alleluia and doxology terminated with the last verse. Here the angel-interpreter appears to be the speaker, not only from what is said being appropriate to his office, but also from the manner in which he is introduced in the next verse. He comes forward here to elucidate the last clause in the doxology by showing, wherein the wife’s preparedness consisted, and whence it was derived.—It was given to her, that is, the state of preparedness did not inherently appertain to her, but it was bestowed upon her; and that by her Lord and husband, as appears from other places, e.g., 3; 18: 6; 11: 7; 9: Mt. 22; 12: Eph. 5; 25–27.—That they should be clothed in white garments was the promise made in C. 3; 5 to those who should conquer, &c. the beast, &c.—“The pure, added to the shining, points to the difference between washing and making white in C. 7; 14. The shining denotes the glory of the holy life of the righteous: the pure their freedom from sin, their blameless and unspotted character.”—Is = represents.—The righteousnesses of the saints here is commonly interpreted to mean “that, which is by faith in Christ, the righteousness of God by faith,” imputed not imparted. But such an interpretation does great violence to the expression: indeed, the noun in the plural is sufficient to exclude it. The phrase ‘naturally denotes particular actions, constituting the personal righteousness of the saints, a righteousness which may be said to be imparted, but not imputed:’ though the impartation is the consequence, and presupposes an im-
putation of Christ's righteousness. And hence the righteousnesses are here said to be given to them. But perhaps in strictness we should understand the meaning to be, that the fine linen represents the honour and glory, which God attaches to the righteous acts of the saints, and especially to those, by which they glorify His name by enduring persecution, and 'suffering for righteousness' sake.' For this is the sense, and these are the acts had in view in the parallel places, in which the being clothed with white garments is spoken of. And this sense is supported by what Wemyss says, namely; "To bestow garments, as is sometimes done by eastern princes, is a great honour and mark of favour: if a stole or tunic very great; if with it he adds the great cloak or robe it is a complete favour." In this case, the special preparedness of the Church will consist in her having made herself illustrious in the sight of her Lord by the proofs of love and devotedness, which she has given in suffering for His name's sake.—In this simple clothing of the bride there is probably a contrast designed with the gorgeous and meretricious attire of the great whore, as described in C. 17; 4: 18; 16.

INTERLUDE, marking the time present.

XIX; 9-11. 1317-1326. And he saith to me; 'Write: Blessed the called to the supper of the marriage of the lamb.' And he saith to me; 'These words of God are true.' And I fell before his feet to worship him. And he saith to me; 'See, [thou do it] not. I am a fellowservant of thee, and of thy brethren who hold the testifying of Jesus. Worship God. For the testifying of Jesus is the spirit of the prophecy.'

The contrast, which the contents of these verses present to that of those which precede and follow them, seems to me to leave no doubt as to the interludial character of this passage. And it is not unlikely, that an interlude might in this instance be introduced here, between the preludial and principal heptads, in order to mark a distinction between this, as being the heptad of consummation, and the three heptads of crisis which precede this.

. 1317. He saith. The verb is frequently introduced thus, without a nominative in immediate connexion. In this instance the angel of C. 17; 1 must be supposed to remain on the scene as hierophant (see on 1117, 1222, 1283, 1558), even though other angels and voices have been introduced since he was mentioned: and this; because he announced himself, as being about to act as hierophant of 'the judgment of the whore,' which judgment was exhibited only in C. 18. In consequence of the same angelic interpreter acting throughout them, a kind of oneness in Cs. 17, 18, 19; 1-10, is indicated. And it is manifest, that there is a special connexion between the subjects of these portions. The judgment of the whore and the marriage of the
lamb’s bride form companion-pictures in a way of contrast (see on 1117). The one presents the negative side: the other the positive. The one symbolizes the destruction of one of the powers hostile to the Lord’s people: the other the admission of that people into the highest privileges and blessings, which he has prepared for them. —It should further be observed, that the omission to designate the symbolic speaker explicitly may possibly not have been without an object in such a case. The intention may have been to leave the reader’s thoughts more at liberty to turn to the person signified, viz., Christ the Mediator, instead of drawing them off to the symbolic person.

1318. Write. The same instruction is given in C. 14; 13 and in 21; 5; and an instruction not to write in C. 10; 4. An intimate connexion appears to exist between the latter and the other three texts; or rather the four, together with two other passages which stand connected with the one before us, form a series marking out a succession of periods. To show what I mean I must premise, that, in the mystical system, two identical or nearly identical phrases or sentences appear to be used, in the nature of bracketing formulae, to indicate a chronological unity or connexion of the portions, which lie between them. Thus, in the present instance, the negative injunction (with which we set out as from a basis) is to this effect; ‘Write not at this epoch (the era of the seventh trumpet) the impending judgments and catastrophe, which the seven thunders portend; because the time is not yet come.’ But when the time of the catastrophe was arrived, inasmuch as the blessedness of the saints was an event, which would accompany or immediately attend on the destruction of their enemies, and consequently implied the arrival of the great catastrophe, the instruction was; ‘Write in plain terms the coming blessedness of those, who die in the Lord.’ Between these two instructions is included the period of the incipient plagues on the whore and the beast. With the latter of the two the one before us; “Write, Blessed the called, &c.,” is identical and synchronous. Connected with this instruction by immediate sequence are the words; “And he saith to me; These are the true words of God,” —a declaration which is repeated in very similar terms in C. 21; 5, and again in C. 22; 6. Then follows the verse; “And I fell, &c.,” which is repeated with slight variations in C. 22; 8-9. The two in 19; 9 and 21; 5 include between them the millennial reign of Christ and his saints, together with the consummations which bound it on either side. The two in 19; 9-10 and 22; 6, 8, 9, include both these and the new Jerusalem scene. Thus, these corresponding expressions appear to serve as formulae or catchwords, marking out certain periods or divisions of the subject. —Not those are blessed, who have been merely called to the wedding (for in the parables, Mt. 22; 7: 25; 10,
many were called, who were ultimately shut out or destroyed); but those, who, having been called, have both accepted the invitation and 'prepared themselves' with the oil of the Spirit,—the anointing, which entitles them to wear 'the garment of righteousness.' Hence, the called here must be taken as a pregnant expression, which includes "called and chosen and faithful;" that is, it designates in particular 'the 144 chilieds,'—'those who have gotten the victory over the beast and his image.' These, having entered into their rest, are now about to be admitted into the full 'joy of their Lord.'—The supper, &c. The Lord makes two suppers. The one is called 'the marriage-supper of the lamb:' the other 'the great supper of God' (ve. 18). The called to the one are those who have been faithful to him even unto death: to the other the ravenous birds of prey. The place of celebration of the one is 'the Paradise of God' or 'the kingdom of heaven:' of the other 'Harmagedon,'—the Mount of destruction. The repast provided in the one case is the fruits of the tree of life (22; 2), with which 'the lamb will feed them' (7; 17), and the water of the river of life: in the other 'flesh of kings and of all the enemies of the Lord's people, small and great.' In the one the Lord's people are the feasted; in the other the Lord's enemies are the feasted upon. In respect of time only is there an agreement: both suppers were in this instance to be celebrated at the Lord's coming, that is, in A.D. 70 the decree went forth for the celebration of both.—It may be well to notice here, that in a lower,—a spiritual sense, the Lord is said to sup with the believer and he with Him in C. 3; 20. See also Lu. 14; 15 ss.; 'One said; Blessed is he who shall eat bread in the kingdom of God: &c.:' 22; 16–18: Mt. 9; 15.—Stuart has remarked on this clause; "There seems at first sight to be a departure here from the imagery of the preceding verse. There the whole Church are represented as the bride, and Christ as the husband. Here the blessedness is mentioned of those, who are guests invited to the wedding-feast. I know not well how to solve this, except by the consideration, that the speaker here regards the consummation of the marriage, i.e., the highest spiritual union with Christ in the heavenly world after martyrdom, as constituting the basis of his imagery in ver. 8; while in ver. 9 he pronounces a blessing on those who, having been called of God, are now in their probationary state preparing for a final union with Christ. Understood in this way, the speaker declares, that blessings of the highest kind await martyrs in the heavenly world; also, that they who have merely begun their course, and who are invited to final happiness, are amid all their trials to be counted as greatly blessed." The difficulty, which Stuart felt, may best be solved by distinguishing between the marriage and the supper in the way indicated on 1313.
1319. And he saith to me. Probably one reason for the repetition of this clause was to give greater effect to the words which it introduces.

1320. These words of God are true. Codex A 4 has two articles, but most authorities have only one. Hengstenberg, mainly from the parallel passage, 22; 6, receives one only, and renders; “These words are true, [they are the words] of God.” The A. V. has; “These are the true sayings of God.”—I take this clause to refer to the words, which the angel had just uttered; “Blessed, &c.” But Hengstenberg says; “The expression, these words, can only refer to vv. 5–8.” Can it be thought, however, that words specially from God would be communicated, partly through the medium of a voice calling for renewed praise, partly through a choir of redeemed saints and in the form of a song of praise, and partly through an angel? Moreover, the greater part of these verses consists of such matter as can with no propriety be attributed to God, while the sum and substance of what is specially pointed to, and all in which the saints here addressed were personally interested is contained in the words, “Blessed, &c.” The manner, too, in which this sentence is introduced,—“Write,” indicates that special importance is attached to the declaration: it is almost equivalent to saying, that the words are given by a special commission. And the parallelism and solemn attestation of the like words in C. 14; 13 leave no doubt on the point. Further, what the persecuted saints then most wanted was to have their future bliss brought so near to them, and pressed home to their minds with such a sanction, that no doubt with regard to it should exist. This could be done in no other way so forcibly as by a special Divine declaration. Hence a declaration on such a point would be most worthy of God, and was most to be expected. And such a declaration is virtually contained in the words, “Blessed, &c.” But, while I think that the statement before us arose out of, and was meant immediately to apply to these words, I consider, that it was intended to have also a general application to the whole of the preceding contents of the Mystery. I am led to form this opinion by the parallel example in C. 22; 6–9. There, no sooner has the end of the Vision been reached in ve. 5 than a statement similar to this (followed by a similar scene of offered worship) is appended, with the manifest intention that it should apply to the whole contents of the Vision, and form a kind of concluding attestation and ratification. Here, too, we have arrived at an end,—the terrestrial end of the Mystery of God. What, then, can be more probable than that this similar formula should be designed to serve the same purpose in respect of ‘the Mystery of God?’ So plainly do the words, “These are the true sayings of God,” indicate an end, that Bengel supposed, that
John took them for the conclusion of the whole Vision, and therefore proceeded to offer worship to the angel.

XIX; 10. 1821. And I fell before his feet to worship him. Observe, that the Greek preposition used here is not the same, that is commonly rendered before. That means before or in the presence of: this before or at.—It is in consequence of the announcement of the end of the Mystery and of the time of delay (10; 6),—of the preparation of the marriage-feast, and consequent coming of the lamb and espousal of his Church, implied in the words 'Blessed henceforth they, who have been called to the lamb's marriage-feast,' that the seer prostrates himself to adore, and to give thanks for all the revelations of Jesus which he had hitherto received, and in particular for this crowning mercy which 'God had sent and signified to him by His angel.'—The use of the verb to worship will not in the least degree bear out the hypothesis, that religious worship is here intended; since the word is commonly used, when civil or secular homage only can be contemplated (see on 511, 879). Nevertheless, the answer of the angel implies, that such worship was intended. And in offering this no slight on the divine prerogative seemed to the seer to be implied. For the angel was, as I have shown, a special representative of Jesus: and it was, as seeing Jesus in him, that the seer offered his adoration. But he was virtually told, that so jealous is the Lord of the honour due unto His name, that worship must not even be offered to a partaker in the Divine nature as such, when acting in an inferior capacity, but must be reserved for the throne of Deity.—There is a passage in the Asc. Esaiæ, which tends to throw much light upon the views entertained in the apostle's days on this point, and which may consequently help us to form right views on this confessedly difficult passage. In the course of his ascent through the seven heavens, the prophet on reaching the second heaven prostrates himself, in order to worship him who sits upon the throne; but he is told by his conductor, that the enthroned one is only an angel, and that he must reserve his worship for the seventh heaven. Subsequently, again, he addresses his conductor as 'My Lord,' who replies that he is not his Lord, but his associate. Permission having been given him by his 'Lord God, the Lord Christ,' to ascend to the seventh heaven, the Beloved there exhibits himself in surpassing glory. Angels and saints worship Him. He then assumes an angelic form. They still repeat the worship without prohibition. Hence it would appear, that the ground of the prohibition would not be the angelic form, but the inferior sphere temporarily occupied. And the teaching is, that God must be worshipped as God only on the throne of Deity, and not in His actions or manifestations.

1322. And he saith to me. The repetition of this clause thrice in
such close proximity appears singular; but I know of no other object, that can have been had in view, than to distinguish between the several declarations.

1323. See not is brachylogical for See, that thou do not worship.—I am a fellow-servant is the reason assigned. 'As now acting in that capacity, I cannot receive worship as God.' This fully bears out what was said on 1321.

1324. Of thee, and of thy brethren who hold the testifying of Jesus. In the parallel passage in C. 22; 9 for the last clause is substituted, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of those who keep the words of this book. The latter may be considered to be explanatory of the former. And if so, it is thus clearly shown, that the parties spoken of are not prophets and apostles exclusively (as Hengstenberg contends), but all witnessing Christians. Witnessing or testifying (that is, maintaining in spite of persecution the truth which Jesus taught) is the salient idea, to which it is of most consequence to pay attention. And this will show, too, who are included. All who witness, as confessors to 'the truth as it is in Jesus,' are brethren of the apostle. For, at the outset he thus claimed kindred with them, saying; 'I John, your brother and fellow-partaker in the tribulation and kingdom and endurance of Jesus Christ . . . on account of the testifying of Jesus.' And he had before introduced himself distinctively, as 'he who testifi'd of the testifying of Jesus Christ' (1; 2). Jesus is set forth as the chief Testifier: 'the faithful witness' or 'martyr' (1; 5), 'the faithful and true testifier' (3; 14); and it was 'He that testifi'd the things' (22; 20). And the persecuted saints are described as his testifiers. The dragon was conquered by, though he afterwards persecuted those, who held the-witnessing of Jesus (12; 11, 17). The beast killed the two testifiers of Jesus (11; 7). The whore was drunk with the blood of the testifiers of Jesus (17; 6). The souls of those, who had been beheaded on account of the testifying of Jesus, reigned with Christ the 1000 years (20; 4). It was the being a testifier or confessor, that made any one a fellow-servant of Jesus in the view of the seer; since this was the special office and function of Jesus in this book, that is, of 'his angel,'—the angel, whom he 'sent to testify these things in the interest of the churches' (22; 16).

And hence worship must not be offered to him: not (as Bossuet and Hengstenberg say) "in order to place the apostolical and prophetic ministry on a footing with that of angels;" but because the ministry of Jesus is here represented as on a footing with that of men. Divine worship must be offered to him only when he is revealed as God, and not when he is exhibited as a fellow-servant of men. The general principle is, that he should be worshipped as God, but not as man,—in his Divine, but not in his human nature, nor even when
acting in the character or capacity of men or angels, although his Divine nature be fully recognized.

1325. Worship God,—the God, who is now before you on the throne; and to whom alone Divine worship ever is in heaven, or ought to be on earth offered. Songs of praise are sung in honour of God and of the lamb; but Divine worship is never offered but to Him who sitteth on the throne: cp. 4; 10: 5; 9, 12–14: 7; 10–12: 11; 15–16: 12; 10: 14; 7: 15; 3: 16; 7: 19; 1–6. How incongruous, indeed, would it seem, in presence of the glorious scene presented in Cs. 4–5, to fall down and worship even the lamb who stands in front of the throne, much more one of the angels whose place is at a respectful distance!—This clause presents the positive side of that, of which the negative is in 1323. The connexion of the whole may perhaps be best exhibited by transposing the clauses thus: ‘Worship not me (a ministering servant), but worship God; for I am a fellow-servant of thee and of the rest who hold the testifying of Jesus, and the testifying of Jesus is the spirit of the prophecy.’

1326. For the testifying, &c. The meaning has been sadly obscured by overlooking the force of the last article. The A. V., Stuart, Hengstenberg, Tregelles, Jenour, all translate the spirit of prophecy, making prophecy in general to be meant. To this source of error may be attributed the many discrepant interpretations, which have been given of this clause. For example. Hengstenberg says; “The testimony of Jesus is all one with the Spirit of prophecy.” Storr: “Whatsoever Jesus put forth in this oracle emanated from a prophetic spirit.” Ewald: “For the profession of Jesus is prophetic spirit: i.e., if any one stedfastly maintains faith in him, he thereby has a prophetic spirit.” Stuart: “John and his fellow-witnesses for Jesus, being in possession of the testimony respecting him, were partakers of the spirit of prophecy; because the testimony respecting Jesus must embrace many things yet future, and which could be known only in a prophetic way. . . . John and the angel were both engaged in the same business. The one, therefore, cannot worship the other.” Now, the truth is, that the text says “the prophecy,” which can mean only the prophecy which John was recording in this book. And if any doubt could exist on this point, it would be removed by the parallel passage in C. 22; 6 ss.; “the words of the prophecy of this book:” “I am the fellow-servant . . . of those who keep the words of this book:” “Seal not the words of the prophecy of this book:” &c., &c. The meaning, then, is, that the testifying of Jesus is the very soul of John’s prophetic Vision, the animating spirit, the heart’s core, the pith and substance of the whole. And this was, in fact, stated at the very outset. The book was described in its title as being ‘The prophecy’ (ve. 3), or ‘a revelation [or
unveiling] of Jesus ... symbolized through an angel to John, who testified of the testifying of Jesus (vv. 1–2). Its contents have been shown fully to correspond to this description; for it has been made manifest, that it is occupied throughout with an exhibition of the long-suffering of Christ during the ages of the old Dispensation,—of his ‘endurance of the contradiction of sinners against himself,—of his testifying to the truth by word and deed for the sake and on behalf of his saints. The argument on this view is plain. For the seer to worship one, who appears here in the character of a revealing ‘angel’ (1; 1, 13–19),—‘a fellow-servant’ engaged in the same work of exhibiting the testifying of Jesus, would be wholly out of place, and opposed to the entire spirit of the work, in which the angel and the apostle alike, each in his proper sphere, were to take part; and the primary feature in which was, that it was a testimony against deviation from the worship of the true God in every shape and degree. In particular, a prominent part of the testifying of Jesus was to the effect, that “thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.” How inconsistent, then, with that testifying, of which John and the angel were fellow-ministers, would it be for the one to be found worshipping the other!—For greater perspicuity it may be well to summarize the argument as follows. The testifying of Jesus is the soul of the prophecy. And testifying against idolatry under every form is the soul of the testifying of Jesus. Consequently, for fellow-ministers of the prophecy to do that, which may have though it be but the appearance of a species of idolatry, would be to offend against the soul of the soul,—the very inmost soul of the prophecy.

THE HEPTAD OF THE GREAT SUPPER OF GOD.

The title, which I have given to this heptad, is derived from ve. 17. This ‘great supper’ is identical with ‘the battle of Harmagedon,’ and occurs on ‘the great day of the almighty God’ (16; 14, 16). It forms the grand consummating scene, representing the catastrophe of the seventh trumpet. That heathens are the victims may be inferred from ve. 15. First, the advent of the great Conqueror is described in respect of his glorious appearance and character, of his attendants, and of his aspect towards his foes. Then, the result of the contest is intimated beforehand by the summoned of merciless executioners. The enemy gather together. But no sooner are they assembled than their leaders are taken captive. And then the whole are destroyed. “The description of the battle,” says Hengstenberg, “is as remarkable for its brevity, as that of Christ is for its length; quite naturally, as there can properly be no sustained conflict against him, who slays with the breath of his mouth.”
DIV. I. DESCRIPTION OF CHRIST'S ADVENT. (1.) AS TO HIS PERSONAL APPEARANCE.

XIX; 11-13. 1327-38. And I beheld the heaven opened, and lo! a white horse; and he who sat on him [is] called FAITHFUL and TRUE. And in righteousness he doth judge and war. His eyes [are] as it were a flame of fire; and on his head [are] many diadems. He hath a name written,—AN INCOMMUNICABLE NAME. And he is clothed with a garment, which had been dipped in blood. And his name hath been called the WORD of GOD.

1327. I beheld the heaven opened. There was no necessity for the statement, that the heaven was opened; since ingress or egress is constantly represented as taking place without any opening being mentioned. Voices, angels, the new Jerusalem, &c., come forth without the opening of the heaven being specified. Indeed, only once before (4; 1) is such a statement made. Hence, it has here in all probability a symbolical significance; and most likely a parallelism with the previous place is intended to be indicated. Now, there heaven's door was opened to admit the seer to see the representation of the Mystery of the old Dispensation. What, then, more probable than that the heaven is here said to be opened in order to intimate, that a new Dispensation from heaven is now about to be established on earth, contemporaneously with the destruction of the enemies of God's people, and the abolition of the former one?

1328. And lo! a white horse and he who sat on him. Cp. and see on C. 6; 2; "And lo! a white horse and he who sat on him."—Hengstenberg truly says; "That the rider is no other than Christ is put beyond a doubt by the parallel passage, C. 6; 2. The white horse points here, as it did also there, at once to the glory of the person and to its manifestations. The white horse forms the contrast to the ass in Matt. 21. His first coming into the world was in the form of meekness: the second will be terrible, the cause of great pain to the ungodly."—The circumstance, that it is the same personage, that was brought to view at the commencement of the ages to introduce the old Mystery, who now appears at the end of them, confirms the opinion just advanced, that it was intended, that he should be regarded as coming here to supersede that Mystery by substituting another in its place.

1329. Is called FAITHFUL and TRUE. Is called is commonly said to be equivalent to is. But this is not correct. The words import, that the epithets which follow are given to him as a designation. Being so applied, his possession of the qualities expressed by them is presupposed. Not only so, but his possession of them in so preeminent a degree, that he, distinctively from all others, may be fitly designated by them is signified. And just so he was called at the beginning
‘the faithful testifier,’ and ‘the faithful and true testifier’ (1: 5: 3; 14). More than once his judgments are said to be ‘true and righteous’ (15: 3: 16; 7), and his words ‘faithful and true’ (21: 5: 22; 6). Hence this is a very appropriate designation to stand first on an occasion, when he comes to judge his enemies, and to fulfil his promises to his saints. ‘That Christ is designated the true raises him far above the level of humanity, it bespeaks almightiness and essential Godhead (cp. at C. 3; 7: 6; 10: 15; 3: 16; 7). This holds also of the name faithful. Absolute faithfulness or credibility pre-supposes omnipotence.’

1330. And in righteousness he doth judge and war. This is added; because the business on which he now comes is to ‘judge and war.’ He comes to do what was announced in the prelude (11: 18); ‘Thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead to be judged and to give the reward to thy servants.’—‘The words and in, etc., are not a component part of the name, but they continue further the description of the nature and action, that is involved in the name. He judges and wars in righteousness, whose property it is to give to every one his own; why, then, should his church despond! how should his enemies fear and tremble! Parallel is Ps. 45: 4; where the divine hero goes forth, ‘on account of truth, and meekness, and righteousness,” that is, in behalf of those, who possess these excellencies, for the protection and deliverance of the true, the meek, the righteous. The judging has precedence of the warring, to distinguish Christ’s warring from that of men, which so often proceeds from irritated passion, and in this always has its foundation. Bengel: ‘In the world one is often a judge and no warrior, or a warrior and no judge. But Christ is a judge and a warrior’” [Hengstenberg].—That Christ is exhibited as He who judges in righteousness and as being faithful and true is a plain indication, that he is the person, who is spoken of in the passages referred to under this and the last number, as judging, and being righteous, faithful, and true, that is, that he is “the Lord God Almighty” of these passages.

XIX; 12. 1331. His eyes are as it were a flame of fire. Precisely the same words are used in C. 1; 14 (and in 2; 18) in the description of the great High Priest, affording another proof, that this all-conquering warrior symbolizes “the High Priest of our profession.”—This item is doubtless intended to furnish an aspect of terror towards his enemies: cp. 10; 1. “The eyes as a flame of fire denote the energetic character of the punitive righteousness of Christ: the eye flashing indignation.”

1332. And upon his head many diadems. These show the wearer to be “a king of kings and a lord of lords.” They are not limited, as in the cases of the dragon (12; 3) and of the beast (13; 1), in
which one diadem only is allotted to each head or king; but, being
unlimited, they form an emblem of supreme and universal sovereignty.
As worn by the dragon and the beast, they unquestionably denoted
despotic power arbitrarily exercised; but here their signification is
restricted by the clause—'in righteousness he doth judge'—to the
plentitude of power, regulated by principles of justice.—Inasmuch as
Christ came forth at the beginning merely 'as a conqueror, and in
order that he might conquer' in the end, he then wore the victor's
crown; but now, since he comes not simply as a conqueror, but also
as the Judge and Lord of all, he wears the many diadems.—To have
respect to these would give strength and courage to the persecuted
saint, who was trembling through fear of a head, which wore but a
single diadem.

1333-4. He hath a name written, the Incommunicable Name: lit.
which he alone knows; but the intention being, that this description
of the name should stand as for the name itself, I have put it in a
form, which makes it more suitable for the purpose.—In the standing
scene of judgment (Cs. 4-5), the presiding judge is designated only
as 'One sitting upon the throne.' No name is given to him. From
the coincidence here we may infer, that it is intended, that we should
see Christ in the Judge there: and, from his bearing the unutterable
name of Jehovah, that we should regard him as one with God. For,
"this is a reference to what the Rabbins call the Shem Hammephorash
or Tetragrammatonבְּנֵא יְהֹוָה, or what we call Jehovah. This
name the Jews never attempt to pronounce. When they meet with
it in the Bible, they read בְּנֵא Adonai for it; but to a man they all
declare that no man can pronounce it, and that the true pronunciation
has been lost (at least since the Babylonish captivity), and that God
alone knows its true interpretation and pronunciation. This therefore
is the name, which no man knew but he himself" (A. Clarke).—We
may conceive of the apostle's seeing this name "written" in characters
of such transcendent splendour, that his eyes could not endure to look
upon them, so as to enable him to decipher them. The characters
would then serve the purpose of a name by denoting that inscrutability
of the Divine nature (cp. Job 11; 7), on which the notion of
Jehovah's having a name, which was in fact no name, was founded.
A name, based on the unsearchableness of him who bore it, would be
as applicable to the Son as to the Father, as Mt. 11; 27 (cp. 10; 30,
38) shows; "None knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth
any one the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal
Him." From the last clause we learn, that the Son has the power to
reveal the knowledge of the Godhead. In accordance with which he
says himself in Rev. 2; 17; "To him who conquereth I will give . . .
a white counter, and on the counter a new name written, which none
knoweth but he who receiveth it."—Tischendorf has admitted a reading, which makes the text run; Having names written and a name written; but it does not seem to be sufficiently authenticated.

XIX; 13. 1835–6. And he is clothed with a garment, which had been dipped in blood. This is another anticipative indication of the result of the conflict. We may suppose, that the blood alluded to here and also in ve. 15 is that, which in C. 14; 20 is said to have flowed as high as the bridles of the horses, that is, of the horses ridden by this Conqueror and his followers. The Conqueror is not himself of a blood-red colour, like the dragon, that is, he is not by nature bloodthirsty; but under circumstances of great provocation he assumes this colour temporarily, and as an external covering foreign to himself.—The precedents are in Is. 63; 1–3; "Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah? . . . and their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments, and I will stain all my raiment:" and Ps. 68; 23; "That thy foot may be red with the blood of thine enemies."

1837–8. And his name hath been called; the word of God. Hath been called is better authorized than the is called of the R. T. It indicates, that this is no new name.—This name is found in the N. T. only in the writings of S. John. By him it was probably given to Christ to denote, that he, as the Christ, is 'the great executor and communicator of the will of God.' And in this place it may have, too, a special significance in unison with the symbolism of the garments; and the circumstance, that this name is introduced between the descriptions of Christ's apparel and of that of his followers, favours this view. If it be well founded, the comparison of 'the word of God' to a 'two-edged sword' in He. 4; 12, in conjunction with its being said here in ve. 15; 'Out of his mouth goeth a sharp two-edged sword,' &c., and in ve. 21; 'the rest were slain by the sword which goeth out of the mouth of the rider on the horse,' may serve to show, that this is a name of terrible omen for the enemies against whom he comes. It tells them, that the word of God, which he comes to execute upon them, is a mandate for their destruction. It intimates, too, that they must needs be powerless to offer any resistance; since, inasmuch as "all things were made by Him" (John 1; 3), they must be in His power. To this effect writes Bengel; "It is not said here, His name is called Jesus; for he manifests himself here [primarily] not as the Saviour of his people, but as the destroyer of his enemies. He will therefore be called here by that name, which is older than the name Jesus. The name Jesus especially unfolds his grace, and the name the Word of God, his Majesty." And so Hengetenberg; "Against him, whose name is the Word of God, all his enemies and in particular the beast, are but as stubble to the fire.
With the spirit or breath of his lips he will slay the wicked, Is. 11; 4."—"This name is written in the Targum, and in other Jewish writings, \( \text{יְהוָה} \), meimera diya, 'the Word of Jehovah;' by which they always understood a person and not a word spoken" (A. Clarke).

DIV. 2. DESCRIPTION OF CHRIST'S ADVENT. (2.) AS TO HIS ATTENDANTS.

XIX; 14. 1339-41. And the armies which are in the heaven followed him on white horses, wearing fine linen, white [and] pure.

1339. The armies of heaven is not the correct reading. Armies might belong to, and so be of heaven, without being in heaven. Whereas the intention is to lay stress on the circumstance, that these are dwellers in the heaven, even as God is, and in consequence of which he is addressed as 'Our Father which art in heaven.'—The armies here spoken of are (as I have shown) substantially identical in signification with 'the prophets and saints' of C. 11; 18; with 'thoes, who hold the testifying of Jesus,' in 12; 17; with 'thoes, who would not worship the image of the beast,' in 13; 15; with 'the 144 chilises' of 14; 1, who were reaped from the earth by Him on the white cloud, vv. 14-16, and who helped to tread the wine-floor, ve. 20; with 'the conquerors of the beast' of 15; 2; with 'the martyrs' of 17; 6, and 'the called, chosen, and faithful' of 17; 14; with 'my people,' 'the saints, apostles, and prophets' of 18; 4, 20, 24; and with 'God's servants,' and 'the called to the marriage-supper of the lamb,' in 19; 4, 9; for all these are designations, under different circumstances or in different parts of their career, of saints who were, or had been while on earth exposed to persecution from the beast. Hence all these places must have a reference substantially synchronical; and it may be presumed, that they are virtually parallel to one another.—In the passage quoted under 482 from the Asc. Essenio it is said, that 'at the coming of their Lord all the saints from heaven shall descend with the Lord in their heavenly clothing.'

1340. Followed him on white horses. Observe, that it is not said followed with him (as in C. 6; 8: Lu. 9; 49), which would mean accompanied,—went pari passu; and so would denote an equality with him. But these came after the principal personage (as in 14; 4, 9), and so formed his train: see on 938.—They were on white horses to denote, that they were those who had conquered (cp. 15; 2). Note, that nothing is said of the colour of 'the armies of horse' in C. 9; 16.

1341. Wearing fine linen, white [and] pure. The and of the R. T. is not a genuine reading, though it is necessary in English to supply it.—Stuart is perhaps scarcely correct in limiting the significance of the white linen to being 'an emblem of admission to the happiness
of the blessed.' It looks to the past as well as to the present,—to their having 'overcome' on earth (3; 5) as well as to their being blessed in heaven. It has a similar signification to the white colour of their horses: though it has at the same time a further significance; inasmuch as, having been given to them as a reward for their righteous acts (ve. 8) in withstanding the beast, it denotes the means of their having gotten the victory, as well as the fact of the victory itself.—The white colour of the garments of the followers forms a contrast to the red garment of the leader. And the contrast shows, that they take no part in the ensuing conflict. 'He treads the wine-press alone:' they come as a train to do him honour, and to be witnesses of the destruction of that beast, against whom they witnessed on earth. This has already appeared in speaking (see 1173) of the 'war between the ten kings and the lamb with his called and chosen and faithful ones:' it is there said; "the lamb shall conquer them." It will further be placed beyond doubt by ve. 21.—The fact, that these horsemen are symbolized as conquerors, and as those, who have earned a special reward by their deeds of righteousness, is alone sufficient to negative the opinion of Stuart, Hengstenberg, and others, that they may represent angels.

DIV. 3. DESCRIPTION OF CHRIST’S ADVENT. (3.) AS TO HIS TERRIBleness TO HIS ENEMIES.

XIX; 15–16. 1342–8. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp broad-sword, that with it he may smite the nations. And he shall tend them with an iron rod. And he treadeth the wine-vat of the wrath of the almighty God. And he hath on his garment and on his thigh a name written; KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS.

1342. Out of his mouth, &c. This is another mark of identification with the great High Priest: cp. and see on 64, 715.—Some read here, as also in C. 1; 16, a sharp two-edged broadsword.—The sword goes out of his mouth to denote, that a word from him suffices to effect that, for which others use the sword. He has but to speak the word, and his enemies are 'slain by the sword, which goeth out of his mouth.'

1343. That with it he may smite the nations. Here, as in the clauses which follow, and in other places, the seer adds statements of a descriptive or prophetic character, touching matters which could not have been presented to his view. Such statements tend to show, that, when elsewhere angels are introduced as making the like, they are brought on the scene only symbolically, and not as having been actual appearances.—The nations necessarily means here, as invariably elsewhere, the heathen: and this alone is enough to exclude many schemes of interpretation.
1344. And he shall tend them with an iron rod. The pronoun is inserted in the Greek; and doubtless in order to mark emphatically the person spoken of. In this there seems to be a contrast implied between the Conqueror and his followers, which confirms my statement, that it is he alone that restrains the heathen, and that the armies from heaven come not as warriors to fight, but as witnesses to behold his triumph, and as attendants to do him honour.—This clause, if it was not introduced expressly for the purpose, may yet serve to identify this personage with the male-child, of whom the same is said in C. 12; 5 (see on 793). This warrior comes to perform now that, which it was there said, that ‘the son of the woman’ was ‘about’ to do.—The same person, though not in the character of a warrior and judge, but in that of a lamb, was said in C. 7; 17 to ‘tend’ the redeemed. And power to ‘tend the nations’ (= the heathen), in like manner as he tends them, is promised by Jesus to every one, who should conquer the beast. This term tend denotes the considerate care of a shepherd towards those, who are willing to submit to his guidance and conform to his will; while the iron rod imports stern compulsion and correction towards such as refuse to recognize him as their shepherd: cp. Ps. 2; 7 ss.—Observe, that the verb is in the future tense, showing, that what is predicated was yet to be done at the time of writing, or at the epoch of this scene.

1345. And he treadeth the wine-floor of the wrath of the anger of the almighty God. The reading of the R. T. wrath and anger is of inferior authority. The wrath of the anger is a Hebrew superlative for the extremest wrath,—‘the cream of the cup of his wrath,’ so to speak. —The Greek pronoun is again inserted to denote, that ‘to him alone vengeance belongeth.’ There is probably an allusion to the precedent in Is. 63; 3; ‘I have trodden the wine-vat alone.’ And just so in C. 14; 9 Christ is symbolized as casting the vine of the earth into the great wine-floor of the Divine wrath, and treading it until the blood rose as high as the bridles of his attendants’ horses. The virtual conjoining there of the two symbolizations shows, that, while the Jews are primarily contemplated in the one place, and the heathen in the other, as the objects of God’s wrath, the visitation may be regarded as one and the same. As both heathens and Jews may be included in the same category as enemies of Christ, so both are involved in one doom.—Christ, as the mighty Conqueror, manifests by the greatness of the punishment the greatness of the wrath, which, as ‘the almighty God,’ He felt and had threatened against every one, Jew and Gentile, ‘who should worship the beast’ (14; 9-11).

XIX; 16. 1346. And he hath a name written. Scholz prefers the reading “the name,” which would imply, that this was the name par
excellence. Polemically considered, it may well be regarded as such; and so it is symbolically, as being the fourth. This Hengstenberg recognizes, saying; "Before the sacred number four, the earth whose signature is four must tremble."—This name has apparently been reserved for this third division (the three former being included in the first), in order to serve a special purpose, namely, to indicate a unity of subject in the first three divisions. That unity consists in their relating to the advent of the Faithful One. And by their having this in common the heptad is divided into the customary triad and quartad.—As the names designate attributes, the four may import, that a universality of Divine attributes is inherent in the great Conqueror. He is 'the true,' 'the inscrutable' (Job 9; 10: Ro. 11; 33), 'the omniscient,' and 'the omnipotent.'

1347. On his garment and on his thigh. Probably the rendering should be (as in Stuart's translation) even on his thigh. At any rate there can scarcely be a doubt, that the meaning is, on that part of his garment, which is over his thigh, and where ordinarily the sword would lie. There appears to have been a significance in the part, on which an inscription was made. Thus, in Herodotus Eut. 2; 127 there is a description of an image of Sesostris with this inscription from shoulder to shoulder; 'I obtained this country by my shoulders,' i.e., by my own might. In the Etruria regalis there are several mystical figures with inscriptions in Etruscan characters (the purport not known) on the right thigh, near to or on the tunic. In an almost naked figure there is an inscription on the left thigh. And on the vesture on the thigh of another is an inscription in the same characters. Many other examples may be seen in Clarke's Com. in loco. The variety of the parts, on which names are said in the Apocalypse to have been inscribed, leads to the same conclusion. The 144 chiliads, and the followers of the lamb generally, have their Lord's name on their foreheads. The servants of the beast bear his name, number, or mark, on their foreheads or on their hands. The whore (who is really, though not nominally the subject and slave of the beast) has his number on her forehead. Hence the forehead or the hand would seem to be the part, on which subjects or servants would have their lord's name engraven. The first beast has the names of blasphemy on his heads. The third is 'filled' or covered with them. Different degrees of blasphemy are thus denoted. Again, here 'the Captain of the host of the Lord' (Jos. 5; 14), who is also 'the Captain of salvation' (He. 2; 10), has one name written on his diadems, and another on his garment down the thigh. The former has reference to his inscrutable majesty and power: the latter (inasmuch as there appears to be an allusion to the ancient mode of taking an oath by putting the hand under the thigh) to his unchangeableness and truth, espe-
cially in respect of the fulfilment of his promises both to his friends and to his foes. Hengstenberg thinks, that the name, being on the place where the sword is commonly found, takes the place and significance of the sword. There might be some ground for this opinion, if the sword were altogether absent; but, inasmuch as not only is this not the case, but the sword is drawn and directed against the foe, it must retain its proper significance, and with augmented force. The sword, according to Hengstenberg, "is everywhere the symbol of the warrior's personality and of his whole position." On Ps. 45; 3; "Gird thy sword on thy thigh, O hero, thy glory and thy majesty," he remarks, that, 'along with the sword, and in it go the glory and the majesty.' If so, these attach to the sword as going forth from his mouth; and the significance of the name's being written on the thigh is not superseded by that being the ordinary place of the sword. If the name's being on the thigh ought to be connected with the sword, I should rather suppose, that it signified, that he won the name by his all-conquering sword.

1348. KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS. In C. 17; 14, which appears to look forward to this symbolization, these two clauses are transposed: see on 1171. Here they are in the same order as in the precedent in 1 Ti. 6; 14.—Diodorus Siculus relates, that Sesostris erected pillars in Thrace with this inscription; "This province Sesoeosis, KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS, conquered by his own arms."—Not long before John's time, Antony had given this title to the two sons whom he had by Cleopatra; and this circumstance may possibly have suggested the application of it to him, to whom alone it could with propriety be given.

General remarks on the first three divisions. Having now completed our examination of the details relating to the advent of Christ, it will be proper to advert to the time and manner of that event; since, while no one (so far as I know) denies, that Christ's advent is symbolized in this passage, there is a wide difference of opinion as to the time and nature of it. Our exposition of the Vision in unbroken chronological order has brought us down to cir. A.D. 70, as the date of the event here symbolized. The repeated declarations, that Christ's coming was 'near,' 'at hand,' and about to take place 'quickly,' and his own prediction in A.D. 33, that it should occur 'in that generation,' with a multitude of statements to the same effect, fully confirm this view. All the considerations, too, which are proposed in this book, as topics of comfort, and as motives to constancy and courage under persecution, are based on the assurance of a change being about to take place. And, finally, the whole character of the symbolization before us, in bringing to view those, who had been engaged in the
conflict with the then persecuting power, together with the destruction of the Cesarian beast by Christ, fixes a very limited period for the occurrence of the event. But, if the time of the advent spoken of was then near, and has now been long since past, it necessarily could not have been a visible advent. Yet its visibility is so commonly maintained, that we may well inquire, whether there is anything in the symbolism to accredit such a view. If, indeed, there were, inasmuch as the symbolic horseman is allowed to represent Christ, and the date to which the scene refers is fixed by irrefutable evidence to the age then current, the only result would be to disprove the inspiration of the work: and hence those, who do not wish to bring about this result, should weigh well the consequences, to which their arguments are calculated to lead those, who may attach any weight to them. So far, however, is this view from being in accordance with the symbolism, that consistency of interpretation positively excludes it. If it be possible to identify any two symbolizations, the person who is brought to view here may be satisfactorily identified with him, who appears under the first seal. The horseman of C. 6; 2 was described as being mounted on a white horse; so is this. The former was said to go forth 'conquering, and in order that he might conquer' in the end; this is represented as conquering at the end of the ages the great enemy of the Lord's people. That had a bow; this has a sword: that a crown; this many diadems—the subordinate symbols being thus generically the same, but accommodated specifically to the difference in the circumstances, under which the horseman appears at the beginning and at the end of the ages. Thus every item in the earlier symbol has something, either identical with, or analogous to it in the later. And if this is not sufficient to indicate substantial identity in what is signified, what can be? But, if the same personage is symbolized in both places, and if Christ be symbolized in this passage (as is universally admitted), then he must also be symbolized in the other. Now, it is clear that, in whatever way he ought to be regarded as present and acting from the Creation, whether in person or in providence (and seeing that we know absolutely nothing about the modes of acting of spiritual beings, or how, when, or where they are present, we are utterly incompetent to speculate even on these points)—in whatever spiritual manner he may have been present, he was certainly not personally visible to mortal eyes. So neither is there the least ground for predicating a visible presence on this occasion. On the contrary, the precedent afforded by the former example is clearly opposed to an interpretation, which affirms such a presence.
XIX; 17–18. 1349–56. And I beheld a single angel standing in the sun, and he cried with a loud voice, saying to all the birds that fly in midheaven; 'Come, be gathered together unto the great supper of God, that ye may eat flesh of kings, and flesh of chief-captains, and flesh of strong men, and flesh of horses and of those who sit on them; and flesh of all, both freemen and servants, both small and great.'

1349. A single angel. In some copies the word for single is omitted; but it has doubtless been inserted here, as in the parallel instances in C. 8; 13: 9; 13: 18; 21, for intensity of effect.—Standing in the sun is an analogous symbolization to that of the 'woman clothed with the sun' in C. 12; 1. 'The sun' there was interpreted to mean 'the sun of righteousness:' see on 778. The high priest of the churobes (1; 16), again, had 'a countenance shining as the sun shines in his strength.' The face of the angel of the covenant, too, was 'as it were the sun' (10; 1). In all these places Christ is symbolized; and the special object in introducing the sun is to represent Him as appearing in the fulness of His splendour and majesty. In all there is an aspect towards the enemies of Christ; and it is signified, that such is the radiant glory of His countenance, that, so far from being able to offer any resistance, none can endure so much as to set eyes upon his face. We are warranted by the precedents in concluding, that the symbolization before us has the same significance, only intensified. Christ, to perform another office,—that of a herald of wrath, is now represented as appearing under the form of a messenger, and one so irradiated by the beams of the Divine righteousness and glory, that no mortal, much less hostile eyes could endure the sight of him. As, in the days of his flesh, 'his face did shine as the sun, and his garments became white as the light, so that his disciples fell on their faces and were sore afraid;' and as, when his angel, 'whose aspect was as lightning, and his raiment as snow,' appeared to the keepers of his sepulchre, these for fear of him did shake and became as dead men; so now, at his second advent, must every heart much more quail and every knee shake on beholding, not his countenance only, but his whole person enveloped in the liquid fire of the righteous wrath of the Most High.—The call made by this angel is another anticipation of the result of the conflict, which could be based only on the irresistible omnipotence of 'the Word of God.'

1350–51. He cried . . . to all the birds, &c. The precedent is in Eze. 39; 4–20; "Speak unto every feathered fowl and to every beast; Assemble yourselves and come: gather yourselves on every side to my sacrifice that I do make for you upon the mountains of Israel, that ye may eat flesh and drink blood. Ye shall eat the flesh of the mighty, and drink the blood of the princes. . . . Thus ye shall be
filled at my table with horses and chariots, with mighty men, and with all men of war." See also De. 28; 26: 1 Sa. 17; 44: Ps. 79; 2: Is. 18; 6: 34; 6: 56; 9: Je. 7; 33: 12; 9: 15; 3. A Jewish tradition (Syn. Sehor, p. 114) says; "In the time when God shall execute vengeance for the people of Israel, he shall feed all the beasts of the earth for twelve months with their flesh; and all the fowls for seven years."—The faculty possessed by birds of prey of discovering carrion at immense distances, and darting upon it with the swiftness almost of lightning, is well known. Their rapacity may be seen exemplified in the appetite of the adjutant and the Egyptian vulture for even the most loathsome objects, insomuch that these birds serve as scavengers of the towns. On account of this voracity (the object here being to symbolize the most complete destruction and extermination of the enemy) all kinds of birds of this description are represented as being summoned to tear in pieces and consume as in a moment the carcases of the fallen foe, whom the great Captain is about to make a feast for them. There is nothing corresponding to them in the real world; but they have been introduced merely as a part of the necessary machinery, and for the purpose above stated.—"The personification of the birds here (who are addressed as intelligent beings) is too common in poetry to need explanation:” Stuart.—That fly in midheaven. This clause, if its insertion was not called for here, is yet useful, inasmuch as it serves to show, in reference to C. 8; 13: 14; 6, that by midheaven is meant the region of the air as far as birds fly. The position of the angel in the sun is appropriate to it, as being one suitable for making his voice heard to the farthest extremities of the midheaven.

1352. Be gathered together. The reading of the R. T. is generally rejected in critical editions.—Cp. Mt. 24; 28; "Where the carcase is, there will the eagles be gathered together;" Mt. 25; 32; "Before him shall all the heathen be gathered together."—Unto the great supper of God. Not, as in the R. T., the supper of the great God. This is called 'a great supper' on account of the great number of victims. The epithet hints at its occurrence taking place on 'the great day of the almighty God' (16; 14); and the two symbolizations refer, as I have shown on 1088 ss., to the same events. Tit. 2; 13 should be compared; "the appearing of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ." This text may at least help to show, who the Divine person spoken of is, even "the great High Priest," "the great Shepherd of the sheep." The great supper of God, at which His enemies form the feast, affords the contrast to the supper of the marriage of the lamb, at which His friends partake of the feast: see on 1318.

XIX; 18. 1353-56. That ye may eat flesh of kings, &c. The Greek word for flesh is put here, as in C. 17; 16, in the plural. The object
is to intimate that the number of victims would be immense. Of a similar use of the plural we have met with several examples (see on 1283). With the same object, too, the word is repeated five times. Again, it is put here in the acc. case to denote, that the whole is supplied to furnish the repast, and not in the genitive, which would imply, that only a part might be. On the other hand, in stating the result in ve. 21, and the birds were gorged from their flesh, the genitive after ας (denoting partition) is used; and thus it is intimated, that the quantity of the flesh was so great, that the birds were unable to devour the whole, being gorged to repletion on a part only.—The specification here, with reference to events which stand connected with the second destruction of Jerusalem, is very similar to that on the parallel occasion in reference to the first destruction (see 6:15), only some of the terms being changed to make this more appropriate to a war or battle. There may also be reckoned here, as there were there, seven items, if the concluding epexegetical clauses (both freemen, &c.) are reckoned as one; but ten, if they are taken separately. They may, however, be grouped as follows (and this is the view taken by Hengstenberg); (1) kings, captains; the strong, the horsemen: which last comprehends (2) free, bond; small, great. According to this grouping, there are a pair of quartads (corresponding to the four Alleluias of the prelude, and the four names of "the Coming one"), and each pair is subdivided into two pairs. The specification in the syllabus of the trumpet (11:18) may be compared. There is, also, another somewhat similar in C. 13:16; and those who there receive the beast’s mark are the same, that here share in the beast’s punishment.

We have already seen, that the first three divisions of this heptad relate to the advent of the Messiah. We shall shortly see, that the three last relate to the punishment of the beast and his adherents. Hence, the one before us is marked out by holding an independent position; and thus stands as a middle point separating two triads.

DIV. 5. AS TO THE BEAST: (1). THE GATHERING OF HIS FORCES.

XIX; 19. 1357–59. And I beheld the wild-beast, and the kings of the earth, and his armies gathered together to make war with him who sitteth on the horse and with his army.

1357. The beast, without any intimation which of the three beasts before mentioned is had in view, might per se leave us in uncertainty as to whether the first or the last is meant. But the context shows clearly, that the first beast is spoken of.—The kings of the earth is, as I have shown on 1087, a synonyme for the beast from the earth. Hence the beast and the kings of the earth are equivalent to ‘the Julian and Flavian dynasties;’ and so the expression as a whole denotes the
beast in his entirety, that is to say, the Cæsarian dynasty regarded in
its totality. The correctness of this view is placed beyond doubt by
the expression 'his armies' which follows.—And his armies. The
reading his, in place of their, is derived from the oldest MS.; and on
my view it is the more appropriate one. Nevertheless, it must be
allowed, that this reading does not seem so natural as the other, nor
would it scarcely be capable of interpretation on any other scheme
than mine. And hence probably some copyist may have been led to
change the his into their; and this he might have done with the less
hesitation, on the ground that the accidental defacing or erroneous
copying of two letters would have sufficed to originate an error, which
might have been supposed to have occurred previous to his time.

1358. Gathered together appears to be a catch-word to indicate the
substantial identity of the war here symbolized both with that, to
which the kings of the civilized world are 'gathered together' (16;
14 and 16) at Harmagedon on the great day of the almighty God
(see on 1088), and also with the great supper of God, to which the
birds are 'gathered together' (ve. 17). Cp. Joel 3; 11; "Prepare
war, . . . assemble yourselves, all ye heathen, and gather yourselves
together. Let the heathen . . . come to the valley of Jehoshaphat;
for there will I sit to judge all the heathen." See on 1096.—To
make [lit. the] war. Scholz inserts the article in the Greek; and I
doubt not, that it is a genuine reading. Its omission in many copies
may easily be accounted for on exegetical grounds. Copyists, prob-
ably, were unable to see the propriety of its insertion; and therefore
left it out. Yet it has in point of fact great force, being designed to
show that this was the war or the battle par excellence. So that I have
not hesitated to receive the emended reading, though our English
idiom does not admit of the insertion of the article in the translation.
—The war or battle. See on 1088.

1359. With Him . . . and His army. His army is here spoken of
as one, but the beast's as many.—Because they are prepared to fight
with his army, it does not follow, that His army should take part in
the fight.

DIV. 6. AS TO THE BEAST: (2). HIS SEIZURE.

XIX; 20. 1360–63. And the wild beast was seized, and he who was
with him, the false prophet who did the signs before him, by which he
deceived those who had received the mark of the wild-beast, and those who
worship his image.

1360. The beast was seized. By whom is not stated. But, inasmuch
as the beast's followers were slain by the sword of the horseman, we
are led to infer, a fortiori, that it was he who seized the beast, and
cast him into the lake of fire.
1361. **He who was with him.** This is the meaning given by the better authorized reading. That of the R. T. gives *with him*, that is, with the beast the false prophet was seized. In addition to stating this fact, the emended reading predicates of the false prophet, that he was the fellow, associate, or comrade of the beast.—**The false prophet who did the signs before him.** Allusion is made to C. 13; 13; "He (the two-horned beast) exerciseth all the authority of the first beast before him . . .; and he doeth great signs, and deceiveth by the signs, &c." And hence the false prophet is substantially identified with the second beast, who was the associate of the first (see on 889).

—The association in this verse of the false prophet with the beast leads to the conclusion, that the former is a synonyme for 'the kings of the earth' in ve. 19 (as it was, indeed, shown to be: see on 1087). Otherwise, it would be necessary to suppose, that 'the beast' there was taken in the widest sense as inclusive of the three beasts previously mentioned, but here in a more limited one as meaning only the first beast. It would also be necessary to take 'the kings of the earth' to denote the rulers of Judea in general, and to suppose, that they were brought in to indicate that Judea was included in the symbolization, and that with it the destruction would begin. But it is much more natural to suppose, that the commencing clauses in vv. 19 and 20 were meant to be synonymous, the designations of the second beast being changed, in part, it may be, to give an allusion in that of 'kings of the earth' to the title 'king of kings,' in part to show who were meant by the former designation by substituting for it 'the false prophet,' and in part to afford an opportunity of explaining the last-mentioned designation by connecting it with the second beast. If this view be not adopted, each statement will be disjointed as it were. On the one hand, some will be brought to the battle-field, whose discomfiture is not mentioned: on the other, some will be destroyed, who were not included in the gathering. But on this view everything will be in order. 'The beast' in ve. 19 will correspond to 'the beast' in ve. 20, 'the kings of the earth' to 'the false prophet,' 'the beast's armies' to 'the rest.'

1362. **By which he deceived those that received the mark of the beast.** Cp. C. 13; 14, 16; "He deceiveth them by the signs, &c., . . . and he maketh all to receive a mark; . . . and that none might buy or sell, but he who had the mark . . . of the beast."

1363. **And those that worship his image.** Cp. C. 13; 14, 15; "saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast." . . . And enabling the image to "cause that as many as would not worship the image should be killed."—The change in the tense may sound strangely; but it is an instance of the attention paid to accuracy. The receiving of the mark was a past affair, but
the worshipping was actually going on at the time of writing. In the use of the two tenses may be seen a clear indication of reference to the time then present.

DIV. 7. AS TO THE BEAST; (3). THE DOOM OF HIM AND HIS HOSTS.

XIX; 20, 21. 1364–68. The two were cast alive into the lake of fire, which burneth with brimstone; and the rest were slain by the broadsword of him who sitteth on the horse (the which goeth forth from his mouth); and all the birds were gorged with their flesh.

1364. The two were cast alive. There can scarcely be a doubt, that the final destruction here symbolized is the 'perdition' predicated of the third beast in C. 17; 8, 11. Hence we may see here a mark of identification of that beast with these two.—Hengstenberg says; "The alive (meaning without corporeal death, cp. ve. 21) confirms the view, that the beast and the false prophet are not human individuals, but purely ideal forms. A human individual cannot proceed alive into hell. . . . That vicious realism, which is unable to distinguish between form and essence, vision and reality, must be put to the blush at C. 20; 14, where death and hell, in like manner purely ideal forms, are cast into the lake of fire." This argument is manifestly open to the answer, that the things immediately spoken of are symbols,—"purely ideal forms," but the realities signified need not be ideal forms. What Wesley says of death may be transferred to 'perdition' or 'the lake of fire.' "Death is the destruction of the subject spoken of, according to its nature, even though it have no natural life, that is, in such a manner that it cannot any more act as such."—Into the lake of fire. No lake had been mentioned before; but nevertheless the article might be used without irregularity, because this was the well-known and only lake of the kind.—The Locus Asphalites or dead sea (sea of the dead), which was said to cover the site of 'the cities of the plain' after their destruction by 'fire and brimstone,' was doubtless the earthly type of the lake of fire and brimstone.

1365. Which burneth with brimstone. In C. 14; 10 it had been threatened, that, "If any one worshipped the beast and his image, and received his mark, he should be tormented for ever in fire and brimstone." Here is a realization of that threat.—In Enoch, C. 53, the prophet is brought to a deep valley burning with fire. To this the kings and the mighty, who had been oppressors, are brought; and here they are bound with fetters of iron that have no weight [="chains of darkness," Ju. 6: 2 Pe. 2; 4].

1366. The rest, i.e., the armies of the beast.—Were slain—not consigned to the lake of fire. The sentiment implied is, that the followers shall suffer a lower degree of punishment than the leaders.—
By the sword of him that sitteth on the horse. His sitting on the horse constitutes his distinctive designation here (cp. ve. 19), as His sitting on the throne does in other places. This is because his riding a white horse shows him to be a conqueror.

1367. (The which goeth forth from his mouth.) This clause appears to be added parenthetically, in order to show, that the sword is an emblem of the word of his mouth, and thus to intimate that nothing more was necessary than his fiat. 'This sufficed to destroy all the armies in an instant. No effort or contest was needed. A magnificent exhibition, indeed, of his power!'

1368. And the birds, etc. A figure used to denote the complete annihilation of the enemy.—Dan. 2: 38 may be thought to present a contrast to this clause. It is there said to Nebuchadnezzar, as 'the head of gold' of the composite image; "Wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field and the fowls of the heaven hath He given into thine hand." Now (as I have shown in Vol. I: pp. 312–16), the Roman empire is included in Nebuchadnezzar's vision, the image representing the Babylonian, Median, Persian, and Grecian kingdoms, and the stone which broke it into pieces the Roman. Hence, at the commencement of the period which this vision includes the birds are given into the hand of the founder of the first kingdom, while at its termination the founders of the last kingdom are delivered over to the birds to be devoured.

General remarks on the last four divisions. For the right interpretation of the Apocalypse it is above all things necessary to keep the symbolical and real meanings distinct; and in no passage of the book is it more necessary to observe this rule than in the one before us, relating to the beast's destruction. I will, therefore, specially aim, in now proceeding to elucidate its general meaning, to discriminate between the two significations.—In the first place, the birds of prey are symbolically represented as being summoned from all quarters to a great feast. None probably will suppose, that this has anything answering to it in the real world. It is manifestly only a poetic figure, introduced to form a basis for the last statement in the passage, and designed to represent in a striking manner how complete will be the discomfiture and destruction of all, who oppose 'the Word of God.'—Next, as to the war or battle. There can be no doubt, that the symbolization is of a battle or single conflict,—the battle of 'the great day.' But this does not in the least imply a single battle in the reality. Under the circumstances, and with the view specially to represent the ease and certainty with which Christ would conquer, the symbolization could scarcely have been any other than that of a battle. Yet a contest of indefinite duration is as likely to have been
symbolized by it as a single conflict.—Then, as to the parties engaged in the battle. (1). On the one side, the rider on the white horse is allowed to symbolize Christ, coming as a conqueror. But then the general rule throughout the book,—the special precedent, which exhibited him as coming in like manner at the beginning of the ages, and with an intimation, that his coming was a continuous one, which would go out into completion only here at the end of the ages,—and the circumstance, that the work of exterminating the enemies of his people is accomplished only in part here, the principal part, as well as the exhibition of ‘the reward given to his servants,’ being reserved for succeeding scenes,—all these considerations combine to show, that Christ’s coming is here, as on all other occasions, a coming in providence and grace, and not a visible or miraculous one. An advent of each being must be appropriate to his nature. A corporeal being, such as a man, when brought on the symbolic stage under a symbol, would in the reality appear and act visibly and corporeally, but a spiritual being invisibly and spiritually. Moreover, congruity of interpretation absolutely requires, on the view of those who suppose a yet future advent of Christ to be here symbolized, that it should not be supposed to be a visible advent in person. For if it be, then ‘the gathering together of the beast, the kings of the earth, and his armies’ must be taken to denote a visible and literal gathering of the things signified, whatever they may be, to make war upon Christ, while manifesting himself personally in all the glory of the Godhead! And if this view cannot be adopted, then the visible advent of Christ in person cannot consistently be maintained. If, then, the advent of Christ here symbolized be one in providence (and a solitary exception to the general rule of such a kind as some contend for is not to be admitted, save on the most conclusive evidence), and if the work to be accomplished by it must, therefore, have been to be brought about by the ordinary and unseen operations of the divine actings in nature, that work must necessarily have been, more or less, a work of time. ‘The battle of Harmagedon’ may symbolize a very prolonged or a very short contest. ‘The great day of God’ may represent a time wholly undefined. (2). As to the parties on the other side, the symbols are the beast, the false prophet, and the beast’s armies. The last represent the beast’s adherents. The two former symbolize generically (in which point of view it would seem, that they can alone come into consideration here) the two dynasties, which furnished the twelve Caesars of history, the one being made representative of the despotic civil power, and the other of the heathen ecclesiastical power. We have, now, in these two dynasties an indication of the duration of the contest, in respect of the primary and particular signification. The war may be considered to have begun.
from the time, when a member of the beast began to persecute the Lord’s people. It was carried on by persecution and the power of the sword on the beast’s part, and by ‘the sword which goeth out of His mouth,’ that is, by His decrees controlling the course of events, on the part of the Word of God. It broke out, as it were de novo, in the war, which Nero and Vespasian levied on Jews and Christians. It reached a primary end when the Julian dynasty became extinct with Nero, and a full end at the completion of the number of the Cæsars in the last emperor of the Flavian dynasty. But, inasmuch as the beast and the false prophet are secondarily made representative respectively of the powers of despotism and of heathenism, an ulterior and wider fulfilment, in the war of persecution waged by successive emperors against Christ’s people, and its final result in the destruction of the persecuting power and the extinction of heathenism, may also have been had in view.—Lastly, as to the issue of the battle. The beast and the false prophet are cast alive into the lake of fire, and the rest are devoured by the birds of prey. This is the symbolic representation; and it is one quite appropriate to the symbols as being living creatures. But, in the reality, the kind of annihilation must be such as is suitable to the thing to be annihilated: e.g., while an immortal soul might be consigned to ‘the perdition of hell,’ a dynasty could only become extinct, a world-power be deprived of its dominion and subverted politically, and a form of religion cease to prevail through the conversion of its professors. That in this instance the first (a soul) cannot be meant appears from this consideration alone,—that the time of the final judgment has not arrived, and does not arrive till the 1000 years are ended, and previous to it there can be no consignment of souls to the lake of fire (cp. 20; 15). One or more of the last-mentioned, therefore, can alone be symbolized; and consequently in this place the casting into the lake of fire symbolizes simply extermination or the extinction of existence. The devouring of ‘the rest’ has been shown to denote substantially the same, but with a less degree of ignominy.

Here let me direct the reader’s attention to a symbolization in 4 Ezra 13, which presents points of striking parallelism to the one before us. An abstract of it has been given in Vol. I: p. 283.

Summary of prelude to the final catastrophe or ‘great supper of God.’
This prelude consists in a fourfold doxological Alleluia. XIX; 1–2. The redeemed 144 chiliiads first give praise for their deliverance through the righteous judgments of God, and in particular for the righteous retribution on the power that had persecuted them, as symbolized in the preceding scene. 3. Again they repeat their Alleluia, in order to intensify their doxology. Meanwhile, the smoke of
the ruined city is seen ascending continually, in token that the ruin of Rome’s empire shall be perpetual. 4. Then the representatives of the Church and of the creation in general adore the Lord, and add their Amen Alleluia. 5. A new exhibition of the Divine attributes, which is about to be made, demands a renewed and universal Alleluia. 6–8. And then (a threatening aspect towards the enemies of the Church mingling with the doxology) the redeemed elect, the Church, and the whole creation join in the fourth Alleluia, and praise the Lord; because now at length he is about to take the kingdom, and fully and finally to solemnize his covenant-union with his Church. In order thereto, the Church, having approved herself by acts of devotedness and deeds of righteousness done for his name’s sake, has received from him the wedding-garments, which will admit her members to ‘the marriage supper of the lamb.’

An interlude, interposed here between the prelude and the principal tableau, distinguishes this heptad of consummation from the three corresponding ones, which are of crisis merely. XIX; 9. The angel-interpreter declares the blessedness of those, who shall be admitted to partake of the preferential millennial bliss, which the lamb has prepared for those, who have confessed his name, and come off conquerors in the struggle with the beast: and he states, that this declaration may be received as coming from the Lord Himself. 10. Thereupon the seer prostrated himself at the angel’s feet to adore the Lord Jesus (whom he recognized in him) for all the gracious and comforting revelations, which He had made to His servant and his fellow-partakers in tribulation, and specially for this—the crowning one of all. But the Lord forbade him, on the ground that, as He now appeared and acted in the character of a fellow-servant and fellow-testifier of him and his brethren, he ought not to worship Him as God in that capacity, but should reserve his worship for those manifestations, in which He showed Himself as God on the throne of Deity. And this he should the rather do; because, the testifying of Jesus being the soul and spirit of the whole of John’s prophecy, and in particular of that part of it which depicts the history of the old Dispensation (vi–xix), and the primary and essential feature of the inspired testifying during the ages of that Dispensation having been to the effect, that ‘there is one God, and none other but He,’ and ‘Him only shalt thou serve,’ it would appear inconsistent with his own prophesying to worship a being, who appeared in any other character than that of God.

Synoptical interpretation of the seventh heptadal tableau of the seventh trumpet. This tableau is divided into two principal parts, the advent of the Faithful and True one, and the great supper of God. These contain three divisions each, and are separated from one another by
an intermediate scene, in which the birds of prey are summoned. The era of the tableau is A.D. 70. XIX; 11. The advent of Christ is first symbolized in a manner which identifies the personage symbolized with him, who came forth under the first seal ‘conquering, and in order that he might conquer.’ There are also indications in the description of this conqueror, which imply, that he has been the actor in the intermediate time; and thus Christ is exhibited as the real though unseen controller of events from the beginning to the end of the Mystery. He appears as the bearer of four names, denoting a universality of Divine attributes, about to be specially manifested in four respects. He is ‘the Faithful and True one;’ and as such is about to exhibit His faithfulness and truth by fulfilling His promises to deliver and avenge his servants, and to punish the persecuting power. 12. His appearance is such as cannot fail to strike terror into his adversaries. From his eyes fiery indignation flashes. (By his fire-flashing eyes and the sword of His mouth this great Conqueror is identified with the glorious High Priest and King of the universal Church, who stands as a frontispiece to and is as the sun and centre of the Apocalyptic Vision.) His head crowned with many diadems denotes, that ‘all power in heaven and in earth hath been given to him.’ His second name proclaims Him ‘the Incomprehensible,’ ineffable in wisdom and knowledge, and illimitable in power: and as such able to search all hearts, and competent to give and do judgment on all. 13. His blood-stained garment portends the consequences, that will ensue to all who contend with Him. The third name intimates, that, as ‘by the Word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth,’ so by ‘the Word of God’ may all created things be annihilated in a moment. 14. In connexion with this name a train of attendants is introduced, being those who have received ‘the word’ at his mouth, and the same who have frequently appeared as ‘contending earnestly for the faith which he delivered to them,’ and ‘resisting the beast even unto death.’ They are clothed in robes, which denote their past victory and their present bliss and glory. 15. In connexion with this name, too, is mentioned the sword of his mouth, that is, the power of his word, by which he can rule or smite the heathen at his pleasure. Alluding to them as the enemies of his people, it is intimated, that he is on the point of visiting them with the consuming wrath of an all-mighty God. 16. The fourth name crowns the whole in designating Him ‘King of kings and Lord of lords.’ And the place on which this name is inscribed indicates, that He is about to exercise his sovereign power for the accomplishment of ‘the oath, which he sware’ unto his people. 17–18. In the middle division, the summoning of the birds is merely designed to lay a foundation
ior representing by a poetick figure the utter annihilation of the enemy. 19–21. In the three last divisions, under the symbol of a battle fought at Harmagedon on 'the great day of God,' the 'going into perdition' of the beast, that is, the exterminating by God's Providence of the two Cæsarian dynasties which led the way in persecuting Christians is symbolized; and further, inasmuch as these are made representative of two abstract ideas,—despotism and heathenism or false religion, there is by implication included in the symbolization the ultimate triumph of freedom and true religion or Christianity. It is also intimated, that all will receive according to their demerits. To the principals, who have laboured to exterminate the truth by the sword, will be awarded the most condign punishment: to those who have been merely their abettors and instruments a punishment less severe.

Interpretations of O. 19.—1. Of the marriage of the lamb. The union of the true Church to Christ [Bp. Newton]. The restoration of the Jews and announcement of Christ's coming [Burgh]. The conversion of Jews and Gentiles [Pyle]. Ode in anticipation of the millennium [Fuller]. Conversion of Judah [Mede, Faber].—2. Of the faithful One and his armies. The final premillennial conflict [Vitringa, and the generality of expositors]. The second advent, figurative, and not premillennial = the battle of Harmagedon, in Palestine [Faber]. The fall of the papacy [Brightman, Croly]. A special judgment [Burgh]. The extirpation of idolatry [Pyle]. The spoliation of Popery in the French Revolution, and the religious contest after 1822 between Protestant Societies and papal Bulls and political religious prohibitions [Gell]. The armies may be the two witnesses,—the kings of the East,—those who tread the winepress, &c., &c.: the battle is the entire overthrow of the wicked [I. Williams]. The triumphs of the Gospel before the premillennial advent, and the nations of Europe leagued against France [Jenour].

Now that we have arrived at the end of the seventh trumpet (as I have shown in the Guide, p. 159), it will be convenient to take a synoptical view of the progress made in the dénouement announced in the prelude, 11; 15–18; 'The kingship of the world is become our Lord's.' 'Thou hast taken the kingdom.' 'The nations were wroth: and thy wrath hath come, and the time of the dead to be judged, and to give the reward to thy servants, and to destroy those who are destroying the earth.'—The exhibition of the wrath of the nations has been fully made throughout the seven heptads, but especially in the first two.—That of the Lord has been manifested under the following heads. 1st. In C. 14; 17–20, after the deliverance of
the Jewish saints, and the giving of the reward to them had been symbolized in vv. 13–16, the utter destruction, with great shedding of blood, of the Jews as a nation, on account of their hostility to Christ and Christianity, is shown. The appropriateness of the Jewish catastrophe having the first place assigned to it must be self-evident. 2dly. In C. 16; 17–21, after the exhibition of a series of minor plagues, the seventh vial is poured out upon the Roman empire in its widest extent (including specially Judea as being a part thereof), and its subversion is symbolized in a very forcible manner. 3dly. In C. 18 the downfall of Rome-proper, regarded under its republican form as the palladium of liberty and free institutions, is exhibited. 4thly. In C. 19; 17–21 the extermination of the Caesarian dynasty, as the representative of the civil and ecclesiastical power of heathenism put forth in persecution of Christ's people, is symbolized. Thus, under four divisions,—the four of universality, the entire destruction of all the visible and terrestrial enemies, regarded in every point of view, is foreshown. Two however, which are spiritual and unseen, Satan and Death and Hades, yet remain. The destruction of these necessarily cannot take place until the end of the Mystery; but then, 'Christ having put all things under his feet, the last enemy will be destroyed,' and Satan cast into the lake of fire (20; 10, 14). [We may note, by the way, that these two, with the beast and the false prophet, make four that are cast into the lake of fire: and, when these two shall have been exterminated, all the seven symbolical foes of Christ and Christianity will have been disposed of;—the dragon in C. 20; 2, 10, the three beasts (represented by the beast) and the false prophet in C. 19; 20, the whore Babylon in C. 18, and Death and Hades in C. 20; 14. The decreed binding of Satan as the dragon, that is, as the military power used for coercion of God's people, dates from the terminus of this trumpet; though, as it was to extend over the 1000 years, it was convenient to represent it in the millennial heptad. Hence, it may be considered, that the destruction of all the terrestrial enemies, all but the last enemy (and they are here brought under the number four) is included in this trumpet.]—The other details in the prelude, though not specifically represented in the symbolizations of the trumpet are virtually included in it, inasmuch as they take place at or commence from its terminus. Christ's taking the millennial 'kingdom' is the necessary consequence of his conquering the beast, in doing which 'he destroyed those who destroyed the earth.' The succeeding scene (in 20; 4), which represents the souls of the martyrs as having judgment given to them and being admitted into their preferential rest, implies 'a judgment' of the dead as taking place at the end of the seventh trumpet, and a donation to them of their reward.'
In the Guide, pp. 77-80, 160, I have stated my views as to the progressive termination of the seventh trumpet; and, in speaking of the commencement of the millennial age or seal-period of the seventh seal, I shall have occasion to restate them. I need not, therefore, enter on the subject here.

HEPTAD XXIV: THE SEVENTH-SEAL PERIOD; comprehending the binding of Satan, the judgment and preferential millennial bliss of confessors, and the third and final catastrophe on the outbreak of Gog and Magog; including also (in vv. 1-6) "THE TIME OF THE END" (or progressive consummation) of the seventh trumpet. A.D. 70-1500 (= A.M. 7000). Ch. xx; 1-10.

Introductory remarks. It was shown in Vol. I.: p. 298, that the seventh seal consists of three parts, viz.: 1. A Prelude (viii; 1-5): 2. THE SEVEN TRUMPETS (viii; 6-xx): 3. THE SEAL PERIOD PROPER (xx; 1-10). The last part,—that at which we have now arrived, contains several points of great importance and difficulty; and in consequence this heptad will require to be considered at much greater length in proportion to the extent of the text than any of the preceding heptads. The localities to which the symbolizations relate, the binding of Satan, the actual duration of the time of his binding and of the reign of the saints, the epoch to which the millennium is to be referred, the nature of the first resurrection, and who they are that have part in it, are points on which wide differences of opinion have been entertained; and which consequently must receive prolonged consideration. In this place it will be proper to advert only to the epoch of the scene, which we are about to consider.—At the close of the last heptad we arrived at the termination of the seventh trumpet (see Guide, pp. 159 ss.), and consequently at that of the seven trumpets, which form the transition or epochal period, chronologically intermediate between the sixth and seventh seals (see Vol. I: p. 301: Guide, pp. 78-80). We now, therefore, enter on the period proper of the seventh seal. And inasmuch as the general rule of assuming close chronological consecutiveness of one scene on another,*

* Nothing can justify an exception to this rule, but a proved impossibility of interpreting a passage in conformity with it. Vain is the appeal, which is commonly made to the Prophets and to other books for precedents to the contrary. Precedents, when they are quite in point, can prove no more than that such may be the case; and they can have no weight whatever in a case, in which a probable interpretation can be offered, without having recourse to the hypothesis of gaps in the history. But those, which are adduced in the present instance, are altogether worthless; because the cases are not parallel. The books, to which
unless there be any clear indication to the contrary, requires, that we assume, that the scene before us follows closely on that which precedes it, we must take for granted, that the commencing date of the former coincides with the terminating date of the latter. But the seventh trumpet has been shown (p. 382: Guide, p. 160-161) to have more than one terminating date, in consequence of its going out into fulfilment only by degrees, and in the course of time. And the dates were as follows. The primary and formal epoch of conclusion was A.D. 70, when the Jewish polity was overthrown and abolished (14; 17-20). The second was A.D. 96, when the persecuting dynasty of the Cæsars became extinct (19; 11-21). The third, which consisted in the subversion of the world-wide supremacy of Rome (16; 17-21) as a heathen power, may be assigned to A.D. 320, when Christianity took the throne from Heathenism. The fourth was consummated in A.D. 476, when Rome itself was levelled with the dust (C. 18).* In

reference is made, do not profess to give unbroken histories, nor even to relate the events which they do notice in chronological order. The Apocalypse, on the contrary, is strictly and systematically chronological. Consecutive arrangement and unbroken narration is, unless I am altogether mistaken, an essential part of its structure, and the key to its right interpretation. There can, therefore, be no ground for departing from the ordinary rules of exegesis in this particular case. And the schemes of those (Stuart, e. g.), who place an indefinite but immense interval, either in C. 19 or between Cæs. 19 and 20, and no less of those (e. g., Elliott), who transpose passages, making the new Jerusalem period of C. 21 synchronous with the millennium of C. 20, violate the natural mode of interpretation, and the right rules of exegesis in a way altogether unwarrantable.

* The accordance of the expectations, that have prevailed in the past ages of the Church, with the first and last of these dates, is deserving of notice.—First, as to the final era of commencement of the millennium, vis., circa A.D. 476. From Barnabas and Irenæus downwards (as Elliott has shown, p. 230), the Christian fathers generally believed, that the world's seventh millennium would be the millennium of the triumph of the Church. They followed the LXX chronology, which places the birth of Christ about the middle of the sixth chiliad. Taking it at A.M. 5500, the millennium would begin A.D. 500; and in conformity herewith Hippolytus predicted, that in the year 600 the end of the world would arrive. And so Hilarion wrote in A.D. 402: "It now wants 101 years to the end of the sixth chiliad; about the closing of which the ten kings must arise, Babylon now reigning fall, Antichrist arise and be destroyed by Christ's coming, and so the saints' sabbath millenary begin." Jerome and Augustine connected St John's saying, "It is the last hour," with the parable of the labourers. Reckoning that the world was to last for six chiliads of years, they made each of the twelve hours of the day to denote a half chiliad or 500 years, five-and-a-half of which or thereabouts having elapsed at Christ's birth, the end would fall in the sixth or the seventh century. I say, 'the sixth or seventh;' for, as time passed on, and the end did not arrive, they contrived by the help of other computations to place the consummation later. Thus, the Chronicon of Eusebius, which gives A.M. 5200 as the date of Christ's birth, would
these events and at these several dates, Satan, considered in his character of the dragon, that is, of the power antagonistic to Christianity, was politically bound; and, correlative therewith, Christianity was relieved from restraint and persecution, and progressively raised to supremacy. Thus, just as the transition-period, forming (as I have shown: Vol. I: p. 301: Guide, p. 78) the time of the end of the sixth seal, and extending from A.D. 70 to A.D. 70, consists of a series of stages, in which on the one hand the heathen power increases and on the other the Jewish decreases step by step; so there is attached to it (running down, or rather being dovetailed, so to speak, into the seventh-seal period) another transition-period, forming in like manner the time of the end of the seventh trumpet, and extending from A.D. 70 to 476, during which the heathen power similarly decreases and the Christian increases (see pp. 24, 70, 349, 368, and Guide, p. 80). Such an intercalary arrangement by means of common periods, interposed between two divisions so abrupt as those of the seven-seal book must necessarily be, would unavoidably be adopted. A division into seals and trumpets, that is, into definite periods, involved the selection of certain epochs; but no complete and sudden changes corresponding to such epochs would occur in the actual course of events. And hence such an adjustment between the divisions of the roll and the facts of history as I have exhibited must necessarily be made. [See further in Guide, 77-79.] And consequently from the commencing and terminating dates of the time of the end of the seventh trumpet, say from A.D. 70 and from A.D. 500, we may properly reckon the millennium to have had its beginnings, that is, an incipient commencement from A.D. 70 and a plenary commencement in A.D. 500. Then its terminations, corresponding thereto respectively, will be in 1070 and 1500. And the mean of highest intensity will be between 500 and 1070.—Here, before quitting the subject of the epochal adjustments, let me recall attention to the correspondencies between the ascending and descending courses of enable them to protract the period of expectation to A.D. 800.—Next, if we take A.D. 70 as the primary era of commencement of the millennium, it will land us at A.D. 1070 as the primary epoch of its termination. "This era," Elliot says, "is one memorable for a panic of very remarkable origin and results, which then intensely agitated the minds of men. It was supposed, that with the end of the tenth century the world would end also." The change in the date arose from the Hebrew chronology having superseded the LXX., and from the millennium being supposed to consist in a binding of Satan, which took place at Christ's birth, and at the expiration of which 1000 years, 'Satan would be loosed, Anti-christ manifested, and the day of judgment come.' "Even after the Reformation various Protestant Doctors still held to this view: as, among others, Pares and Foxe: the exacerbation of Papal tyranny under Gregory VII, A.D. 1078, being supposed by them to mark the end of the Millennium."
the heathen power. In B.C. 320 the fourth or Macedonian kingdom was broken up, and 'the unhewn stone' of republican Rome came on the scene as the rising world-power antagonistic to God's people: in A.D. 320 that power as heathen was subjected to Christianity,—that is, the power of Rome was transferred from the side of heathenism to that of Christianity. From B.C. 70, the era of the first trumpet, the 'little stone,' now become 'the great mountain,' began to be cast into the sea (8:7, 8)—that is, Rome, having attained to the rank of the ruling world-power, became at this epoch the fifth universal monarchy in reference to God's people: in A.D. 70 again, the goal of the last trumpet, Rome attained the acme of its dominancy over the then cast off people of God, and 'took away both their place and nation;' and 'the kingdom of God was taken from the Jews, and given to a people bringing forth the fruits thereof.'

DIV. 1. THE DESCENT OF AN ANGEL.

XX; 1. 1869–71. And I beheld an angel coming down from the heaven, having the key of the abyss, and a great chain upon his hand.

1869. And I beheld. While this scene is unquestionably connected very closely in the way of immediate sequence with the preceding one, in which Christ's advent as the Conqueror is symbolized, the two are yet shown not to be identical (as some seek to make it appear) by the circumstance of Christ's being here represented as coming anew from heaven, and under a different character. In the former scene, too, he descended to the earth, but in this he proceeds to the infernal regions. The intimate connexion chronologically and historically of the first six verses of this chapter with the portions which precede and follow them, and at the same time their broad Apocalyptic severance have been fully demonstrated in the Guide, see esp. p. 159 ss.—An angel. If we take into consideration the great importance of the act, which this angel comes to perform, it will appear somewhat strange, that no epithet should have been applied to him in conformity with the common practice in this book. The omission may, however, be accounted for on the grounds, that no room for doubt could exist in reference to the person represented by the angel, and that no question as to the angel's power could arise, seeing that he was able to bind Satan.—That this angel is to be regarded as a special representative of Christ appears from his having the key of the abyss, and from the mission he comes to execute. As it was Christ, who before (12:7 ss.) was seen to conquer Satan, and cast him down from the heaven to the earth, so we cannot doubt, that it is he, who now casts Satan down from earth to hell, and binds him therein. Again, it is Christ who has in his own right the key of Hades (1:18), which must include that of the abyss,—a part thereof.
And this angel is seen, not as having the key of the abyss given to
him by another (as in 9:1), but as coming possessed of it.—Coming
down from the heaven. This clause may be thought to connect this
angel with the angel of the covenant of C. 10:1, and with the herald
of Babylon’s destruction in C. 18:1; since these are the only angels
besides, that are seen in the act of descending.—The symbolization
of a person or thing as in the course of descent (as in C. 3:12;
10:1; 18:1; 21:2, 10) may be intended to convey, that a con-
siderable period will be occupied in effecting that, for which the
descent is made. If so, in the present instance it will be intimated,
that the work of binding will be a progressive work.

1370. Having the key of the abyss. See on 72 and 574.

1371. And a great chain upon his hand. In C. 1:18:2; 1:“in
his hand;” in 1:20:5; 1:“upon his hand.” Here it is upon, to
indicate perhaps the magnitude of the chain by intimating, that it
was too large to be grasped.—Of course the key and the chain are only
means of symbolizing the binding; and it is pressing the symboliza-
tion too far to assign specific significations to each, as some have
done, e.g., Bossuet, who represents the chain as meaning “the inviol-
able orders of God, and the impress of his eternal will.”

DIV. 2. THE BINDING OF THE DRAGON.

XX; 2–3. 1372–78. And he laid hold of the dragon, that old serpent,
who is a calumniator and an adversary, and bound him [for] a thou-
sand years, and cast him into the abyss, and locked and sealed over him,
that he might not deceive the nations any more, until the thousand years
should be ended. After these he must be loosed a little time.

1372. He laid hold of or seized. See on 83.—The dragon. I have
had occasion to observe more than once, that it is the manner of this
book to indicate a parallelism or relation between different passages
by reproducing the same expression. Now, in this verse such a
parallelism is indicated in the most emphatic manner, Nos. 1372, 3,
and 5 being almost verbally identical with C. 12:9. In the first
place, it will scarcely be questioned, that the same personage, namely,
the Mediator of the Covenant, is represented here by the angel, that
was there by Michael the archangel. In the next, the dragon who is
seized here will, as there, symbolize not only the devil, but primarily
to mortal eyes the chief instrument by which he is seen to act, that
is to say, the military power or power of the sword, by which he
warred and persecuted the saints (see on 784). This is commonly
overlooked; but it will be seen to be most essential to a correct inter-
pretation, that it should be borne in mind.—That old serpent. See
on 807–8.

1373. Who is. In C. 12:9 who is called. This difference has led
me to suppose, that it is intended, that there the terms should primarily be regarded as designations, but here in their significations; and I have translated accordingly.—A calumniator and an adversary or the devil and Satan. In some copies the article is inserted before the last term, as it is also in similar cases in C. 6; 8: 8; 11: 20; 13. —Some copies add the clause, he who deceiveth the whole world; but it has probably been borrowed from C. 12; 9.—Hengstenberg has remarked; "Here the same names of the wicked enemy are found, and in the same order as at C. 12; 9; which is certainly intentional, and imports, that what Christ here executes against Satan, had its root in that fundamental victory over him. The number four is used also here, because Satan is brought under consideration as the prince of this world."—Four descriptive terms are here applied to Satan, two being symbolical, and two (which may serve as explanations of the first two) being relatively literal. To these in C. 12; 9 a clause is added to show the extent of Satan's operations, viz., that they will not be limited to Judea (in which the scene is laid), but will extend over the Roman world. As a dragon, Satan appears as a persecutor using the sword to destroy the saints. As the old serpent,—that is, under the character, in which at the beginning he is represented as having made himself perceptible by the senses of our first parents, he is exhibited as again at the end of the ages becoming an object of physical perception, thus making a last effort (specially directed against the second Adam) in the way in which he succeeded at the first. As a serpentine calumniator, by false representations he misleads the public mind, and excites it to bitter enmity towards the lamb and his servants. As a draconic adversary, he is represented as a public prosecutor, causing the saints to be brought before judges and rulers, and to suffer the loss of all things. Such, I conceive, may be the hidden meaning of these two mystical descriptions of the dragon. And viewed in this light, they serve, by showing in what respects Satan had extraordinary liberty allowed him during the period marked out by the location of the two texts, to indicate wherein his millennial binding consisted.

1374. And bound him. The importance of the concluding remarks on 1372 and 1373 will here be apparent. The nature of the binding must be appropriate to the thing bound. If, then, the dragon represents in the unseen world the spiritual actings of Satan, and in the visible world the power of the sword, as wielded by him for the suppression of Christianity through persecution of its professors, the binding of Satan must denote the putting a restraint on such spiritual actings and physical coercion. The nature of the binding may, too, be reasonably expected to be correlative to that of the previous loosing. Now we have seen (12; 9) that Satan was loosed on the earth
in the characters of the serpent and the dragon (that is, of the deceiver and the persecutor) at the time of our Lord's ministry. And we know from history, that his loosing then could only have consisted in the according to him liberty to exercise an unusual power over the minds and bodies of men, and to stir up the enemies of the new faith to persecute its professors. We may fairly presume, then, that his binding now consisted in the complete or partial withdrawal of that liberty. Such a method of ascertaining the true nature of the binding must surely commend itself, as preferable to that, which has ordinarily been adopted. Instead of thus comparing one scripture with another, men have from the earliest times given loose reins to their fancy. Starting from the unsound position of adopting the most literal view possible of Satan's binding, they have indulged their imagination in framing glowing pictures of what the state of the world may be supposed to be, when Satan should be bound. To assist them in this, they have sought to make it appear, though without a shadow of reason, that the highly figurative and poetical descriptions by the old prophets of a state of peace and plenty, to come upon the earth at some future period, are to be referred to the time of Satan's binding. And thus they have succeeded in attaching to the term millennium (or, rather, in substituting in place of its simple and sole meaning of a thousand years) the idea of a state of Paradisiacal bliss. So that it is now scarcely possible to use the term without risk of conveying an idea, totally different from what is intended. But, let any sober-minded person judge which method of ascertaining the meaning of the symbolization before us is likely to lead to the truth,—that of endeavouring to deduce the author's meaning from related passages in his work, or that of building castles in the air, which have no prop or support, and have been raised on the false foundation of taking a symbolization literally. The author has symbolized a loosing of Satan on the earth, and a binding of Satan. The former was past at the time that he wrote: the latter was future. Surely from the nature of the past facts (which he symbolized by the figure of loosing) we may safely infer what he expected that of those then future (which he symbolized by the figure of binding) would be.—In the view I take Wemyss substantially agrees. He says (Cla. symb. p. 15); "The confining Satan in the abyss for a thousand years seems to be a figurative description of the restraint imposed upon all powers, that might either seduce men into error and wickedness, or persecute men of conscience, constancy, and faithfulness. And this, perhaps, is the whole amount of what so many have dreamed, in relation to what is termed the Millennium." Wordsworth, too, exhibiting the results of Satan's binding, writes thus (Lectures, p. 49):—In other signal ways Christ hath "chained
Satan, who had chained the nations. Bel boweth down, and Nebuchadnezzar, before whom myriads had lain prostrate. The Idols whose altars had reeked with human blood were cast to the moles and to the bats. The Oracles are dumb. Pagan Temples become Christian Churches. Basilicas are now Cathedrals. The Cross, once the scandal of the world, floats on the banners of armies, and is set on the diadems of kings.'—The figure of binding in connexion with Satan is made use of in Mt. 12; 29: Lu. 11; 22; and mention is made of Christ’s power over the devil and the powers of darkness in Co. 2; 15: He. 2; 14. In 2 Pe. 2; 4, and Jude 6 the devil is stated to have been at some past period ‘cast down into hell, delivered into chains of darkness, and reserved in everlasting chains unto the judgment of the great day.’—At ‘the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ,’ Satan is symbolized as carrying on a war in heaven (12; 7). This must have lasted but a very short season. He is then cast down on the earth. There he again carries on a war, also ‘for a short season’ (12; 12, 17); and is thence cast into the abyss (20; 3). Again, he levies war, for ‘a little season;’ and is finally cast into the lake of fire (20; 3, 10). Thus, Satan wages three wars, each of short duration; and he meets with three downfalls, falling each time a step lower, until he sinks into the pit of perdition. It seems reasonable to suppose, that each of these must denote a degree of personal restriction and limitation of power, which would necessarily be attended with a diminution of ability to act injuriously against man.—Cp. Vol. I: p. 499: Vol. II: pp. 16–20, 24–25, 40.—A thousand years. Some there are who contend, that this period is symbolical. Most of the year-day theorists, indeed, take it literally; but a few, in order to carry out the theory consistently, say, that a period of 360,000 years is intended here. As I have elsewhere (Vol. I: p. 41 ss.: Psalmi, p. 364 ss.) refuted that theory in toto, I need not now enter on the question.—Some, again, maintain, that this number is to be regarded as an indefinite one. I doubt not, that it is used as a round number, and may rightly be construed with that proportionate and limited indefiniteness, with which round numbers are ordinarily used. I mean, that, if (for example) three numbers, say 10, 100, 1000, be used as round numbers, there would be a limited indefiniteness allowed to each in proportion to its magnitude: thus, 100 would allow of a greater indefiniteness than 10, and 1000 than 100. But this is a very different thing from the absolute indefiniteness, for which some contend in this instance. Thus, Stuart makes the phrase before us to import merely ‘a very long period,’—a phrase, which gives no definite idea whatever of the duration. And Wordsworth speaks of the thousand years as being ‘the whole day of this world’s life.’ I am not concerned to show, that a thousand is never
used with such an indefiniteness. It will suffice, if I can make it appear, that it is not so used here. And the following considerations will, I think, show this. 1. The number is not introduced in the way that it would have been, if it had been used indefinitely. The *as it were*, which is so common in the Apocalypse, is not prefixed to it. There is no appearance of its being used in the way of simile or comparison, or in order to magnify an idea, that is, as a superlative: and in one or other of these ways the number is, I believe, invariably introduced, when used indefinitely. 2. The repetition of the number six times in different connexions is opposed to such a construction. "This intentional emphatic repetition," says Hengstenberg, "shows, that a real importance is attached to the number, although, since the beginning and end of the space indicated by it bear from the nature of things a floating character, we are not to imagine, that we can historically point out with precision the thousand years, and we must satisfy ourselves with being able to fix on a period, that somewhat nearly corresponds to it." 3. The indefinite construction leaves the meaning to float in utter uncertainty. Take the saying, "A thousand years is with the Lord as one day, and one day as a thousand years;" and while it may be argued from the one of its clauses, that by a thousand years is meant a very long period, with equal reason from the other it may be inferred, that a very short period is intended. So that with equal probability 100 or 100,000 years may be meant. 4. We are entitled to look for at least some approach to congruity in the length of the seventh age with the average of those which preceded it. That average is 1000 years; and with it the number in question will exactly agree, if it be taken as a definite number, but if it be taken as an indefinite, it may represent a period never so widely removed by its brevity or by its length from congruity with the rest. On these grounds I adhere to that sense, which is in itself the most obvious and natural one, and reject a construction, which is purely arbitrary.—With regard to the date of commencement of the thousand years, the period has (as I have shown in my introductory remarks) three epochs, *viz.*, in round numbers A.D. 70, 300, and 500; and it will be my business hereafter to show, that the history of the period commencing from these epochs will satisfy the symbolization.
effect produced by it on the state of things on the earth.—These clauses appear to be added only for the purpose of intensifying the idea of the security of the custody, in which Satan was kept. But if we are to suppose, that they are meant to denote anything in the real world, it would seem, that they can only signify, by implication, the freedom given to Christianity to spread itself without let or hindrance. But this must be understood as comparative, that is, as contrasted with the restraint put upon it before the millennium by the early persecutions, and after it by the outbreak of a new antagonistic power.—That we must regard the restraint put upon Satan as comparative, and not as complete, appears from the fact, that death prevailed during the millennium: cp. ve. 13. And "death," as Hengstenberg observes, "is inseparably connected with all besides, that renders our earth a valley of trouble and distress; in particular with sin, through which it came into the world, and whose wages it is. But sin is inseparably connected with the working of Satan; it was through that at first, and through that also in later times, that his working proceeds."—In contrast with this secure sealing of the dragon by the Lord, we may suitably place the vain sealing of the Lord by the dragon, when the latter thought, that he had consigned Jesus to the safe custody of his agents, Death and Hades: cp. Mt. 27; 66.

1376. That he might not deceive the nations any more. The any more virtually refers us, for a knowledge of the particular character or result of the deception here spoken of, to that, which Satan and his agents had been described as practising. Now, in C. 12; 9 we find him described as the deceiver of the whole world, with an obvious reference to his exciting the oecumene,—the Roman world, to make war upon Christ and Christianity (see p. 19). In 2; 20 an instrument of his is described as 'deceiving Christ's servants to commit [spiritual] fornication, and to eat things offered to idols.' In 13; 14 (cp. 19; 20) another agent of his is said to 'deceive by his signs, into worshipping the beast's image, those, who had the mark of the beast.' In 18; 23 his ally, the whore of Babylon, is said to 'deceive all the nations by her witchery.' And, lastly, in 20; 8 the character of the deception is plainly shown by its being said of Satan, that 'he shall go out to deceive all the nations . . . to gather them together to war against the camp of the saints.' Thus we see clearly, that the nature of the deception here spoken of is seducing by fraud or by force the people of the Lord from their allegiance to Him, and bringing them over to heathenism, that is, virtually to the worship of the devil. A restraint put upon this seduction is, then, the effect of the binding of Satan. We are not left to conjecture wherein the binding consisted, or what consequences it would produce; for we are, by necessary
implication, plainly told. And hence we shall be inexcusable, if we substitute the surmises of our own imaginations for the clear intimations of the text.—What has now been shown will be made further evident by taking into account who they were, who were to be set free for a time from Satan’s seducing power. The nations means the heathen. ‘The Greek word,’ says Hengstenberg, ‘in the language of the Apocalypse does not denote nations generally, but always the heathen nations. . . . Here, according to the natural import of the words, it is not the deceiving of individuals that is spoken of, but the deceiving of the peoples as such. Further, the discourse here is not of the seducing to sin generally, but of seducing to absolute heathenism, to open opposition toward Christ and his Church.’ In another place Hengstenberg has remarked; ‘The subject of discourse here, as the connexion shows, is not Satan’s deceiving in the general, but his deceiving with the view of stirring them up to an open attack on the kingdom of Christ, for the purpose of destroying it, and so as even to threaten its destruction.’ We cannot, then, rightly refer the binding of Satan to a period subsequent to the general Christianization of the peoples, who are here had in view.

1377–8. Until the thousand years should be ended. After these he must be loosed. We have seen, that the binding and the not deceiving are virtually synonymous, or at any rate correlative terms, the binding being the cause of the not deceiving, and the not deceiving the effect of the binding: or perhaps I should rather say, that the one term is the symbolical expression, and the other its literal equivalent. Here, again, this is confirmed by the same being shown to be the case in respect of the loosing and the deceiving. In the first of these clauses it is said by implication, ‘after the thousand years he shall again deceive:’ in the second, ‘after these he must again be loosed.’ The nature of that subsequent loosing and deceiving will fully confirm what has hitherto been shown. And it will be my business in the proper place to make it appear, that the history of the period will satisfy these statements.—A little time. It will be a test of a true exposition to be able to show at the epoch to which it has been brought down in unbroken chronological order, and by independent data, not only a renewed assault on Christianity by the power of the sword, but one which lasted only for a little time.—What duration should be understood by a little time may best be judged from the similar phrase on the parallel occasion. Satan was then said to be loosed on the earth ‘for a short season’ (12; 12); and from the epoch of that scene to his binding in this the length of time was about 40 years.
DIV. 3. THE FIRST RESURRECTION AND JUDGMENT.

XX; 4–5. 1879–88. And I beheld thrones (and they were seated upon them; and judgment was given to them), and the souls of those who had been beheaded through the testifying of Jesus and through the word of God. And they who worshipped not the beast nor his image, and received not the mark upon the forehead; and upon their hand; both lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. (But the rest of the dead lived not, until the thousand years were ended.) This [is] the first resurrection.

Hengstenberg says; “That vv. 4–6 contain an interlude appears from ve. 7 manifestly joining on to ve. 3.” But it is scarcely proper to call a passage, circumstanced as this is, an interlude. A more correct representation would be, that vv. 1–3 and 4–6 contain two parallel lines, which converge to a point in ve. 7. For they alike relate to the same period of 1000 years, only the former verses speak of Satan’s binding, and the latter of the saints’ exaltation,—the one of the earthly, the other of the heavenly sphere; and the reference in ve. 7 is even stronger grammatically to “the thousand years” of ve. 6 than to that of ve. 3. When, in these two synchronous lines the history of the thousand years has been completed, both as to heaven and earth, the narrative is taken up and carried on again in ve. 7 in a single line, because the sphere of action is single. And that sphere being the symbolical earth, the connexion would unavoidably appear to be closer with the one of the two lines which related to the earth than with the other, more especially as it was necessary to resume the history of the party, that formed the principal subject in the former.

1879. I beheld thrones. Here our thoughts naturally turn to the thrones of God and of the elders in C. 4; 2, 4; and we are prepared to expect, that this is a similar symbol to that, and perhaps representative of the same parties.—A throne implies a king, yet only in the wide sense in which the term is used in the Apocalypse, that is, as comprehending any ruler. Judges were rulers among the Jews. Thus, the book of Judges contains a history of those, who ruled over Israel at one period. And, that royal judges are here had in view, the office of judging being the salient idea, appears from what follows; and is confirmed by the parallel symbolizations in C. 4; 4 and 20; 11, in which those who occupy the thrones are judges.—But where were these thrones seen, that is, where is the scene laid—in heaven or on earth? This is a most important point: yet we are left to obtain an answer to the question from indirect considerations; for nothing is directly stated on the point. First, then, I observe, that there is nothing that favours the supposition, that the symbolic earth is the scene. No inference can be drawn from the preceding
scene (vv. 1–8), since the place to which we were last carried in it was the under-world; and ‘the abyss’ cannot be thought of in the present instance. On the other hand, the following considerations will lead us to think, that the heaven is had in view. 1. The omission to name the place can be accounted for only by supposing, that the author considered, that the place would as a matter of course be known, and that no doubt could be entertained about it. Now this he could have done, only if the heaven was the scene; since there was no precedent or example of any kind, that would lead any one to imagine, that the earth could be the theatre of such an exhibition. 2. In the opening scene just referred to (4: 2, 4) the thrones were ‘set in the heaven.’ Hence it is natural to conclude, nothing being said to the contrary, that these were so likewise, more especially as this is a scene of judgment as well as that. 3. Heaven, and not earth is the appropriate place for “souls.” 4. Martyrs are the enthroned ones here. Now, to such the promise was made, that they should sit with Christ and his Father on their throne (3: 21). And as their throne is in heaven, it may reasonably be supposed, that these are too. 5. Those who are brought to view here have passed through ‘the grave and gate of death;’ and earth is not the place for such. 6. The persons symbolized here are those, who have part in the first resurrection. And a resurrection is constantly spoken of as being a rising from the realms of the dead to a residence either in heaven or in hell, but not on earth. 7. In Heb. 4: 9 the apostle says; “There remaineth a rest (lit. the keeping of a sabbath) for the people of God.” The word ‘sabbatism’ indicates, that he had in his mind the sabbath of the seven ages. And what he says afterwards (10: 19: 11; 16) shows, that the scene of the sabbatism of which he spoke was heaven. These considerations, in the absence of anything to the contrary, may surely justify us in concluding, that these thrones were seen in the heaven. And if so, all ground for holding the doctrine of a millennial reign of Christ and his saints on the earth will be taken away.—And they were seated upon them. Who were seated? Is the expression indefinite, amounting only to this, ‘The thrones were occupied’ or ‘Persons were seated on them’ (cp. Lu. 6: 38: 12; 20, 48: 16: 9): or is it definite? And if the latter, to whom does they refer? That the expression should have been intended as indefinite is scarcely credible. It can surely never have been meant, that unknown or undistinguished persons were seated on the heavenly thrones, and had judgment given to them. Persons of some particular class or character must assuredly be had in view. But who they were is not so easy to determine: at least, this may seem to be the case, if the number of plausible hypotheses that may be made be taken into account. 1st. The occupants of the thrones may be
supposed to be the twenty-four elders. That a part of them, or rather of those whom they severally represent, may be contemplated will be seen to be possible. But, that the symbol of the elders, as a whole, is had in view is highly improbable; for, if it had been, there would surely have been a reference to the former mention of it, by some such mode of expression as, 'I beheld the twenty-four thrones, and the elders seated on them.' 2dly, Wordsworth maintains, that the parties enthroned are the saints in general; for of them it is declared, that they shall 'judge the world,' and also 'angels' (1 Co. 6; 2, 3). But it will be seen from the sequel, that this is not a judgment of the world at large, and certainly it is not one of angels. 3dly, Ewald supposed the enthroned ones to be angels. A fatal objection to this view is, that angels are never represented in Scripture as being judges of men; but, on the contrary, they are (as we have just seen) said to be judged by men. Angels are described rather as acting in an inferior capacity to men, as being 'ministering spirits to the heirs of salvation.' 4thly, Stuart, rejecting the opinion, that angels in general are intended, yet contends, that the seven presence-angels may be here associated with God and Christ. But this is pure speculation. There is no foundation whatever for such an opinion; and it is open to the same objection as Ewald's view. 5thly, Hengstenberg says; "It admits of no doubt (!), that those who sit upon the thrones are the twelve apostles, probably in fellowship with the twelve patriarchs." While speaking thus confidently, and referring indeed in support of his opinion to C. 4; 4 and Da. 7; 9, 10, his only argument, which has any apparent weight, is Mt. 19; 28, where Jesus tells his apostles, that 'in the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, they also should sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.' While this text may be thought to prove, that the apostles are included in the symbolization (which, I doubt not, is the case), it is far from showing, that they alone are included in it. And if others besides them are symbolized, then the symbol cannot be said to be a symbol of them as apostles. And the fullest meaning that the text can be supposed to have, would be fully satisfied by their being distinguished in some way above the rest. 6thly, There remains, I believe, only one other hypothesis; and consequently, if those which have been mentioned are to be rejected, it must be received. We cannot doubt, when parties are abruptly introduced in the way that these are here, without any name or designation being applied to them, that the omission must be attributed either to the writer's considering that the persons intended were so well known, that any explicit mention of them was unnecessary, or to his having sufficiently indicated whom he meant in the accompanying context. We have seen, that so many hypo-
theses might be made on the subject, that the former alternative is inadmissible; and consequently the latter must be adopted. Hence we can only come to the conclusion, that those, who were here seen enthroned, were "the souls of those beheaded for the testifying of Jesus." And this conclusion receives confirmation from some other passages. In C. 3; 21 the promise of co-enthronization with the Father and the Son is made 'to him who conquers,' that is, to him who remains 'faithful unto death' in the conflict with the beast. Consequent upon the dragon's casting down, it is said in C. 12; 11, that those who 'conquered him' did so 'through the word of their testifying,' and were those 'who loved not their life unto death:' and hence it is probable, that such would receive the highest honour and reward. In 2 Ti. 2; 12, too, we are told, that it is those who suffer with Christ who shall reign with him. See also Lu. 22; 28: Ro. 8; 17: 2 Co. 4; 17: Re. 1; 9: 21; 7. On the whole, I think that what is meant here may be thus expressed; 'I beheld thrones set in the heaven, and the souls of those beheaded, &c., were seated upon them.' Probably the author did not adopt this order, because the mention of the thrones suggested, that the occupancy of them should be adhered to in immediate connexion with them. The nouns thrones and souls being coupled together in the same case, as the complement of one verb, indicates the closest connexion between them; and thus shows, that the intermediate clauses have been thrown in parenthetically. And this facilitates the view I have propounded. For, if the souls do not represent the enthroned judges, they must represent those who are judged; and in that case, far from being as closely connected as possible with the thrones, they would doubtless have been introduced as distinctively as might be from them. And in order to effect this two sentences would have been formed, as indeed the A. V., though not by its pointing, yet in fact, through the introduction of the verb I saw (which is not in the original), makes it appear that there are. This view will also appear to be the more probable one, if it be considered, that the symbolization before us is intimately connected with that of the advent of the Lord Jesus, and his 'called, elect, and faithful' ones, which precedes it (19; 11–21),—this being as it were a supplement to that. That both scenes have virtually one subject is indicated in the syllabus of the seventh trumpet, wherein the two are briefly described in the clauses, 'that thou shouldest destroy them that destroy the earth,' and 'that thou shouldest give the reward to thy servants.' Hence we may reasonably suppose, that the symbol merely is changed for the sake of adaptation to the change of scene ("the armies of heaven on white horses" becoming "the souls" of the martyrs), while the thing signified is the same. And if such be the case, then there may be a double reference in the clause they were
seated, vis., one (by a constructio ad sensum) to those who had just before been spoken of under another symbol in conformity with grammatical usage, and the other to the symbol newly introduced in accordance with symbolical congruity. And thus the peculiar form of the sentence will be fully accounted for.

1380. And judgment was given to them. The original of this clause is ambiguous, inasmuch as it may be taken in three ways: 1st, as meaning, that the power or office of judging was committed to them; or 2dly, that sentence was given on them; or 3dly, that sentence was given by them. And, such being the case, and questions of some interest being dependent on the right construction, we must carefully examine the force of the terms, and the connexion in which they stand, with the view to ascertain what is the true meaning. Now in the Apocalypse two Greek terms are used of related, but not identical significations, both of which in the A. V. are rendered by judgment: see on 944. The one used here is κρισις; and of it the literal meaning according to Liddell is "a decision, decree: judgment, sentence." The other (which, to mark the difference in the original I have invariably translated judging) is κρασις; and of it the primary meaning is thus given; "1. a separating, putting apart: 2. a deciding, determining; a judgment, sentence: 3. a trial." Hence it will be seen, that the latter is the generic term; since it comprehends both the act of judging and the judgment given: while the proper force of the former is to express the last-named sense. An examination of the 48 instances, in which the latter word, and of the 28, in which the former occurs in the N. T. will show, that the use in the Scriptures is generally in accordance with that in the classics; though, inasmuch as examples may be adduced in which the word before us appears to denote the act of judging or discriminating (e. g., Jo. 9: 39; Acts 24: 25), complete reliance cannot be placed on the mere force of the term. (Ct. with the clause before us John 5: 22; "The Father judgeth no man, but hath given all judging (κραισις) to the Son.") Still, its proper signification being such as has been stated, we are led to expect, that one of the two last of the above-mentioned meanings of the clause must be the true one. And we must therefore proceed to inquire, which of these is admissible. It may be well to premise however, that, though the word judgment is commonly used in an unfavourable sense, this is not necessarily its meaning; for the original term may denote any sentence, whether favourable or unfavourable to those on whom it is passed (see on 770). An adverse sentence is out of the question here; and none other than one of enthronization can be meant. Now, sentence was pronounced on them will be found to be inadmissible for the following reasons. 1. On such a construction the purport of the two clauses in parenthesis
would be this, 'They were constituted judges, and sentence was passed on them,' which involves the *hysteron-proteron* of putting the enthronization before the sentence of enthronization, that is, the effect before the cause. *They* and *them* must needs refer to the same parties. So that the same persons will first be said to be enthroned, and then sentenced! 2. Having in view the precedent in C. 4; 2, 4,—taking into account that 'the Father hath committed all judgment unto the Son,'—and comparing Mt. 19; 28, we cannot doubt, that Christ is the principal judge. And how or by whom could sentence have been pronounced on him? Stuart, in advocating this construction, says; 'If it be the martyrs who occupy the thrones from which judgment is dispensed, it would seem natural, that the verb *judged* should precede the statement of this.' But I shall presently show, that this verb does not refer to the martyrs. If, now, the first two interpretations are to be rejected, there is no alternative but to adopt the third. It has the advantages of taking the principal Greek word in its proper sense,—of exhibiting the clauses as following one another in the natural order,—and of being liable to no objection, that I am aware of. It has, too, the further recommendation of being substantially identical with the first interpretation; since the two mutually imply each other, the function of pronouncing sentence presupposing the office of the judge, and the power of judging involving that of sentencing. I need not, therefore, discuss the question with those who, like Hengstenberg, consider, that 'the judgment being given to those who sit on the thrones denotes, that they received full judicial power.' Nor do I think it worth while to enter into a discussion with those who can hold, that 'judgment was given to them means for substance the same as they reigned in the last clause of the verse.' But I am content to receive Stuart's exposition as giving the true meaning. He says; 'The simple meaning of the Greek is, "power of passing sentence was given."'—The pronouncing sentence, or exercising the office of a judge implies the existence of persons to be judged. Who are they in this instance? Stuart and many others answer the souls of the martyrs. But if we are right in thinking, that it is the souls, that are constituted the judges, they can scarcely be also the judged. And hence there seems to be a necessity for dividing the sentence in the way that I have divided it, so that there may be a distinction into two classes made, the martyrs and the confessors. Then, all will be easy. The martyrs having first been elevated to judicial thrones, and having had conferred on them the high honour of being associated with Christ as his assessors in judgment, are authorized to pronounce sentence on the righteous dead by declaring who are found worthy (as having been confessors of Christ on earth) of being admitted to the preferential millennial life and
reign with him in heaven. And that some special honour was believed in apostolic times to be reserved for martyrs may be gathered from Hermas, Vis. III. An aged woman,—a symbol of "the Church, which was constituted before the foundation of the world," seats Hermas on the left side of a settee, telling him, that the right side was reserved as the place of honour for martyrs (illorum est qui jam meruerunt Deum et passi sunt causa nominis ejus), . . . "who have endured wild beasts, scourgings, imprisonment, the cross, for his name's sake."—I agree with Hengstenberg, and shall show more fully hereafter, that 'the object of the judging is here, not the world in general, but the church,' by which I mean the saints of that epoch (cp. 6; 10: 11; 18). "The claims," as he says, "of the faithful witnesses of Jesus to the heavenly recompence must be investigated. The judges and the judged are by the construction united in the closest manner with each other. The sentence is this, that the faithful witnesses must live and reign with Christ."

1381. I beheld thrones, . . . and the souls of those beheaded. 'The souls,' says Hengstenberg, 'are here, as at C. 6; 9, the murdered souls—not the souls in the intermediate state, disembodied spirits, which are never so designated. In place of the souls the blood or the corpses might also have been put.' Stuart writes much to the same effect. Both take the term in a quasi-literal sense as denoting murdered persons, forgetting apparently, that what John speaks of is symbolic, and purely a creation of the imagination. The proper question to be asked is, What do these souls symbolize? The parallel examples in C. 6; 9 may help to show, that living beings are denoted; but it is too nearly identical with the one before us to do more than this. The descriptions of the symbols in the second trumpet and the second bowl,—"the created things in the sea having souls were destroyed,"—"every soul in the sea died," also show, that living creatures are symbolized. But in this instance are souls only (i.e., incorporeal spirits) or souls reunited to 'spiritual bodies' denoted? I do not know, that the solution of this question is of any great moment in the interpretation of the passage; but, as Stuart has thought it worth while to discuss the question at some length, I will briefly state and examine his arguments. 1. The principal one depends on the meaning of the verb ἐπισκόπεω, which he translates revised, and says that it means "returned to a life like the former one, viz., a union of soul and body." In support of this assertion he refers to C. 1; 18: 2; 8: 13; 14, and other passages. But these texts fail to show, that the word has this sense of its own proper force; for, wherever the sense exists, it depends on the context and circumstances, and not on the word itself. And there is another Greek word, which answers to our term revised. Again, Stuart argues, that, in
saying *they lived*, the author cannot mean to state, that ‘the souls of martyrs were dead before this period, and now would come to life, after he has throughout the book represented them as being in heaven.’ Of course the author could not speak of immortal souls as having been dead; nor does he do so. He has, however, nowhere represented these souls as being in heaven before the epoch, to which this scene refers. It is due to the erroneousness of the interpreter’s scheme, if he is made to appear to do so. Stuart further alleges, that the author ‘cannot mean, that the souls now begin to be happy, for they had long been happy, because “the dead who die in the Lord are happy henceforth.”’ But the text cited has reference, as Stuart himself allows (see on 968), to the epoch of the author’s writing, and predicates the blessedness of those who died at that epoch, because they would at once enter upon the millennial bliss. So that it actually affirms that, which Stuart adduces it to prove not to be true! He goes on to say; ‘Still less can the author mean, that they become immortal now; for they were always immortal.’ Even this position might be gainsaid on the ground, that inherent immortality is a controverted point. Thus, while it would have sufficed to show, that any one of the alternatives suggested by Stuart, besides that for which he contends, as being the meaning of the author when he wrote *they lived*, might be adopted, it has been shown, that he has failed to make good his ground on any one of them. And even if he had established every one of these, yet another, and the one which, as I believe, exhibits the salient point in view, might have been adduced, viz., a resurrection of souls from the life of ‘rest’ (cp. 6: 11: 14; 13) in Paradise to that of unchangeable ‘blessedness’ in heaven:—these souls, as the text explicitly says, were raised to ‘live with Christ.’ 2. Stuart further alleges, that ‘in no other way than by a union of the soul with a “spiritual body” (such an one as the saints in general will have at the final resurrection) can this resurrection be ranked as correlate with the second resurrection named in the sequel; for in naming this the first (ve. 5) John has developed such a correlation.’ This appears to me to be an argument of great weight; and though it cannot be deemed absolutely conclusive, because it may be held, that the first resurrection is the rising of the souls of some to a state of higher bliss, but the second a rising of all men by the reunion of the body to the soul, yet it establishes a very strong probability; and the difference between the two hypotheses is so unpractical, that it would be scarcely worth while to spend time in attempting to determine which is the true one, even if there were a prospect of being able to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion. 3. To this argument of Stuart’s it may be added, that the general rule of a symbol being as diverse as possible from the thing symbolized renders it more
probable, that the symbolic souls should represent beings having souls and bodies, than such as have souls only.—From the fact, that the souls must have symbolized persons, the following deductions, which are of considerable importance, may be made. 1. Principles cannot be symbolized. And hence the opinion, that the millennial state would consist in the prevalence of the principles of the martyrs,—an opinion adopted by Augustine and many others, under widely differing views as to the extent and degree of the prevalence, is destitute of foundation. 2. So, also, is that, quoad hoc, which holds the ecclesiastical supremacy of Christianity to be the salient feature of the millennium. 3. And that, also, which combines the two preceding views.—The term beheaded, or more literally killed with the axe has respect, as Hengstenberg says (referring to the use of the term in Polybius, I: 17, 12), to the Roman mode of execution; and thus shows, that we are here to think of the martyrs, who suffered in the Roman persecution. And this is confirmed by the contrast with the word used on the parallel occasion preceding the Babylonian destruction, viz., slain: see C. 6; 9. At the same time, we ought not to tie the term down to a rigid literality, so as to allow none to be included in the statement, but such as had actually been decapitated. The word appears to have been selected in order to indicate the authority, under which the parties had been executed. But yet the character of the work justifies, if it does not require, a certain figurativeness or wideness of meaning being given to it, by which it may be taken to include all, who suffered under the authority of the Romans, by whatever means they may have been put to death.

1382. Through the testifying of Jesus, &c. Either for the sake of the testimony which Jesus gave, or on account of the testimony which they gave to the testifying of Jesus might be understood. Both were in fact true. They gave their lives for the sake of the Gospel: their persecutors took them on account of their testimony to it.—As the same Greek preposition is used in both clauses of the seven repetitions of this expression, I have, for conformity therewith, invariably used that English preposition, which would on the whole suit the sense best, namely, through, in preference to varying the phrase for adaptation to the meaning, while there was no corresponding variation in the original.—A comparison of the phrase here with that in C. 6; 9; through the testifying which they held, indicates, that this refers to “martyrs of Jesus,” while that does not: see on 420: also on 6, 848.

1383–84. And they who worshipped not, &c. Taking the words in order, it would be proper to consider first the connexion, in which these stand with the preceding sentence; but, in the present instance, the consideration of the questions which will arise may be facilitated
by adverting previously to the other points, which the sentence will bring before us.—And first it is observable, that the verbs in this sentence are not put in the same tense as the participle in the preceding one. If any inference is to be drawn from this, it may be, that this sentence is intended to have a different, more comprehensive, and more prolonged application than that.—It may also be noticed, that in C. 14; 9, 11, the phrase runs, “who worship the beast, and his image, and, &c.”—The various readings of the substantives indicate attempted emendations of the anomaly of different cases being coupled together.—It were vain and futile to attempt to distinguish the parties spoken of into different classes, so as to regard those who did not worship as forming one class, and those who did not receive the mark as another. Perhaps the parallelisms in C. 14; 9, 11: 19; 20 may be thought to favour such an hypothesis, but the use of the expressions elsewhere, as in C. 13; 15–17: 15; 2, does not countenance it; and there can scarcely be a doubt, that the whole is designed to be only a comprehensive description, framed so as to exclude all the worshippers of the beast, by whatever outward marks their devotion to his service might be manifested. It thus becomes equivalent to the description in the prelude; since all who, in the face of persecution, refused to serve the beast must have been ‘prophets, or saints, or God-fearing men’ (11; 18); and all who professed to be God’s ‘servants’ would be sure in those days to have the test of persecution in some shape or other applied to them by the beast or his worshippers (cp. 1 Pe. 4; 12–14).—The four terms in two pairs,—the beast or his image, the forehead and the hand, confirm what has just been said by indicating, that universal comprehensiveness, and not classification, has been the object had in view in the amplitude of the description.—If I have satisfactorily proved, that the beast is a symbol of the Roman power under the Caesars, this description shows, beyond a doubt, who were the parties whom the author had in his mind, when he wrote; “They lived and reigned with Christ.” They were, at least generically, if not individually, identical with those, who were symbolized by the 144 chiliods of C. 14; 1, the conquerors of C. 15; 2, and the heavenly hosts of C. 19; 14. —I proceed now to consider the connexion of the sentence before us with that which precedes it. In all the versions that I have seen the two are thrown together into one, the whole of the verse being supposed to come under the regimen of the verb I beheld. In defence of this construction Tregelles writes thus. “The parallel to this sentence in Greek construction is found in C. 1; 7. In each case there is a general statement followed by καὶ δὲρας, not as some class added to the general statement, but as expressing some who, while included in the general term, are brought into an especial pro-
minence. In 20; 4 John sees a certain class, and especially and prominently among them, and as part of them, 'those who had not worshipped,' &c. The grammar of the sentence shows this." In reply to this statement I make the following remarks. 1st: As to the example referred to as a precedent. That the second clause in it is comprehended in the first arises not from the construction, but from the circumstance of a universally comprehensive term being used in the first. How could any addition be made to "every eye"? To be parallel, the example adduced ought not necessarily, by the force of the terms used in the first clause, to make it appear, that the second is included in the first. In the precedent referred to, however, the second clause may in point of fact be parallel to, and exegetical of the first, as I have shown on 27–28. 2dly: As to the grammar of the sentence. It might suffice to observe, that Stuart admits, that the pronoun may be 'not a mere relative pronoun, with reference to the souls,' and that 'the exegesis which makes an additional class to be meant may be allowable.' But I observe further, that, however this may be, and allowing that an argument based on the rules of grammatical construction should be allowed such weight as it may be thought to merit in each particular case, it can rarely, if ever, be deemed conclusive or reliable in a work, which is found to abound in grammatical solecisms. I may add, that C. 2; 24 seems to show, that our author would use ἐρευς as perfectly equivalent to ἦσσω. 3dly: As to the first clause comprehending the second. The purport of each shows, that this cannot be the case in the present instance. It is impossible to suppose, that the author meant, that all who refused to worship the beast were beheaded. But the position Tregelles takes requires him to maintain, that not only such, but also others, who did not refuse to worship the beast, were martyred; for he says, that 'those who worshipped not' formed only "a part" of those who were beheaded. On the other hand, the nature of the case would seem to leave no room for doubt, that many, besides those who were martyred, did not worship; and if so, it will follow, that the second clause is the more comprehensive of the two, and must either include the first (and, in that case, the converse of Tregelles's assertion will express the truth) or, as Stuart says, it must designate "an additional class of Christians, who had suffered in various ways, but had not been made actual martyrs." To the same effect writes Hengstenberg; "The description, who had not worshipped, &c., adds to the martyrs all those, who in the conflict, that then raged so fiercely between Christ and the beast, had remained steadfast on the side of the former."—Those, who adopt the construction which I have rejected, appear to have no clear idea of the connexion between the latter and the former portions of the sentence. For example: the A. V. and Stuart seem
to make they who dependent on the souls, but Tregelles on I beheld, and Hengstenberg explicitly says; 'We must explain those, who, not of those' (int. souls). The former construction makes souls to be spoken of in both parts of the verse: the latter souls in the first part, and persons in the second. Now, if it be considered, that this is a symbolic scene,—that its theatre is heaven,—and that the latter part of the verse does or may include within it the parties who are spoken of in the former, there will, I think, be little doubt entertained, that on this view of the whole the latter must be the right construction. If all alike, it may be asked, were seen as souls, how could the seer distinguish them into two classes? However, take which view we may, the result will be practically the same. If we suppose the author to mean to say, that he saw the souls of the nonworshippers, then those souls will form a symbol of the nonworshippers. But if we understand him as predicating of the nonworshippers, that they entered on the life with Christ, then the sentence will contain a statement by the seer in reference to the confessors of the period which he has in view.—Having now considered the usual construction as it is exhibited and advocated by the espousers of it, and shown the fallacy of the arguments by which it is supported, I proceed to state the positive grounds, on which I have rejected it. And first, if they who worshipped, &c., had been meant to be governed by the souls, and therefore to be coupled with those who had been beheaded, the same part of speech, in the same voice, tense, and case, would doubtless have been used; whereas the first phrase is a participle in the passive voice, the pluperfect tense, and the genitive case, but the second a verb in the active voice, the sorist tense, and the nominative case. 2dly. There is an absolute necessity (as I have shown on 1380) for making a broad distinction between those spoken of in the former, and those in the latter part of this verse; because it is requisite, that there should be seen to be some, upon whom the judgment given by the martyrs was passed. 3dly. I think it will be found, that the interpretation of the whole becomes more easy, free from difficulties, and consistent with the context and circumstances on the construction I have adopted.—Let me add here, that the view I take seems to receive a general confirmation from the parallelism, which may be traced between the symbolical and the supplemental statements. The introductory part of each is binominal, and they who worshipped not, &c., and they who received not, &c., correspond to the holding of the testifying of Jesus and the word of God. They were seated on thrones is equivalent to they reigned. And sentence was given by them has a correlative clause in they lived and reigned, &c. Thus there appears to be a correspondence in the appended statement with the symbolical representation, which indicates a parallelism and generic identity of reference of the former with the latter.——
On the whole, I come to this conclusion with respect to the parties spoken of in this verse. The souls of those who had suffered martyrdom under the Roman beast, are seen to be raised to royal thrones in heaven. They are associated with Christ in the judgment now to be passed on those, who had been their brethren on the earth. In consequence of the sentence they give, all those (it is stated), who had not yielded to the beast, were admitted to enter at once on the apocalyptic life, and to reign 1000 years with Christ in heaven, before the rest of their brethren should be admitted to the same blessed state. Hence it appears, that only one class,—the martyred souls, was seen by John; and that, as to the saints, who had confessed Christ but not been martyred, their souls were not seen, but a statement merely in reference to them is made. That statement is necessarily so comprehensive as to include (and obviously à fortiori) the martyrs; though the circumstances show, that it has immediately in view those who were not martyrs.—It will follow from what I have now said, that I reject the view (1st) of those, who consider, that in this verse three classes are specified,—the enthroned (whether including, as some say, the apostles only, or, as others, the great body of the saints), the beheaded, and confessors; (2dly) of those, who see here two classes, either by regarding the enthroned as a general designation, including two divisions,—the beheaded and confessors, or by considering the term to be applied to the beheaded, of whom the nonworshippers were a portion; and (3dly) of those, who see only one class, supposing the several clauses to state different facts respecting the same parties. All these views have been directly or by implication refuted; and it would be easy to point out additional objections to those, which have not been directly handled, but it can scarcely be deemed necessary or worth while to do so.

1385. Both lived and reigned with Christ. Both. Cp. 6; 11: 13; 15, 16: 19; 18: 20; 10.—Stuart translates they revived. But I have shown on 1831, that the Greek word cannot rightly be thus construed. It must, indeed, in the present instance necessarily presuppose a revival and resurrection, but it does not state either. Not an act or event, but a state of existence, implying duration, is expressed by it: cp. John 14; 19; "Because I live, ye shall live also." Confessors of Christ are said to enter on a new life,—a life, all the conditions and circumstances of which are totally different from those of their former life. They lived with Christ necessarily implies a higher state of existence than they had ever enjoyed previously. Before they were in hades, now they are exalted to heaven.—In the R. T. of ve. 5 the proper Greek word for revived is used; and it would doubtless have been found here, if the immediate intention had been to express the idea of revivification.—They reigned with
Christ in accordance with the prospect, which had been held out to them, while they were on earth: cp. 1; 6, 9: 2; 10: Ro. 5; 17. Not merely were they admitted into a state of supreme bliss, but they had also the highest honours of that state awarded to them (cp. Vol. I: p. 289). As to the epoch and locality of the reign see p. 383, and on 1379, and after 1392.—A thousand years. Critics are pretty equally divided in opinion with respect to the genuineness of the Greek article. Tregelles rejects it. Griesbach and Scholz receive it. Kelly places it in brackets as being doubtful. To ascertain the true reading is a point of some importance in the present instance; for, if the article be genuine, reference is made to the thousand years of ve. 2, and hence the period is identical with that; but if the article be not genuine, it is an open question, whether the thousand years of this verse be the same with the former or not:—I say, an open question; because the mere omission of a reference does not necessarily imply diversity, inasmuch as the author may not have made the reference from unwillingness to associate the idea of the blessed rest of the saints with the incarceration of the wicked one. We have, however, nothing better to depend upon in the present instance, than the greater probability there may appear to be in favour of the omission or of the insertion of the article. And certainly the probability is on the side of its insertion by a later hand; since it is not unlikely, that a copyist having twice written a thousand years might either undesignedly or through supposing this to be the same period have used the article, while it is highly improbable, that any one would have intentionally omitted it, if found in an ancient copy. This probability receives strong support from the article not being found in the most ancient MS. Mainly on its authority, I have not used the definite article in my translation. It appeared to me also, to be the proper course in a case of so much doubt to give the preference to that reading, which would leave the point in question open to either construction. Having done so, I may state that my own opinion is, that the thousand years of this verse, and that of ve. 2 are conterminous. There is no reason for supposing, that they are not: and there are no data for assigning different eras of commencement. Bengel, it is true, denied the identity of the saints' millennium with that of Satan. But Hengstenberg, on the contrary, affirms it somewhat dogmatically, referring to ve. 7 as conclusive, which, however, seems to me to add nothing to the argument. On the whole, I think, that there is no alternative but to assume the virtual identity of the two periods. I say 'the virtual identity:' because there is a short season of Satan's loosing interposed previous to the judgment, in respect of the earthly scene, which can have no place in respect of the heavenly sphere of existence: but its duration must be
so insignificant as compared with the thousand years, that it would not come into account in so concise an indication of events. If, then, we regard the period between A.D. 70 and 476 as being a transition-period common to the seventh trumpet and the period proper of the seventh seal, the history will be found to accord well with the symbolization. For, as that period includes 'a time of the end' of the seventh trumpet, during which the destruction of the enemies of Christianity was effected, so it will by parity of reason include 'a time of commencement' of the millennium, during which the victims of those enemies were gathered into their rest.

5. 1386. But the rest of the dead lived not. The particle is omitted in some of the best authorities. — The important question here is; Who are meant by the rest of the dead? Hengstenberg answers; "The godless dead:" but Stuart; "All, who had not suffered martyrdom or persecution from the beast." Which is the right answer will in part appear, if we call to mind what is the nature of the life in question. It is the æonic life,—the life and reign with Christ. And as none but the righteous dead can be supposed to be raised to this life, such alone can be spoken of here. Then, the terms in which those are described, who were adjudged to be partakers in the millennial bliss, namely, as having been beheaded for the testifying of Jesus, or as having refused to worship the beast, are not sufficiently comprehensive to include all the righteous dead; and consequently those excluded must have been left for the second resurrection. Again: it will be seen hereafter, that righteous as well as unrighteous persons are included in the judgment described in vv. 11–15. Moreover, other Scriptures (e.g., Mt. 25; 31 ss.) describe a judgment, in which both the just and the unjust will stand before God; and, if all but "the godless dead" appear in the premillennial judgment, how can both classes appear in the postmillennial? On these grounds I conclude, that the writer's intention was to represent martyrs and confessors only, as being admitted to the highest degree of celestial glory at the commencement of the millennial æon, while the rest of the righteous dead would be similarly exalted after it. And this conclusion will be found to receive confirmations as we proceed: see on 1387–92, 1413–17.—I have already observed, that the reading of the R. T. gives lived not again or revived not; but the reading is rejected in critical editions.

1387. Until the thousand years were ended. The word until plainly implies, that "the rest" would be raised to the same life at the end of the thousand years, that confessors were before it: cp. 6; 11: 7; 3: 15; 8. Yet Hengstenberg denies this. He says; "We are not to conclude from these words, that they lived at the end of it... Believers lived during the thousand years: at the end they go into
perfect bliss. The ungodly, on the other hand, did not live during the thousand years, but were in hades and in torment; and at the end of the thousand years they pass out of their provisional state of misery into the final one, and shall be cast into the lake of fire." Now, the first part of the last sentence will be seen to convert the text before us into a truism, and the last part to make it state the opposite of what it actually does state; if, first, we observe, that Hengstenberg uses the word lived in the sense of existed in a state of bliss; and then, secondly, bring his statement into accordance with the text as follows:—‘During the thousand years believers lived in a state of imperfect bliss, afterwards in perfect bliss: the ungodly, on the other hand, did not live in a state of bliss,’ "until the thousand years were ended," implying, that they would then enter into bliss! Life is the scriptural expression for the bliss of heaven (Mt. 18: 19; 17: Jo. 3; 36: 5; 29, 40: 11; 25, &c.); and lived, in this connexion, can be used only of a "blessed" life (cp. ve. 6): and hence by the rest must be meant, not the ungodly, but the great body of the righteous, in reference to whom the word until may and does imply their subsequent resurrection to the same life. What propriety would there be in telling us, that the ungodly were not partakers in the millennial life? Who could for a moment suppose, that they were? Or who would not be led to think, if he read; ‘The ungodly lived not till the end of the thousand years,’ that they did then live the same life? All the confusion is occasioned by interpreting the rest to mean the ungodly.—The next sentence manifestly goes back to the last clause of ve. 4. So that the one before us must have been introduced parenthetically for the purpose of explanation, and to leave no room for doubt as to the destiny of the righteous, who had not been martyrs or confessors. The close connexion of the next sentence with ve. 4 tends to confirm the view I have taken by showing, that the writer had the righteous dead exclusively in his mind throughout.

1388. This is the first resurrection. This is an elliptical statement, which, if fully expressed, would read thus:—The new life and reign of confessors which has just been spoken of is the consequence or sequel of the first resurrection. It will be appropriate here to consider generally the doctrine of the first resurrection, and the opinions that have been held in reference to it.

The doctrine taught in the Apocalypse respecting it is, that about a thousand years previous to the general resurrection and judgment symbolized in C. 20; 11–15, a select portion of the righteous dead, consisting of those who had been confessors of Christ under the persecution of the Roman beast, were to be raised from hades to the enjoyment of the highest honours and happiness, which attend the life
in heaven. Whether what is here predicated of confessors of Christ at this epoch may, by parity of reason, be extended to all confessors of the truth of God must be left to each person to judge for himself, inasmuch as the texts directly relate only to those, who have been mentioned.

I. I adudge the following texts as being severally proofs of the whole, or of some part of the above annunciation of the doctrine. 1. The declaration before us. There can be no question, that the second resurrection implied in the word first is symbolized in vv. 11–15. No other resurrection is brought to view; and though it is true, that a period of Satan’s loosing intervenes at the end of the thousand years, yet this (as I have just observed) has doubtless been passed over, as being of too short a duration to be brought into account. Now no orthodox person, I believe, will deny, that the resurrection of vv. 11–15 is a resurrection, in which righteous persons are raised to what is called in Scripture par excellence “life” (meaning everlasting happiness), and the unrighteous to what is similarly designated “death” (that is to say, eternal misery). Consistency of interpretation, then, requires, that the first resurrection be understood in the same sense, except in so far as it may be limited by the context. The context, as we have seen, limits it to confessors during the persecution of the Roman beast. In accordance, then, with the sense and limitation indicated in the passage as a whole, we are bound to receive the doctrine, that the first resurrection is a resurrection of such confessors to the heavenly life. [The hypotheses, by the help of which attempts have been made to avoid this conclusion, I will consider hereafter]. 2. The insertion of two articles by throwing emphasis on the word first is an additional indication, that a second resurrection, similar in kind, is had in view. 3. The statement, to which the one before us refers (1383–87), enunciates the doctrine by virtually affirming the first resurrection, and implying the second. 4. Ve. 4 shows, that persons are raised in the resurrection to which it refers (see on 1381), and that those persons are martyrs and confessors. This of itself alone implies a subsequent resurrection, in which righteous persons, who had not been martyrs or confessors, would be raised. 5. The parallelism of this resurrection, which stands connected with the second destruction of Jerusalem, with that symbolized in C. 7, which stands connected with the first destruction, affords a strong presumption in favour of a preferential resurrection of confessors. ‘The great multitude,’ who were there seen before the throne, consisted of those who had ‘come out of the great tribulation.’ see on 482, 506.

II. The foregoing are proofs from the Revelation exclusively. Now Hengstenberg has made the following assertions. “If we un-
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understand by 'the first resurrection' a resurrection in the literal sense,—if, accordingly, we suppose that the first resurrection has respect to one part of men, the second to another, we then arrive at a doctrine, which in no other part of Scripture finds a ground of support,—which, on the contrary, is everywhere explicitly opposed. . . . Scripture nowhere knows of anything but a general resurrection." That the doctrine is "everywhere explicitly exposed" in the rest of Scripture is an hyperbolical assertion, devoid of truth. And if it were true (which it is not), that this doctrine is not taught elsewhere in Scripture, this fact would furnish no sufficient reason for rejecting the doctrine; since a single clear statement of one inspired writer ought to suffice for the authentication of any doctrine. These assertions, however, make it expedient to pursue the subject further. And I will therefore go on to show, that, so far from any ground existing for them, the doctrine in question is plainly taught throughout the Scriptures of the New Testament.

1. And, first, I refer generally to the passages, in which the words resurrection and dead (sc. persons) occur, and to the distinction, that is made between them by the appropriate use of the article. The more accurate use of the Greek than of the English article gives a definiteness to the original, which (in this instance in particular, from the circumstance of the phrase 'the dead' being used alike for the dead in general, and for any particular class of the dead) it is not easy in all cases to transfer to an English translation,* and which in our A. V. is almost entirely lost. Both ἀναστάσις and νεκρος are frequently used with and without the article, the former word occurring 42 times and the latter 134 in the New Testament. When the article is not used, the meanings are respectively 'a resurrection' and 'the dead' in general or in the abstract: when it is used, a particular resurrection or some class of the dead is denoted in those cases, in which the object of the insertion is not to indicate reference to a previous mention of a resurrection or of the dead. In the latter case it will appear, in general from indications of the ideas which were uppermost in the minds of the inspired writers and of those whom they addressed, and in particular instances from unequivocal modes of expression or from the context, that the resurrection had in view was that which is here designated "the first," and the class of the dead 'the just' in contradistinction from 'the unjust.' If the latter

* For example: the human race being spoken of under two classes, where the Greek is 'dead and living,' our idiom constrains us to say, 'the dead and the living': cp. the Greek and English of Mt. 22: 32. In the following phrases there is no article in the Greek. 'Raise the dead.' 'The dead are raised.' 'Not a God of the dead.' 'That God should raise the dead.' 'Lord both of the dead and living.' 'If the dead rise not.'
(the dead) cannot be limited, in respect of the N. T. generally, to confessors of the apostles' time, it does not necessarily follow, that this arises from others having been included in 'the dead' alluded to; since it may be due, in part to the writers or speakers having regarded all their brethren as being then placed in circumstances, in which they could not hold fast their faith without being in some shape or other confessors, and in part to the constant object of the former having been to set before the latter the millennial life as a special reward, to which all of them might hope to attain.—Having made these prefatory remarks, I now proceed to cite a few texts in illustration.

(1). In 1 Co. 15, when at the outset, vv. 12, 13, the abstract doctrine of a resurrection is spoken of, and when subsequently in ve. 16 the dead in general and in ve. 21 the general resurrection are alluded to, the expressions used are ἀναστασίας νεκρῶν and νεκρος; but elsewhere throughout, when (as the whole passage indicates, and in particular vv. 20, 23, 29, 42-44, 51 ss.) the first resurrection and the righteous dead,—‘those who have fallen asleep in Christ,’ "those who are Christ's," are contemplated, then the phrases are ἡ ἀναστασία τῶν ν. and δὲ νεκρος. (2). Having in view the state of the dead in the abstract, or in consequence of Christ having visited both the receptacles of the dead (Lu. 23; 43; 1 Pe. 3; 19; 4; 6), he is always said to have risen ζ. ; but, inasmuch as he is the brother of the righteous dead alone, he is called in Rev. 1; 5: Co. 1; 18, "the firstborn ζ. "

(3). In Mt. 22; 23 ss. the Sadducees begin by raising the abstract question touching a resurrection. But, when Jesus enters on the subject in reply to them, we see that he contemplates it in reference to the resurrection of the righteous only; for he says; "They are as the angels of God in heaven;" and in the parallel place in Luke (20; 34); "The children of this [the sixth] ζ. marry and are given in marriage, but they who shall be accounted worthy of that [the seventh] ζ. , and of the resurrection which is from among the dead, . . . die no more; for they are equal to the angels, and are children of God, being children of the resurrection." By "that ζ. " the sabbatical or millennial ζ. must be intended. "They can die no more" corresponds to "over these the second death hath no power." "The resurrection" must, then, be "the first resurrection," and "the dead" the righteous dead.—Compare, again, the parallel place in Mk. 12; 25-27; "When they shall rise ζ. , &c.:" "τοις τοις ν., that they are raised, &c.:" "He is not a God νεκρῶν, ἀλλὰ ζωντων." Here are three connected places, in one of which the article is used, but in the others it is not. Can it be, that there is no difference between the phrases? And if not, what can the difference be, but that in the one instance the righteous dead are contemplated, and in the others the dead in general? (4). In 1 Co. 15; 29 the ques-
tion is asked; "What shall they do, who are baptized on behalf of the
dead, . . . ? Why are they then baptized on their behalf?" It is
manifest, that martyrs are spoken of; and accordingly the article is
inserted. (5). In Mt. 14; 2: 27; 64; 28; 7 it is said of John
Baptist and of Christ severally; "He is risen from the dead." From
the sentiments entertained by the speakers in reference to John and
Jesus, they must have regarded them as having been among the
righteous dead; and hence the article is used in each instance; while
in other places, where the righteous dead are not specifically contem-
plated, e.g., Lu. 16; 30, 31, the article is not found. (6). John
5; 21, 25; "The Father raiseth the dead and giveth them life:"
"The dead shall hear . . . and live." The life here spoken of is the
millennial life. Otherwise there is tautology in ve. 21. The con-
text also shows this, especially vv. 24, 29; "He that believeth . . .
hath eternal life . . . and is passed from death unto life (lit., the
life)." "They that have done good unto a resurrection of life." In
these texts, then, the righteous dead are had in view, though subse-
quently there is a transition to the dead in general.—The foregoing
texts may suffice to show, that there is a force and propriety in the
use of the Greek article, which the English idiom fails to exhibit,
and that the doctrine of a preferential resurrection of righteous dead
was prominently present to the minds of the authors of the New
Testament. Consequently it is fair to presume, that, when the
phrases, 'the dead,' or 'the resurrection' are used, without an indica-
tion in the context of any different reference, the reference is to the
righteous dead and to the premillennial resurrection. The conclu-
sions now arrived at will be strongly confirmed, and the doctrine fully
verified by certain special texts and arguments, which I proceed to
adduce.

2. In Lu. 20; 35: Acts 4; 2: Ph. 3; 11 we meet with the expres-
sion ἦν ἀναστάσις [or ἦν ἀναστάσις] ἐν νεκρων, which properly translated
is the resurrection which is from among [or out of] the dead." Two
Greek prepositions are used to denote motion from: εἰς denotes this
simply; but ἐκ is partitive, and signifies the egress of a portion,
leaving the main body behind. 'The resurrection of the dead' would
be expressed by ἦν ἀναστάσις τῶν νεκρῶν: cp. Mt. 22; 31. I hold,
therefore, that these texts afford by implication clear affirmations of
the doctrine of a select resurrection. The duplication of the prepo-
sition in Ph. 3; 11 makes that text specially emphatic. And 1 Pe.
1; 3; "by Jesus Christ's resurrection ἐν νεκρων," confirms what has
been said, as to the force of the article and of the preposition, by
showing what would be the mode of expression, in a case, in which
there can be no doubt, that there was an egress from the great body
of the dead.
3. The first and the last of the above three texts furnish an additional argument inasmuch as they imply, that a special qualification was requisite for the resurrection to which they refer:—"They who are accounted worthy of that son [the millennial], and of the resurrection from among the dead:"—"That I may know Him, and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings, sharing the likeness of His death: if by any means I might attain to the resurrection from among the dead." The doctrine of Scripture is, that all will be eventually raised; but it appears from these texts, that a resurrection was anticipated, of which some might not be accounted worthy, and which must therefore have been confined to righteous dead. St Paul seems even to imply, that participation in such sufferings as Christ endured, and in particular a martyr's death, was the requisite qualification.

4. Lu. 14; 14; "Thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just." Hab. 11; 35; "a better resurrection." A resurrection common to the righteous and the wicked could scarcely be spoken of as 'the resurrection of the just' or 'a better resurrection;' and this is rendered more certain by such a resurrection being described in Acts 24; 15 as 'a resurrection of the just and of the unjust.' The hypothesis, by which post-millennial writers seek to evade the force of this argument, namely, by supposing that, while the godly and the ungodly will be raised at one and the same time, they will be raised in two distinct classes or companies, is purely gratuitous, and a mere device to escape a difficulty. The force of any argument may be avoided, if recourse be had to unlimited conjecture to set aside the natural meaning of terms. And in this instance the hypothesis is rebutted by Mt. 13; 41, 49: 25; 32.

5. Acts 4; 2; "They preached through Jesus the resurrection from among the dead:" 17; 18; Paul "preached Jesus and the resurrection." These texts explicitly, and others by probable implication appear to show, that the preferential resurrection was a prominent topic of apostolic preaching.

6. 2 Ti. 2; 18; "Saying that the resurrection is past already." They could not have said so of the postmillennial resurrection, though they might of the premillennial, as I understand it. Hence they must have been taught the doctrine of two resurrections.

7. 1 Co. 15; 22 ss. contains references to an advent, and to two resurrections and judgments, in perfect parallelism with those described in Rev. 19; 11 to 20; 15. The following abstract and references may suffice to indicate the points of correspondence. 'As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive.' But each in his own order [rank or class]. Christ a firstfruit [in A.D. 33]. Afterwards they who are Christ's [=the confessors of Re. 20; 4] at his coming [symbolized in
Re. 19; 11 ss.]. Then the end [as symbolized in Re. 20; 11 ss.], when he shall have delivered up the [millennial] kingdom to God [at the end of the thousand years, Rev. 20; 7], when he shall have put down all rule, &c. [as in the case of Gog and Magog]. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death [Re. 20; 14; “Death,” in the last place, “was cast into the lake of fire.”].

8. Tregelles translates and interprets Dan. 12; 2 as follows; “Many from amongst the sleepers of the dust of the earth shall awake: these shall be unto everlasting life; but those (the rest of the sleepers, those who do not awake at this time) shall be unto shame, &c.”

9. A resurrection from the dead was undeniably announced and expected to take place at the next ensuing advent of the Lord. That advent was to happen in the then existing generation, as I have elsewhere shown (supra, and Guide, pp. 86 ss.), and as the following texts should suffice to prove: Mt. 24; 30–34: 10; 23: 16; 28: 1 Th. 2; 1: 4; 15: Ph. 3; 21. The resurrection connected with it must, then, have been premillennial. Some have, indeed, endeavoured to make it appear, by citing such texts as 2 Co. 4; 14: Ph. 1; 21: 3; 11, that St. Paul did not expect Christ’s advent in his lifetime. But these texts prove nothing more than that he did not expect a visible advent to terminate the existing state of things, though indeed they would not be inconsistent with the expectation, but only with the knowledge of such an advent.

10. 1 Th. 4; 14; “Them which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. . . . The dead in Christ shall be raised first.” Cp. Re. 14; 13; “Blessed the dead who die in the Lord.” Here a resurrection is spoken of, in which righteous dead alone are mentioned as having part.

11. Heb. 4; 9; “There remaineth, then, a rest ([lit. a sabbatism: marg. the keeping of a sabbath] to the people of God.” In speaking of ‘the people of God,’ the writer evidently had them in his mind as a persecuted people (see Cs. 10; 32–35: 11; 32–38: 12; 1–13); and in the term sabbath a definite period of rest is implied. This period in the present case must needs be preferential, and can only be the sabbath of the ages. Indeed, it is not at all likely, that the writer would so much labour the proof of a rest in heaven common to all the righteous, seeing, that none of those to whom he wrote can be supposed to have been ignorant of, or to have entertained any doubt about it. Hence, this statement may be taken to be equivalent to a declaration, that ‘those who have forsaken all’ for Christ’s sake shall enjoy a preferential sabbath in heaven.

The passages now cited show, that, so far from the doctrine of a first resurrection being exclusively an Apocalyptic doctrine, and one
everywhere else in Scripture explicitly opposed,' it pervades every part of the New Testament. Reserving, now, to the end of the part which relates to the millennium the hypotheses, which have been adopted to avoid recognizing in the passage under consideration a first resurrection like in kind to the second (because those hypotheses have respect to the thousand years as well as to the act of resurrection), I will briefly advert to an objection, which may perhaps be made to the view I have been advocating.

III. It may be objected, that, whatever appearance there may be, that in some passages the doctrine is taught by implication, yet there is not that direct and explicit teaching of it, which might have been expected. I answer, that such a teaching could be expected, only if the doctrine was first propounded and inculcated in the writings, which have come down to us. But this was certainly not the case. Supposing the doctrine to have been originally taught by Christ and His apostles, it was unquestionably taught orally. But there is good ground for believing, that it was a Jewish and not a Christian tenet. The Rabbins, we learn from the Zohar and other ancient Jewish books, taught the doctrine of a preferential resurrection of the just of their own nation, at least as early as the Christian era; and from several coeval works we may gather, that a belief in it was general among the Jews.* The case in this instance is similar to that of many other tenets; as, for example, the doctrines of a future state of reward and punishment, the existence of good and evil angels, and of hades, including paradise and gehenna. These doctrines were not

* Midrash Tillin, in Ps. xci. 15, *Make us glad according to the days wherein thou hast afflicted us,* adds, "By Babylon, Greece, and the Romans; and in the days of the Messiah. How many are the days of the Messiah? Rab. Eilesen, the son of R. Jose of Galilee, said; The days of the Messiah are a thousand years."—Sanhedrin, fol. 92, I. cited by the Aruch, says: "There is a tradition in the house of Elia, that the righteous, whom the holy blessed God shall raise from the dead, shall not return again to the dust; but for the space of a thousand years, in which the holy blessed God shall renew the world, they shall have wings like the wings of eagles, and shall fly above the waters."—"This is also a rabbinical mode of speech. In Erubin fol. 19, I; Chagiga, fol. 27, I: "Rab. Lakish said; 'The fire of hell hath no power over an Israelite who sins.' Rab. Elieser says; 'The fire of hell has no power over the disciples of the wise men.'" See Clarke's *Com. in loco.—"Buxtorf. de Synag. Judaic. c. xxxvi. χίλια μιλή έπη νομικής μικρούς apud Judæos: "Messias dies sunt mille anni," say the Rabbis; see the authorities cited by Mede, *Works,* Bk. v. ch. iii. p. 892; by Wetstein, *Nov. Test.* ii. p. 886, *in Apoc. xx. 2. Sex annorum millibus durabit hic mundus; veniet Messias tempore matutino milenarii sexti. Dies septimus respondet millenario viis; quod totum Sabbatum est." See Wordsworth's *Lectures,* p. 5. Compare also the extracts in my *Guide,* p. 98 ss., and *supra,* Vol. I: pp. 217, 224, 226, 228 ss., 289: Vol. II: p. 114. And see *Sib. Or.* Bk. III: vv. 686-746. a.c. 160.
first taught by Christ and His apostles; but, on the contrary, a knowledge of and belief in them was assumed by the founders of Christianity, who only corrected erroneous notions, and gave to them those sanctions, of which they greatly stood in need. And we cannot rightly expect to find a more explicit teaching, in respect of the doctrine of a preferential resurrection, than we meet with in the case of other doctrines similarly circumstanced. But who, in view of the fact, that the doctrine of a reign of the risen saints with the Messiah for a thousand years was commonly known to and received by the contemporaries of the apostles, can doubt, that the allusions in the passages which have been referred to were made to that preferential resurrection and reign?

In conclusion of my exposition of this division, the following brief paraphrase and rearrangement of its clauses will probably serve to make my view of the passage clearer.—‘I saw in the heaven thrones and the souls of those who had been beheaded on account of the testifying of Jesus; and the latter took their seats upon the former, and judgment was given by them. And, in consequence of the sentence which they gave, those who had not worshipped the beast ... entered on both the life and the reign with Christ, which is for 1000 years, and is the consequence of the first resurrection. The rest of the righteous dead enter not on the life and reign with Christ till the end of the 1000 years.’—The scene, which is presented to our view in this passage, stands related in a way of contrast to that exhibited in C. 19; 19–21. In the latter execution is done on the beast, the false prophet, and ‘the rest:’ in the former rewards are assigned to the martyrs, the confessors, and ‘the rest.’

DIV. 4. AN INTERLUDE, SETTING FORTH THE BLESSEDNESS OF THOSE WHO HAVE PART IN THE FIRST RESURRECTION.

XX; 6. 1389–92. (Blessed and holy [is] he who hath part in the first resurrection: over these the second death hath not power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years.)

This sentence has been introduced in the way of interlude (see Guide, p. 196), for the purpose of showing how great is the felicity of confessors, inasmuch as their eternal destiny was determined by the sentence, which was awarded to them the millennial life. The object of the interlude being to supplement and explain, it should be taken generally in a literal or quasi-literal sense.

1389. Blessed and holy. Ordinarily holiness comes before blessedness. Persons are happy, because they are holy. But here the order of the words seems to imply, that holy in this place denotes something higher than blessed. And if so, it must be the ‘glory’ and ‘beauty
of holiness,' that is contemplated. Cp. 14; 4; 'Who would not glorify thy name; for thou only art holy?' Each confessor is now, like his Lord, "glorious in holiness." This glory proceeds from his being made 'a priest unto God,' in whom "holiness to the Lord" is manifested in a far better way than by an inscription on a mitre. Such 'blessedness' and 'holiness' can be only that, which is enjoyed in heaven,—not that of earth. That which is the result of having part in the first resurrection is spoken of. The next clause, also, shows this; for it could be only of those, who had passed into the unseen state, that any one would think of predicating, that they were removed beyond the power of the second death. Moreover, it would make the declaration a mere truism to understand the words 'blessed and holy' in an ordinary and low sense; since every one knows, that all God's saints, and much more the most distinguished among them, are blessed and holy in a certain degree. We must then, on this account also, take the phrase as being emphatic, and affirming the highest degree of bliss and glory, that created beings are capable of.


1391-92. But, etc. The reading of Codex A gives do reign. And there is a reading of inferior authority, which substitutes after these things for with him. Codex B and some cursives insert the article before thousand.—The mode of expression in the parallel places should first be noted:—1; 6; "He hath made for us a kingship [or a kingdom],—priests to his God and Father:" 5; 10; "and hast made them to our God a kingdom and priests, and they do reign on the earth." By us in the former text confessors may well be meant; for the writer is speaking of those who were 'fellow partakers with him in the tribulation and kingdom and endurance of Jesus:' by them in the latter confessors must also of necessity be intended, as I have shown on 367. These two texts, therefore, support the view, that confessors only (that is to say, those in general who during the persecuted infancy of Christianity adhered to the profession of it) have part in the first resurrection.—With him. The pronoun being in the singular appears to indicate, that one person only had been spoken of in the preceding clause. If so, we might either understand of God and of Christ to mean of Jesus regarded in his characters of God and Mediator, or (translating of God, even Christ) suppose the Godhead to be contemplated in the person of Christ.—On this construction several differences as between this text and the two above cited are observable. This declares, that confessors 'shall be priests of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years' in heaven: those, that they 'have been made by Christ to God a kingdom and priests, and do reign on the
earth.' There is, however, nothing necessarily incompatible in the
differences. Christ, from the time of his assuming the Mediatorial
office, founded a kingdom to God, in which his faithful people were
to form a royal priesthood under him as their High Priest and King,
and into which the confessors of the apostle's time were now admitted
to reign in life with him for a thousand years; at the end of which
period those of their brethren, who should then be on the earth, would
be exalted (speaking by comparison with what the state of the con-
fessors of the apostle's time had been) to a reign on earth (see on 368).
Hence, the epoch of C. 1 ; 6 and of C. 20 ; 6 being premillennial, it
would properly be said then; 'He hath made for us a kingdom;' and,
'We shall reign with him [in heaven] for a thousand years' before the
rest of our brethren. And again, the epoch of C. 5 ; 10 being post-
millennial (say circa A.D. 1500), it might be said of the then living
professors of Christianity; 'They do reign [or rule] on the earth.'*
This statement (the chief points of difference having been fully con-
sidered and elucidated under 367) may suffice to show the consistency
one with another of the three texts. And to the same number and
to No. 23 the reader is referred for the sense, in which I understand
the principal terms,—priests, and reign with its correlative kingdom.—
The term reign can no more be taken in its strictly literal sense as
implying subjects, than the term priests can be taken to imply the sacrifice
of an animal, as the same sense would equally require. Respect
must be had here to the glory, dignity, and means of happiness pos-
sessed by kings and priests, and not to their official relations. To
guard against misapprehension, however, I think it well to observe,
that to offer prayer and praise was no part of the office of the Jewish
priests. Their function was, by the sacrifices they offered on the altars
of burnt sacrifice and incense, to symbolize the making acceptable of
the prayers and praises, which the people were offering without in
their respective courts.

Having arrived at the end of the last division that relates to the
millennium, we may here appropriately consider the various interpreta-

* Referring to the subject of the saints' reign on the earth, Stuart appears to
make it consist in 'the enthroned martyrs' seeing and rejoicing in the undis-
turbed dominion and prosperity of the Church during the millennium. On the
same topic Hengstenberg writes; "Christ reigns from the beginning of the
thousand years to their end. For, his enemies who contended with him for the
dominion, the beast, the false prophet, and the dragon, have now become his
footstool. His members take part in this dominion. They can look down with holy
pride upon the earth, wherein the church, to which they devoted their services
and their lives in times of danger and tribulation, has now become the reigning
power; so that matters proceed upon earth only in accordance with their will
resting on the will of Christ."
tions of the first resurrection and millennial reign, which have from
time to time been put forth. They are the six following. 1. A
corporeal resurrection, and personal reign with Christ on earth, of his
risen saints (which, it is generally reckoned by modern expositors,
will commence circa A.D. 1865). 2. A revival and reign on earth
of the truth, or of spiritual principles in the hearts of Christians.
3. An ecclesiastical supremacy and temporal prosperity of the Chris-
tian Church. 4. A prevalence of spiritual principles internally and
of ecclesiastical prosperity externally in the Church. 5. A reign
in heaven or an exalted celestial state of martyred saints, and perhaps
also of confessors; and, as some say, of Christians in general. 6.
A rise to a first stage of bliss in heaven. The first view was that
of Papias and of many of the earliest fathers. It has been held in all
ages, and is generally maintained by presentist expositors at the
present day. The second advent of Christ is necessarily made to be
premillennial: and thus three advents are involved; for Christ cannot
be reigning on earth during the time, when Satan shall gather the
nations from all quarters of the globe to encompass the camp of the
saints, and he is said to come to hold the general judgment symbolized
in C. 20; 11–15. The second was introduced in the fourth cen-
tury. It was most fully developed by Augustine, who dated the com-
menence of the millennium from Christ’s first advent. The
third was not suggested, until after the Reformation. Grotius and
Hammond have been its chief advocates. They place the millennium
between the establishment of Christianity by Constantine in the
fourth century and the irruption of the Turks on Christendom in the
fourteenth century. The fourth view was introduced by Whitby
in the eighteenth century, and has been advocated by Vitrings and
others, down to Faber and Whately. Its advocates generally con-
sider the millennium to be future. The following is one statement of
it more in detail. ‘It will be a period, the duration uncertain, when
Christ will reign through his truth over all nations. It will be pre-
ceded by changes in kingdoms, and by judgments on God’s enemies;
and there are indications, that the time is at hand. It will be pre-
ceded by the binding of Satan, that is, by a restraint on Satan’s
agency. It will be introduced by the outpouring of the Spirit. It
will be an era, when religious knowledge will be universally diffused.
It will be an era of just government. In it men universally will not
be converted to God.’ Faber contends for three resurrections, all
still future:—the first premillennial and figurative, consisting in a
revival of Christian principles; the second postmillennial and figurai-
tive, consisting in a revival of the principles of Antichrist; the third
literal at the general judgment. The fifth theory is that of Stuart.
He speaks of the revival of the martyr-saints as being future; but,
on his view he has no data to fix the time of its commence ment. The sixth is Hengstenberg’s view. All the five last theories make the second advent of Christ (a personal and visible one) to be post millennial. The first four, it will be observed, suppose the scene of the reign to be the earth, while the others place it in heaven. On the first, fourth, and fifth hypotheses the reign is generally supposed to be still future: those writers who adopt either of the other hypotheses (among whom will be found Eusebius (315), Origen, Jerome, Augustine (410), Ticonius (450), Luther, Bale, Bullinger, Chytræus, Marlorat, Foxe, Ribeira, Brightman, Alcassar, Pareus, Grotius, Hammond, Le Clerc, Bossuet, Welstein, Lee, Hengstenberg, and Wordsworth), refer it to the time past. Of these, one writer dates the 1000 years from the birth of Christ, another from his death, a third from the establishment of the Christian Church, a fourth from Constantine, a fifth from Charlemagne A.D. 800, but most writers place the commencing epoch within the first five centuries of the Christian era. Some consider the period to be a definite one in round numbers, but others regard it as being absolutely indefinite. Various modifications of the above theories might be mentioned, but all the different hypotheses may for substance be arranged under one or other of the classes above specified.

1. Insuperable difficulties attach to almost every particular of the pre millenarian Presentists’ theory. I have shown, that the first resurrection is correlative to the second in being an exaltation to heaven, and not a restoration to a life on earth,—that it is a raising of martyrs and confessors, but not of “the saints” generally,—that the epoch of it did, and not will, follow on the destruction of the beast,—that the coming of Christ which precedes it (19; 11) is not a visible, corporeal advent, in the human nature, but an advent in providence as Mediator and God, and consequently one invisible to human eyes,—that the binding of Satan connected with it is not “an absolute restriction of the powers of hell,”—that there is no proof, that Christ and the saints will come on earth, and “take the government for a thousand years,”—and that no such political, ecclesiastical, and spiritual state of things as that contended for is described or implied in the account of the millennium. Moreover, while there is an utter destitution of evidence in support of the tenet of a Paradisiacal state on earth, there is not wanting proof to the contrary. For, in that it is said (ve. 3), that ‘Satan should deceive the nations no more, until the thousand years should be ended,’ it is implied, that the nations or Gentiles, that is, professors of false religions, should be in existence during the entire period, who might, but for the binding of Satan, be deceived by him. And so afterwards (ve. 8), when he is described as going forth to deceive the nations and gather them together to war, it is implied
again, that they were at the end of the thousand years, and had been previously, in existence. If, then, idolatrous nations, Gog and Magog, as numerous as the sand of the sea-shore, were in existence during the thousand years, what becomes of the tenets of the Presentists, that 'all false religion had been put down,' 'the Gentiles converted,' and 'Antichrist destroyed' before the thousand years began, and that then 'a Paradisial state' was set up?

Stuart has remarked; "As to the notion of a descent to the earth by Christ and the martyrs, and their visible reign here, there is not a word in the text, nor even an implication: at least, I can find none. What a gross conception it would be to mingle celestial and terrestrial beings in one common mass! The glorified Saviour and the glorified martyrs mingling with material and perishable beings, and becoming subject again to the laws of matter. If it be said, that the earth is itself to be changed entirely at the beginning of the millennium, and to be fitted by this change for the abode of such glorious beings raised from the dead, where then, I ask, are Gog and Magog to live during this period, and nurture their hosts, "like the sands of the sea for multitude? And other men—are they still mortal beings or not? If they are, then a material world, however Eden-like, is their place of residence; for flesh and blood can inhabit no world of a different character. How then are the glorious Saviour and the glorified martyrs literally to mingle and commune with material and fleshly and perishable beings? The thing is impossible, because it is against the fundamental law of our spiritual nature. If it were not impossible, moreover, still it is utterly improbable on any ground, that the triumph and exaltation of the martyrs are to consist in their being sent back to the earth in order to resume a terrestrial existence, surrounded with sufferings and sorrows. Besides all this, there is not a word from the Apocalypticist respecting the so much talked of renovation of the earth. . . . It follows, then, that the idea of spiritual beings as coming from the abodes of the blessed, and spending a thousand years in a material world, whose organization is not substantially changed, can have no foundation but in the phantasy of the brain. It is as incongruous as to say, that God has material eyes, hands, and other organs of sense."

To the same purport Hengstenberg writes; "It should be quite sufficient to show the fallacy of such an interpretation, that it leads to a perfectly monstrous combination of things incapable of union: the church consisting of a mixture of members, partly living in mortal flesh, and partly risen and glorified—the latter abiding on the unrenewed earth, though as such only fit for the dwelling of mortal men; the risen and glorified at the end of the thousand years, entangled anew in the troubles of earth, in war and conflict, which
belong only to a present existence, and driven out of that rest from their labours which was promised them."

Postmillenarian writers of the Presentist school have advanced the following propositions as furnishing arguments against a future premillennial and approaching advent of Christ. ' (1) The Church will be absolutely complete at Christ's personal coming. (2) His coming will exhaust the object of the Scriptures. (3) The sealing ordinances of the N. T. will then disappear. (4) The intercession of Christ and the work of the Spirit will cease. (5) Christ's proper kingdom is already in being; commencing formally in his ascension, and continuing unchanged till the final judgment. (6) When Christ comes, the whole Church will be made alive at once, the dead by resurrection, the living by transformation. (7) All the wicked will rise from the dead at the coming of Christ. (8) Many texts predicate a simultaneous rising and judgment of the righteous and the wicked: see, e.g., Dan. 12; 2: Mt. 13; 37-43; 47-50; 16; 27: 22; 11: 25; 14-46: Jo. 5; 29: 6; 39 cpd. with 12: 48: Acts 17; 31: 1 Co. 15; 24-26: 2 Co. 5; 10: 1 Th. 5; 2: 2 Th. 1; 5-10: 2 Ti. 4; 1: 2 Pe. 3; 1-13: Ju. 14: Ro. 1; 7. (9) The heavens and the earth will be dissolved by fire at the coming of Christ.' [See Brown's Christ's Second Coming: will it be premillennial.] ' (10) It were incongruous, that 4000 years should precede, and only 2000 follow Christ's coming. (11) The destruction of the wicked is represented (e.g., in Mt. 13; 40-42, 49-50: 2 Th. 1; 7-10: 2 Pe. 3; 7, 10-13) as taking place at Christ's coming. (12) It is the doctrine of the Scriptures (see e.g., Mt. 13; 33: Ro. 11; 12, 15), that the nations of the world are to be converted previous to the advent. (13) There is no text, in which Christ is said to come to introduce the millennium, that is, to reign on this earth. (14) Scripture sets forth these as the purposes, for which Christ will come:—to raise the dead: to judge: to perfect the salvation of his people: to reward his servants: to punish the wicked: to cause the earth to be burnt up: and to deliver up the Mediatorial kingdom: and these purposes are inconsistent with the supposition, that he will come to introduce the millennium. (15) Christ's coming to introduce the millennium is unnecessary.' [Evangelical Magazine: Nos. 380 ss.] (16). For the saints to be brought down from heaven to earth must imply a diminution of their happiness. (17) Faber has argued thus:—"The first and second resurrections, at the commencement and at the end of the thousand years, are homogeneous. But the former may be proved to be figurative. Therefore the latter must be figurative also." Now, though I think that his argument breaks down in its minor premises, I believe that it may in respect of the principle on which it rests be reconstructed, so as to be valid against premillenarians. For, inasmuch
as it is said, that "the rest of the dead lived not again, until, &c.," it is implied (and the texts cited to prove the contrary fail to do so: cp. 6; 11), that at the end of the thousand years they would be raised to a life similar to that, to which those of the first resurrection had been raised. I mean, that if the one are to be raised to, and fitted for the life of spiritual beings in the abodes of such, it must be assumed, that the others are to be raised to the same; and so, on the other hand, if the one are to be raised to, and fitted for the life of terrestrial beings, the others must be raised to the same. Homogeneity and uniformity of interpretation require this construction. But, it is said by Elliott, that "the saints will at Christ's premillennial advent be resuscitated in the body from death and the grave, and take upon them the government of the earth." Consequently, "the rest of the dead" must be resuscitated to such a terrestrial existence. But the premillenarian theory denies this.

2–4. The foregoing remarks may suffice for the refutation of the premillenarians' theory. And I may content myself with stating more briefly the objections to the other hypotheses; because these are not to the same extent opposed to the view I advocate. The three next being based on a tropical interpretation of the resurrection and reign, the arguments which are advanced against one will, for the most part, be more or less applicable to all. And therefore, for the sake of brevity, I will include the three under one head, without being careful to distinguish as to the precise application of the arguments to the several hypotheses. And there is the less occasion for me to do so; because, while I hold that no allusion is made to the state of things on earth in vv. 4–6, I consider, that a state of comparative prosperity of the Church on earth is implied in the binding of Satan. And hence I am only concerned to disprove the spiritualizing hypothesis of Whitby, Faber, and others. Accordingly I shall have it chiefly in view.

The theory of a resurrection and reign of principles is negativized by the fact, that a reign of persons is symbolized, as the following considerations show. (1) Souls in ve. 4 is a designation of a symbol representative of persons (see on 1381). (2) In every other instance the term soul denotes or implies a person. It ought, therefore, to be taken in the same sense here, if the context will permit. But this not only permits, but requires such a sense. (3) I have heretofore shown, that the souls here have substantially the same signification as the 144 chilias, the conquerors on the sea of glass, and the armies of heaven, all which are symbols of persons. They symbolize, too, in general those, who are spoken of in C. 12; 11 as having 'overcome the dragon by the blood of the lamb and by the word of their testifying' (cp. 20; 4), and as having 'loved not their
soul unto death. Consequently they must symbolize persons. (4). Symbolical souls are described in C. 6; 9 as crying unto God. Are not these allowed to represent persons? Or how could principles be represented as crying unto God to avenge their blood, and as having white robes given to each of them, and being told, that they must remain at rest, until the number of their fellow-servants and brethren, which should be slain as they had been, should have been made complete? But, if souls in the parallel place must symbolize persons, so also must they here. (5). Acts proper to persons are here predicated. In what sense could it be said of principles, that they sat on thrones,—that judgment was given on, to, or by them,—that they had been beheaded,—that they had testified,—that they had refused to worship the beast or to receive his mark,—or that they could live and reign conjointly with a person? I conceive it to be impossible to give even a plausible interpretation of all these particulars on the spiritualizing hypothesis. If it be said, that the persons who held the principles are had in view, then the fundamental position, that persons are symbolized, is conceded: and it must be persons that rise and reign. (6). The dead must unquestionably mean a class of persons. Even if the clause in which this phrase occurs could be so interpreted as to have reference to principles, yet how could the distribution into two classes, implied in the words the rest of, be explained? What class of principles can be supposed to rise at the beginning, and what class at the end of the thousand years? (7). The argument from this clause may be put in a different form. "If the firstfruits be holy, the mass will be holy." Now the dead who are spoken of in ve. 4 are holy persons. But all holy persons are not included in this number; for martyrs and confessors only are spoken of. They constitute, then, 'the firstfruits,' of which 'the rest' form the mass. The clause, then, will import, that 'the mass of the holy dead lived not, until, &c.' And this will mean, according to the figurative hypothesis, when put into literal terms; 'The main body of holy principles revived not, until the 1000 years were ended.' But, according to spiritualizing theorists, the principles that then revived were emphatically unholy.—Suppose, however, that by 'the rest of the dead' is meant the dead of all ages, holy and unholy, except confessors, the position of Faber and others will not be improved. For then a resurrection of the great majority of mankind in all ages will be made a symbol of the prevalence of wickedness among a part of mankind in one age. Who can receive so unnatural an interpretation? (8). The symbolic souls are primarily had in view throughout the passage. And hence, if they represent principles, we may properly ask the following questions. How can principles be said to be made 'blessed and holy' by having part in the first resurrection? (9). How 'the second death,
that is, the lake of fire, to have no power over principles? (10). Or how principles be made 'priests of God?' (11). A definite period of a thousand years is assigned to the life and reign of those who are raised. But no such period of special prevalence of the spirit or the principles of the martyrs can be pointed out in past history. And the occurrence in the future of such a prevalence for just this duration, and no longer, is infinitely improbable. (12). Consistency of interpretation requires, that the same kind of things should be supposed to rise in the two resurrections. But it is clear from vv. 11–15, that persons rise in the second. So must they, then, in the first resurrection. "Any great change," says Stuart, "from a degraded and wretched condition, temporal or spiritual, may indeed be figuratively called a resurrection, a restoration to life, i.e., to happiness; but it would be out of the question to name it a first resurrection. This implies of necessity a comparison with a second, in which the first must be like the second in kind, but must precede it in the order of time. So in 1 Co. 15: 23: 1 Th. 4: 16, Paul, in giving an account of the general resurrection, declares, that 'the dead in Christ shall rise first,' i.e., before the wicked, who will also be raised [persons in both instances]. And thus it is here, when John compares the two resurrections." (13). Death (meaning the state of death) and life are correlative terms. If, then, death in this passage be allowed to have respect to persons, so life (and therefore the resurrection, which is an entering on that life) ought to be. (14). In the syllabus of the seventh trumpet (11; 18) it is said; "to give the reward (lit., the hire or wage) to thy servants." The insertion of the article implies a preferential reward; and therefore one to be given to a particular class of the risen dead. (15). The scene of this symbolization I have shown (on 1379) to be heaven; and the notion of a resurrection and reign there of the spirit or principles of the martyrs is out of the question. (16). A resurrection implies a previous death; but when or how can the martyrs' principles be said to have died? (17). To attribute a spiritual sense to this particular passage is inconsistent with the mode of interpretation adopted from the beginning to the end of the book. (18). The term resurrection being used in a parenthetical explanation ought, if the context and circumstances permit, to be taken in a literal or quasi-literal, and not in a figurative sense. (19). The N. T. Scriptures everywhere teach, that the advent of Christ was or might be then near at hand; but the opinion of those who hold, that the millennium was to precede the advent, is inconsistent with this teaching. [The following, out of a multitude of texts, may be referred to in proof of the then possible nearness, and therefore of the premillennial occurrence of the advent. Mt. 10: 23: 13; 40, 49 Gk.: 6; 27, 28: 22; 6, 7: 24; 30–34: Lu. 12; 35–40: 21; 31,
32: John 21; 23: Acts 7; 31: 1 Cor. 1; 7: 4; 5: Phil. 4; 5: 1 Th. 2; 1: 4; 15: Heb. 10; 37: James 5; 8.] (20). Faber contends, that three resurrections, the first and second figurative, but the third literal, are symbolized in Rev. 20. Now, while the descriptions of the first and third (vv. 4–6 and vv. 12–13) differ in terms, they manifestly accord in meaning, “the sea, &c. gave up the dead” being a symbolical expression, for which ‘they had part in a resurrection’ might be put as the literal equivalent. But the description of the second (vv. 7–10) does not bear the smallest resemblance in terms or apparent meaning to the others, there being in it no allusion of any kind to a resurrection. A legitimate inference, then, surely is, that it is the first and third that are like in kind, and that the second is diverse from them: and, if so, and if figurative and literal resurrections be indeed symbolized, a comparison of the passages can leave no doubt, that the latter must be had in view in the first and third descriptions, and not in the second.—Here let me take occasion to show, how Faber’s argument cited above may be turned against his own view. He says; “The first and second resurrections at the commencement and at the end of the thousand years are homogeneous. But the former may be proved to be figurative. Therefore the latter must be figurative also.” And, I add, not figurative in any sense that the expositor may choose to adopt, but figurative in the same sense as in the former instance. Now Faber makes the first resurrection to consist in a revival of Christian principles. The second then, to be homogeneous, ought to consist in a similar resurrection in ‘the rest’ of the world, who had been previously ‘dead’ in the same sense of the word that those who had part in the first resurrection had been dead, that is, dead to Christian principles. But, so far is this from being the case, that, on the contrary, a revival of antichristian principles is found, according to Faber’s own showing, to be symbolized; and no similar revival of Christian principles is exhibited at all! (21). From the introduction in close proximity of “the first resurrection” and “the second death,” we may reasonably suppose, that they are meant to be brought to view as standing in some relation to one another. And this relation, whatever it be, may probably enable us to arrive at a more satisfactory conclusion as to the nature of the first resurrection.—But we must, in the first instance, proceed circumspectly in endeavouring to ascertain wherein the relation is made to consist; since the precise point of relation between these connected terms may readily be misapprehended. For instance: if (as some have done) we concluded, that, because the first resurrection is a resurrection of the righteous only, the second resurrection must be a resurrection of the wicked only, we should fall into error; as the parallel though inverted case of the first and second deaths may suffice to show. ‘Resurrection,’ it should be borne in
mind, is not the correlate of ‘death.’ Neither is ‘life,’ properly speaking. But ‘birth’ is the correlate of ‘death.’ Much ambiguity of expression, and consequent confusion of ideas arises, in part from the partially accordant and partially opposed nature of the things spoken of, and in part from the varying use, sometimes in a literal sense and sometimes in a figurative, of the several related terms. It will, therefore, be worth while to define the terms accurately, first, in their literal and then in their figurative meanings, and to show their relations and bearings. [1]. Now, ‘birth,’ used alone, means the first birth. It presupposes a state of non-existence, and expresses, as applied to man (who alone comes in question here), the entering of a being, consisting of an immortal soul and a mortal body, on a terrestrial state of existence. This compound nature of man necessarily involves two consecutive states of existence. [2]. Hence, ‘life’ is used to denote the first life, which is an animal life, limited to this earth. [3]. The temporal nature of this life involves ‘death,’ —the first death, which transmits the body to the dust, and the soul to the realms of the departed, called in Scripture “Hades.” [4]. But Scripture explicitly teaches, that ‘all men shall rise again with their bodies.’ And this general resurrection is symbolized, in respect of those who lived under the first Dispensation, in Rev. 20; 12, 13. In vv. 4—6, however, the entering on a new life of some who had died, and who are described as having been martyrs and confessors, is symbolized as taking place a thousand years previous to the general resurrection. And the entering on this new life is designated “the first resurrection.” The first resurrection then, we learn, is a preferential entering of confessors of Christ on the life and reign with Christ. [5]. The second resurrection, as we learn from Rev. 20; 11—15, is the living again, in their reunited souls and spiritualized bodies, of the remainder of the righteous, and of all the wicked. At the general judgment which ensues, these are separated into two classes, and consigned to two separate spheres of existence. [6]. The righteous enter on that life of bliss in heaven, to which the confessors had previously been admitted. This, in reference to the life on earth, and in contrast to the state of the wicked, may be called the second life. In Scripture it is designated “the life eternal,” — a phrase, in which the term life merges its proper sense in that, which alone renders its eternal duration a blessing, namely, celestial bliss. [7]. The wicked are consigned to “the lake of fire.” “This, the lake of fire, is the second death.” This life in hell is called ‘death,’ in part to denote that it is a passing from a higher to a lower state of existence, and in part because the contrast of the term with that, which is ‘life’ in the highest sense,—the eternal life, causes it to convey, more forcibly than any other expression would do, an idea of the
misery which characterizes that state. Here it should be observed, that there is an accurate correspondence between the first death and the second death, inasmuch as in neither is there an extinction of existence. In both alike the ceasing to live is relative, not absolute. By the first death a man ceases to live in relation to earth and its pleasures, and passes into the separate state: by the second death he ceases to live in relation to heaven and its happiness, and passes into a state of unmitigated torment. Now it is reasonable to look for a similar correspondence between the first life and the second or resurrection-life. In both men ought to be the subjects of the life; and the former should be a life in relation to earth, but the latter in relation to heaven. But if this be the case, we shall find no place, on the literal acceptation of the terms, for a resurrection, which is not one of men to a new state of existence, but consists merely in a change of principles or sentiment,—still less, for one which lies only in a state of greater prosperity.—Let us, then, advert to the figurative use of the terms in question. [1]. The fall of man entailed an alienation of the human race from God. This alienation, though not a death in the proper sense of the term, has been figuratively designated 'death,' and has been described distinctively as 'spiritual death,' and as 'a death in trespasses and sins.' But this figurative death can scarcely have a place in a passage, which speaks of the final death as 'the second death'; for it is clear, that this cannot be the first or natural death. And if not the figurative death, it is not likely, that its correlate, the figurative resurrection, should have. [2]. Again, the doctrine of redemption implies the return of a portion of the human race from their natural state of alienation from God. And this reconciliation to God is figuratively designated in Scripture, not a 'resurrection,' but a 'new birth' or the 'being born again' or 'regenerated.' Hence it is reasonable to conclude, that, when the term 'resurrection' is used, this spiritual change from a death in trespasses and sins is not had in view. Moreover, as the term 'regeneration' is not and could not be used to denote a change from a better to a worse spiritual state, so neither can the term 'resurrection' be so used, directly or by implication. These two, —'a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness,' are the only instances, in which any of the terms in question are used figuratively. And, far from lending any countenance to the opinion, that by 'the first resurrection' a spiritual revival is meant, they rather show, that such cannot be the case.—From the review we have now taken, we may more clearly discern one reason, why the first resurrection and the second death have been brought into close connexion one with another in this passage, namely, to indicate a contrast between them in respect of the one being an exaltation of a class of men to a life of the highest bliss,
and the other a consignment of another class to a life of the utmost misery. Such a contrast could not be made as between a class of tenets or principles, and a class of persons. And we may therefore presume, that the former cannot have been had in view here. (22). C. 21; 9 furnishes us with the contrast to C. 20; 6. And if it cannot be doubted, that the final doom of the ungodly is had in view, when it is said; "The fearful, &c. shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death," it ought not to be denied, that the full bliss of the godly is contemplated, when it is said; "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: over such the second death hath no power." (23). "The souls, and not the spirits of the martyrs, are spoken of. But the word soul is constantly used in connexion with whatever is most strictly personal; while the word spirit is constantly employed, where there is a federal or vicarious meaning. Thus John came in the spirit of Elias; but it would do violence to every rule of Scripture language to say, that he came with or in the soul of Elias. The latter word occurs in the N. T. more than a hundred times, and, with two exceptions at the most, always denotes what is exclusively and strictly personal." (24). "The prophecy predicates a life of the souls, or of the martyrs to whom they belong. Now by the life of the soul is meant, in the general usage of Scripture, its natural life or union with the body. Hence the life of the souls here mentioned must imply a bodily resurrection:" Birks. Op. 1 Cor. 15; 44-46 in the Greek.

The theory of a spiritual millennial reign being inseparably associated with the doctrine of a postmillennial advent of Christ, to disprove the latter is to refute the former. Now the following arguments have been advanced by premillenarians (chiefly by Birks) to establish their view. (1). The only advents of Christ that are symbolized precede the millennial passage. (2). No intimation is found in the N. T. Scriptures of the intervention of a thousand years before the advent. (3). The descriptions given of the state of the Church previous to the advent are opposed to such an intervention. The rest of the Church from trouble is only, "when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed." (4). All the passages, which refer to the subject, are either tacitly or explicitly opposed to such an intervention. See Mt. 7: 21-22: 10; 23: 13; 24-30, 36-42: 19; 28: 24: Lu. 12: 31-46: 17; 20-28: 19; 11-24: Jo. 21; 22: Acts 3; 19: 1st and 2d Thess.: 1 Cor. 1: 6: 10; 11: 15; 22-26: Ro. 11: 26.

On the whole, I think I am justified in saying, that it is scarcely possible to conceive a case, in which an hypothesis could be more clearly rebutted by every detail of the passage, or by a greater variety of extraneous considerations, than this is. Such being the case, the reader may be curious to know on what ground the theory can be
maintained. And I will therefore briefly cite and examine the argument of one of the most recent advocates of a tropical interpretation. But, having had mainly in view hitherto the hypothesis of the futurist spiritualizers, I will now quote from the work of a preterist millenarian.

Wordsworth writes to this effect (Lectures, p. 53 ss.): 'It is said the souls, not the bodies of the saints. Again, it is not said lived again, but lived. Hence, not a corporeal, but a spiritual resurrection must be had in view: a quickening from death in sins (Ep. 2; 1). The first resurrection is “a death unto sin, &c.”—our incorporation into the body of Christ (1 Co. 12; 13: Ep. 1; 22: Co. 1; 24: 2; 12: 2 Co. 5; 14: Jo. 11; 25: 14; 10: 8; 52). It is called our first resurrection; because it precedes the resurrection of the body; and because it is the opposite of the second death. There must be, not merely new birth, but a new life. This is the first resurrection.'—On this I observe, 1st, that Wordsworth appears to take the term souls either in a literal or in a spiritual sense; whereas it is plainly used symbolically (see on 1381). It does not here stand opposed to bodies, but on the contrary denotes a symbol, which represents the saints' glorified bodies as reunited to their previously disembodied spirits. So that his inference against a corporeal resurrection is unfounded. 2dly, Even if this were not the case, with what propriety can souls be taken to mean principles, so that a resurrection of souls should be interpreted to mean such a change of sentiments as in Scripture language is termed 'a new birth unto righteousness?' There is no real connexion between souls and spiritual in the significations, in which the terms are used in the above extract, though any plausibility, which this hypothesis may seem to have, rests on the assumption of such a connexion. The truth is, that there is a latent sophistry arising from the imperceptible sliding of the different meanings of the words into one another. Because souls and spirits are sometimes used in much the same sense, it is tacitly assumed, that souls must be used as equivalent to spirits, though the corresponding Greek terms are used in the Apocalypse in distinct significations, as a comparison of the examples will show: see, e.g., on 742, 906. Next, spirits in the plural is assumed to have the same sense as spirit in the singular. [And hence, through these two steps, "the spirit of the martyrs" is commonly used as if it were an equivalent for "the souls of the martyrs." ] Yet such an identification will by no means hold good, as the phrase in letter and in spirit may suffice to show. Then, spiritual is taken to be identical as an adjective with spirit as its substantive, though this also does not of necessity follow. Spiritual, as used in this theory, is opposed to 'carnal, sensual, devilish;' and can be applied only to those who are righteous: whereas a spirit or soul may
be carnal, sensual, devilish, and damned; and thus even a contrariety between the terms may exist. 3dly, Why Wordsworth should allege, that it is not said lived again or revived I cannot understand, seeing that he immediately uses equivalent terms, viz., 'resurrection,' 'quickening.' No doubt, the expression in the clause referred to is lived, because the new life which ensues on the revival (improperly called by him a "new birth") is here had in view. But then the term resurrection occurs immediately afterwards in the same connexion. 4thly, From the manner in which the long line of texts is quoted it might be supposed, that they furnish proofs of the assertion, that "the first resurrection is a death unto sin, &c.;" whereas they prove nothing of the kind. They merely show (what every one knows), that there are such things spoken of in Scripture as a death in sins and an incorporation into Christ, but they do not in any way connect with these the first resurrection: they leave Wordsworth's statement as a mere unsupported assertion. And here let it be observed, that while the figure of a death in sins and a being made alive unto God is used in Scripture, the term resurrection itself is never used in a figurative sense. New birth is, as I have shown, the appropriate figurative term for that spiritual change which Wordsworth contemplates; and if resurrection were also used to denote that change, it would tend to produce confusion. 'A regeneration in spirit,' and 'a resurrection of spirits' (if the term resurrection could properly be used in a literal sense in reference to spirits or souls), would be the appropriate modes of expression. 5thly, Precedence in point of time merely is not a sufficient reason for this being called 'the first resurrection.' If it were, then a rising up of any kind, even to a rising from a seat, might be designated, in relation to the final resurrection, the first resurrection. But it is obviously necessary, that the two things, which are brought into correlation by the words first and second, should be co-ordinate: both must be bodies, or both souls; both persons, or both principles. 6thly, In so far as 'the first resurrection is the opposite of the second death,' an argument is thereby furnished against Wordsworth's view, as I have just shown. 7thly, A resurrection implies, not only a previous death, but also a life preceding that death; but Wordsworth's view, though it presupposes a state of death, does not admit of a preceding life in the individuals, of whom he predicates the resurrection.

5. With the fifth theory I agree, except in respect of the millennium being future, and also of all saints having part in the first resurrection; and on these two points I have already said all that appears to be necessary.

6. Hengstenberg's statement of his view is as follows. "The Apocalypse points to a double stage of blessedness—the one awaiting
believers immediately after their departure out of this life; the other
what they are to receive, when they enter the new Jerusalem ("their
future inheritance on the glorified earth"): cp. 6; 11: 14; 13: 19;
9: &c. In the doctrine of a double stage of blessedness the Saviour
himself took the lead. He refers to the first in Lu. 23: 43: John
14; 2, 3: 13; 36; 17; 24. The latter is referred to in Mt. 19: 28:
John 5; 25 se.: 6; 39, 40. There can be no doubt, that by the first
resurrection we are here primarily to understand that first stage of
blessedness ("the blessedness of heaven"). Now I am not concerned
to deny, that a twofold state of bliss hereafter,—one degree (in hades)
preceding, and the other (in heaven) following the reunion of the
body to the soul, is an Apocalyptic and Scriptural doctrine: in fact,
this doctrine is the basis of my view. But what I must deny is, that
this doctrine is rightly held by Hengstenberg, or rightly introduced
in this place. Agreeing with him, that those who were raised in the
first resurrection were raised to a higher life, the questions still
remain; Who were raised? What was the epoch of the resurrection?
And what the specific nature of the life? Now I have shown, that
the two resurrections are resurrections (the second inclusively) of two
classes or companies of persons to the same celestial bliss, the one
occurring at the beginning and the other at the end of the thousand
years; and consequently they cannot be successive elevations of one
and the same body to different degrees of bliss. And in corroboratio
of this view it has been shown, and will appear more fully hereafter,
that it is not true, that "the rest of the dead in ve. 5 are the godless
dead," nor yet that "the judgment in vv. 12, 13 is held only on the
ungodly." And as to the epoch of the first resurrection;—if it be (as
Hengstenberg says) "the uniform doctrine of the Apocalypse, that
substantially the heavenly glory had been communicated to the
departed saints at an earlier period, indeed at their departure out of
this life," with what propriety can these saints be said to live and
reign with Christ a thousand years in heavenly glory, if (as he also
says) 'the commencing era of the thousand years may most suitably
be fixed at the first Christmas-eve of the year 800'? Other argu-
ments might be advanced against this hypothesis; but I cannot think,
that it is likely to meet with a reception, that would make it worth
while to devote more space to its refutation. Who, e.g., will receive
the saying, that the second resurrection will consist in a descent of the
righteous from heaven to earth? And this in order to increase of bliss!

In now bringing to a conclusion my remarks in reference to the
last two divisions, I will lay before the reader a summary view of
what I take to be the true interpretation of the millennial passage,
under the several heads of the places, to which directly or by impli-
cation the text relates.—On earth, in consequence of the binding of

Vol. II.
Satan, men are delivered from those direct personal possessions by the devil to which they had previously been exposed, and the nations or Gentiles no longer have the power to persecute the Church of Christ. As a necessary consequence, the Church enjoys a state of comparative peace and prosperity. I say comparative; for it is obvious, that this new state is described as one of degree, in reference to those which preceded and followed it, and not as one of absolute and complete change. This improved earthly condition is represented as continuing a thousand years, and no longer. And accordingly, whether it be supposed to commence from the era of the destruction of the Jewish power, or from that of the heathen, there ought to be found at the expiration of a thousand years a new outbreak of hostilities against the Church and of persecution of the saints.—In heaven, those Christian confessors, who had suffered from the persecutions of heathen Rome, are represented as being exalted to a millennium of sacred bliss and royal glory, which is granted to them as a special reward in the way of precedence over their brethren, and as an anticipation of that state of happiness, which, as saints merely, they would have entered upon only at the end of the soon.—In hades, the number of the righteous is diminished by the removal of those, who had been confessors, to a glorified state in heaven. With this exception, the abodes of the departed undergo no change, until the end of the millennium.—It thus appears, that, in two cases out of three, the history has respect to regions unknown to man. Everything that is said in reference to these must be matter of pure revelation; and consequently, with regard to all the statements relating to them, man must be wholly incapable of forming any a priori opinion.

I may appropriately introduce here two or three extracts from Hengstenberg's work in reference to objections or rather prejudices, which may be entertained against my view of the terrestrial millennium in common with his.—"Strange truly," he says, "is the prejudice against the view we have propounded of the thousand years' reign, as if it took from us somewhat of our consolation! as if it were fitted to overthrow our hope! On the contrary, it is very consolatory for us to know, that we have the thousand years already behind us; therefore, before us, not the mere glimmering, but the clear day—not the preliminary victory, which is again to be succeeded by a heavy reverse, but the final conquest."—Again he says, in reference to the existence of the papacy as an objection to the millennium being placed in the time past; "The papacy can only then be regarded, after an unhistorical mode of viewing it (against which Luther himself protested, when he was not carried away by the spirit of controversy), as standing on a level with ancient and modern heathenism. It is this very mode of
viewing it, unhappily wide-spread and deeply rooted in former times, which has especially led to the abandoning of the historical ground, in determining the position of the thousand years, and flying off to the future. The thought has also had much influence, which is expressed by Bengel at p. 581, “Those make far too little of the matter, who understand the thousand years of something that is past, and consequently something quite insignificant.” He who looks thus upon the past in the Christian Church, at the same time cuts up, without perceiving it, the root of a living and reasonable hope for the future. If the word, “Lo I am with you always, even to the end of the world,” has been kept so badly in the past, it will be foolish to expect, that it should suddenly begin in the future to receive a glorious fulfilment.”—Again, although Hengstenberg’s theory in reference to the first resurrection differs materially from mine, I can fully adopt the following remarks in reference to vv. 4–6. “This section contains nothing that belongs to the earth, and on the fulfilment of which history could give us its report. It rather leads us from the earth, and from the triumph which has been granted on earth to the cause and the servants of Christ, to heaven, that we may see there the glory of those, who had departed before the beginning of the thousand years,—who were slain for the word of God and the testimony which they had, and who loved not their lives to the death.”

DIV. 5. THE LOOSING OF SATAN AND ITS CONSEQUENCES.

XX; 7–8. 1398–99. And when the thousand years are ended, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison-hold; and shall go forth to deceive the nations, which are in the four corners of the earth, the Gogrians and the Magogrians, the number of whom is as the sand of the sea—to gather them together unto the war.

In this division the writer still keeps, in imagination, the same chronological standpoint at the commencement of the thousand years, that he had occupied in the preceding divisions; and thence he announces, by way of preparation for the symbolization, what will take place at the end of the millennium.—“This,” says Hengstenberg, “is properly the only instance in the Apocalypse, in which the future as such is announced beforehand: while John elsewhere, and here also again in ve. 9, only describes what he has seen and heard.” But see C. 10; 6, 7: 11; 2 ss.: 14; 9 ss.: 17; 13: 18; 21 ss.: 21; 4, 7.

1393. Some copies read, And after the thousand years Satan, &c.—The reference involved in the article would grammatically be made, rather to the thousand years of ve. 6, than to that of vv. 2, 3. Nevertheless, the subject-matter and the locality show, that the latter has been had prominently in view; though doubtless both are included in
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the reference, inasmuch as vv. 1–3 and vv. 4–6 contain as it were two parallel lines, the one relating to earth and the other to heaven, and both finding a terminus in ve. 7 (see on p. 394).

1394. Satan shall be loosed. We may reasonably expect, that the nature of Satan’s loosing here must be correlative to his binding, and congeneric with his previous special advent on the earth (cp. on 1373–74). Not that it is to be expected, that the three should be in all respects alike in kind; but we may fairly anticipate, that they would have some characteristic in common. Now Satan was bound in two ways,—in respect of the extraordinary powers, which had been accorded to him for a special purpose,—and in respect of the power of stirring up the heathen to persecuting assaults on the Church. The former having been special to serve a temporary purpose, a loosing again in respect of it is not to be looked for; but we may rightly anticipate only a liberty to let loose his hosts in hostile attacks on the Church.—Stuart gives as the ‘sentiment’ of the passage; “The last mighty struggle against Christianity will be made by many barbarous nations, who will put forth most strenuous efforts to destroy it, and will actually bring it into great danger.” This struggle, as also the advent of C. 19; 11–21, Stuart supposes to be still future; and he interprets C. 20; 11–15 of a future judgment, and C. 21 of the state of the righteous in heaven. Of course he severs the chronological continuity by an unknown, but certainly a vast interval.—Hengstenberg, on the other hand, places the millennium between A.D. 800 and 1800, and supposes our present standpoint to be in this short Gogian period, just previous to the general judgment, and the immediately ensuing state of terrestrial bliss in the new Jerusalem.—Out of his prison. See on 118, 1196.—The Greek word for prison is the same that is used by S. Peter, when speaking (1 Pet. 3; 19) of “the spirits in prison,” to whom Christ preached; but it is not the same, that he uses (2 Pet. 2; 4) in reference to the angels that sinned. Those angels, he says, were “cast down to Tartarus, and delivered into chains of darkness to be reserved for judgment.” By Tartarus he doubtless meant the same dark abode, of which S. Jude speaks (ve. 6), saying, in reference to the same angels, that, “He hath reserved them in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day.” The Tartarus of the heathen corresponded to the abyss of the Jews: while prison is manifestly a generic term, applied by John to the abyss, but by Peter to hades-proper (see Vol. I.: p. 11). That Satan’s prison was the abyss, and not the lake of fire, is an indication, that it was not intended to symbolize ‘an absolute restriction of the powers of darkness.’

XX; 8. 1395. And shall go forth to deceive. I have shown (see on 1376–78), that the being loosed and the deceiving are, as to their ulti-
mate meaning, identical, or at any rate the one implies the other.—
The nations. The heathen or Gentiles in the widest sense of the
term, as inclusive of all professors of false religions, must here as else-
where be meant: see on 1376.

1396. Which are in the four corners of the earth. The Greek word,
which in the A. V. of this text is rendered quarters, is in C. 7; I
translated corners. Now there appears to be a peculiar significancy
in the term, which is lost sight of, when the Greek word is rendered
quarters. To understand accurately the idea conveyed by it, we must
call to mind the opinions of the eastern nations respecting the shape
of the earth; for to these the description is doubtless accommodated.
Now it may be inferred from the notions, which prevailed among the
Arabians (see Lane’s Arabian Nights), that the opinion generally en-
tertained was, that the world is surrounded on every side by a circular
boundary of inaccessible mountains. Beyond these is the country of
Yajooy and Majooj, which, as it was supposed to occupy “the four
corners of the earth,” may be thought to have thrown the external
shape of the world, i.e., the land, into the form of a square (the
mathematical symbol of universality), the four corners pointing to the
cardinal points, whence the winds proceeded (7; 1). Be this as it
may, the country of Yajooy and Majooj, or else their gathering-place,
is laid down in Arabian maps as occupying parts of Europe and Asia
to the north-east of Palestine. In that direction (as will also appear
presently from other authorities) was placed the only point of egress
from the land of Yajooy and Majooj; and hence in that quarter would
necessarily be the gathering-place. The accessible defile was closed
in, however, by a rampart, on which El-Khidr and Ilyas (Elijah) were
believed to keep guard by night in order to prevent the eruption of
Yajooy and Majooj. Such were the opinions entertained by the
Easterns. And in accordance therewith, the nations from the four
corners of the earth are to be conceived of as having been gathered
together by Satan in the direction of the steppes of Tartary, and
thence issuing forth over the plateau of the earth or land of the sym-
bolical world. Hengstenberg, however, contends, that the four corners
of the earth “is all one with the whole earth even to its four corners.”
And doubtless the phrase may be and is so used, when the idea is that
of extending from the centre to the corners. But such is not the case
here. The conception is of an irruption from the corners to the
centre as in the case of the winds, C. 7; 1. Starting from the ex-
tremities of the earth, the Gogians emerge from their point of egress,
and spread over the entire breadth of the earth. The mode of expres-
sion in this place differs from that in the texts referred to by Heng-
stenberg (as, e.g., Ju. 20; 2; “the corners of the whole people”):
here Gog and Magog are said to dwell in the four corners, which must
be meant in contradistinction from the breadth of the earth which they invade.

1397. The Gogians and the Magogians. Magog is mentioned in Gen. 10; 2 as a son of Japhet. Elsewhere the word is found only in Ez. Ca. 38, 39, in which passage it means a land or country, of which Gog is the prince. With it are associated Meshach and Tubal, which gives us a clue to the locality of Magog; for those two countries lie between the Euxine and Caspian seas, or at the south-east extremity of the Euxine sea. Jerome says of Magog, that it means "Scythian nations, fierce and innumerable, who live beyond the Caucasus and the lake Maeotis, and near the Caspian sea, and spread out even onward to India." Theodoret also says of Gog and Magog, that "they are Scythian nations." The Arabian writers are full of the mention of Yajouj and Majouj (as they pronounce the name); and the opinion can be traced among them, that Gog and Magog were the eastern Scythians. From a Syriac poem, written by a Jacobite Christian probably about the end of the sixth century, the following particulars relating to Gog and Magog are taken. The writer assumes, that Alexander the Great built a wall in a pass of the northern ridge of mountains (the Caucasian), so as to prevent an irruption of Gog and Magog from that quarter. Subsequently he represents Gog and Magog as assembling in such multitudes as to cover the earth with their forces. God Himself interposes, opens the gate, and lets in upon the countries of the southern region the countless hosts of Gog. "In the 7000th" [year], says the author, "in which the heavens and the earth shall be destroyed, there shall come forth armies from their countries." He then goes on to describe the dreadful ravages and slaughter, which their innumerable hosts shall make, until the earth is entirely desolated. Mohammed gives in the Koran an account very similar to this. The conclusion of it is, that, in the last period of the world, God will throw down the wall which Alexander built, and give free access to the barbarian hordes. When they have done their work of destruction, they, with all other infidels, will be turned into Gehenna. It is only at the end of time, according to the Koran, that an opening will be made for Gog and Magog to come from all the lofty mountains, i.e., the Caucasian ridge.—These two accounts in all probability were not derived the one from the other, but both from a widely-spread tradition. If they had their origin in Apocalyptic interpretations, they are of great interest, as showing what were the earliest views taken of this passage. If they had not, they are no less useful to show what were the ideas generally entertained at a very early period respecting Gog and Magog, their habitat, and the duration of the world. The whole evidence, taken together, can leave no room for doubt, that by Gog and Magog the apostle under-
stood to be meant vast hordes of barbarians occupying remote and unexplored districts beyond the mountainous country to the far north-east of Palestine. — It may be worth while to observe, that such a wall as that spoken of is actually in existence. It is still called the wall of Gog and Magog, and according to the universal tradition of the inhabitants extends from the Caspian to the Euxine sea.

The historical summary contained in the last paragraph is abridged from Stuart's 'Inquiry respecting Gog and Magog.' To it I will append the opinions of two or three other writers. In the Sibyl, Or. Bk. III (circa B.C. 30) the land of Gog is placed in Ethiopia. 'Josephus, however, renders the Hebrew word Magog by the Greek for Scythians. So also does Jerome: while Suidas uses that for Persians—a difference that matters but little in the main question, since Scythians, in the ancient authors, is but a collective name for northern and but partially-known tribes.' 'Michaelis thinks, that Magog denotes those vast tracts of country to the north of India and China, which the Greeks call Scythia, and we Tartary. The Arabs call the Chinese wall; 'The mound of Gog and Magog.' Agag in Nu. 24; 7 is supposed to be a corruption for Gog, a common name of the princes of some powerful people. Mede supposes the Turks or Mahometan powers in general to be meant.

On the whole, we may conclude, that Gog and Magog was a name given to the barbarous nations, lying beyond the boundaries of the civilized world in any direction. But, as the irruptions known to the sacred writers came from the north-east, these nations were believed to have a 'gathering-place' in that direction. Such appears to have been the origin of the symbolical designation before us. Of course we are not to expect, that the peoples symbolized will bear the name of Gog and Magog any more than Rome bore the name of Babylon. Nor is there any ground for supposing, that apostates from Christianity are symbolized. How, indeed, could the peoples living beyond the limits of the Christianized or civilized world, ever have become Christians? Or if they had, what could have seduced those in particular, who lived in the four corners of the earth, to apostatize all on a sudden, and in a body? But, indeed, they are described under the generic name of Gentiles or heathen, which is enough to show, that apostate Christians cannot be denoted. What we may reasonably expect to find is peoples, who, in their aspect, manners, and religion, were esteemed by those whom they invaded fierce, barbarous, and heathenish,—peoples coming from the same direction as Gog and Magog, and swarming over the land in countless numbers.

1398. To gather them together unto the war. The B. T. and Griesbach omit the article before war; but it is authorized by A and B, and about thirty cursives, and received in some of the best editions.
Admitting its genuineness, no reference to any previous mention of this war is necessarily made; since the article may be, and doubtless is here used to characterize this as a very notable war. This is the war per excellence,—Satan’s last struggle with the sword.—The sentence reads best, when the next clause is placed before this, as in the translation above. This clause stands in a kind of opposition with 1395, showing wherein the deceiving consisted, or the result of it.

1399. The number of whom, &c. Cp. on 849.—The host of the Canaanites (Jo. 11; 4), the camels of the Midianites (Ju. 7; 12), and the Philistines (1 Sa. 13; 5) are severally said to have been as the sand of the sea. These examples may serve to guard against understanding the simile too literally.

DIV. 6. THE INVASION AND DESTRUCTION OF GOG AND MAGOG.

XX; 9. 1400-4. And they went up on the breadth of the earth; and encompassed the camp of the saints, and the beloved city. And fire came down out of the heaven from God, and devoured them.

1400. Here we observe, that the seer has changed his standpoint. Previously it was placed at the commencement of the millennium; and thence he announced, as it were prophetically, what would take place until the end of the thousand years. Now it is transferred to the end of the Gogian period, whence he relates retrospectively what he saw in his Vision during that period.—"Going up is used of any warlike expedition, because the object of it appears a height to be ascended and taken."—The breadth denotes the entire extent: cp. Ha. 1; 6: also C. 11; 8: 21; 16, 21.—Of the earth. We ought, here as elsewhere, to conceive of the land of the symbolical world as being primarily intended. Then this will denote in the secondary and true sense the territory of the people of God. The terms connected with this will be seen to support this view.

1401-2. And encompassed, &c. In the centre of the territory of the saints the metropolis is supposed to be situated. This is termed the beloved on account of the sentiments, which the Lord entertains towards its inhabitants. Whether by the accompanying term is meant a citadel within the city, or a camp around it, is not certain. The natural order of the terms,—the land, the camp, the city, is in favour of the latter construction. In the following texts the same Greek word is used. Acts 21; 34; ‘The chief captain commanded Paul to be carried into the castle.’ He. 13; 11; ‘The bodies . . . are burnt without the camp.’ The former supports the one construction, the latter the other. On either view the things spoken of stand to the country in the relation of its last means of resistance: so that, when the land is overrun, and either the camp in the one case or the city in the other is encompassed by an enemy, the very existence of the
nation is placed in peril; and its only hope lies in such exquisitive succour being brought as may avail to raise the siege. Hence the meaning of the symbolization will be the same on either construction, the symbolization denoting, that the very existence of the thing symbolized is put in jeopardy.—Whether distinct significations are to be assigned to the camp and the city may admit of doubt. Possibly the one may represent the external form and polity, and the other the essentials: or the one the political, and the other the ecclesiastical constitution.—As to the thing generally signified, I can agree with Hengstenberg, that it is the Christian Church. The designation, 'the beloved city,' can at this epoch have no other meaning. But I cannot agree with him, that Jerusalem is the symbol. There is no ground for such an assertion. And it is highly improbable, that a city, which at the epoch of the symbolization had long perished, should have been introduced thus as a symbol. If it had been, why should not its proper name have been used? Possibly the case of Jerusalem, in respect of its destruction, may have been had in view as a prototype to a certain extent. Cp. Lu. 19; 43 ss.; 'The days shall come upon thee, that thine enemies shall . . . compass thee round, &c.' So far the cases are similar. And if it was not added, in respect of the beloved city, 'And they shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down,' it was only (as the symbolization goes on to show), because the overruling providence, which the Lord exercises over His Church, was to interpose for her deliverance.

1403-4. And fire came down, &c. A flash of lightning is manifestly contemplated primarily. When any one is struck down by lightning, it seems as though God opened the heaven, and struck the blow immediately by his own hand (cp. Ps. 18; 14: 144; 6; 'Cast forth thy lightning, and tear them'). And hence we may conclude, that the essence of the symbolization is the representation of a special interposition of Providence.—As neither Gog and Magog, nor the earth, nor the camp, nor the city, is to be taken in a literal sense, so neither is the fire from heaven. All that may be intended is, that by a Divine interposition the heathenish nations were arrested in their victorious course, and an end put to their further progress. The power to make inroads on the camp of the saints to any greater extent was taken from them; and the fiat sent forth, that they should be devoured by a slow, consuming fire, inherent in their own system.—The wording of the clause, as well as the correspondence of the occurrence, show, that Ge. 19; 24 has been had in view as a prototype: "The Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven." "From the allusion to Ge. 19; 24," says Hengsten-
berg, “it is clear, that nothing is here indicated respecting the form of the judgment. What appears to refer to it belongs to the ancient type.”—Fire, in like manner, was said (11; 5) to proceed from the two testifiers, and devour their enemies; and, in a different symbolic sense, the second beast was said (18; 13) to cause fire to come down from heaven: see on 715, 898. Cp. 2 Kgs. 1; 10, 12: Is. 29; 6: Ezr. 39; 6. So also at the end of the passage cited on p. 115 from the Asc. Ezech it is said, that, previous to the general judgment, ‘The ungodly shall be devoured by fire, which issues from the Beloved.’ And in 4 Ezra 13; 10 the Messiah ‘breatheth forth fire and consumes his adversaries.’ The last symbolization, however, seems to have more points of resemblance to the premillennial advent (19; 11–21) than to that, which precedes the general judgment. For example. “That man [the Messiah] waxed strong with the thousands of heaven (19; 14). And when he turned his countenance to look, all things trembled, that were seen under him (19; 12). And whosoever the voice went out of his mouth, all they burnt that heard his voice, like as the earth faileth, when it feeleth the fire (19; 15: 20; 9). And lo! there was gathered together a multitude of men, out of number, from the four winds of the heaven (20; 8), to subdue the man that came out of the sea (19; 19). But I beheld, and lo! he had graved himself a great mountain—the Mount Zion, and flew up upon it (14; 1). And they which were gathered together to subdue him were sore afraid, and yet durst fight (19; 19). And lo! he neither lift up his hand, nor held sword, nor any instrument of war: but only he sent out of his mouth as it had been a blast of fire, and out of his lips a flaming breath, and out of his tongue he cast out sparks and tempests; and they were all mixed together,—the blast of fire, and the flaming breath, and the great tempest; and fell with violence upon the multitude which was prepared to fight, and burnt them up every one, so that, upon a sudden, of an innumerable multitude nothing was to be perceived, but only dust and smoke of fire (20; 9). Afterward saw I the same man come down from the mountain, and call unto him another—a peaceable multitude. And there came much people unto him, whereof some were glad, some were sorry, some of them were bound, and other some brought of them that were offered (20; 11–15).” [Cp. in Vol. I: p. 233.] As there are correspondencies in this passage with both of the symbolizations connected with the two judgments in the Apocalypse, we may presume, that the circumstances attending the two advents of the Messiah were expected to be similar and parallel.—Some have regarded the wording out of the heaven from God as being tautologous; and hence probably it has come to pass, that some copyists have omitted the words from God. But the expression need not be accounted tautologous. The heaven
(the celestial abode of the saints) may have been introduced to contrast with the earth (their present territory), with the view to intimate, that, when the latter is overrun by swarms of bitter enemies, and it may seem that they have scarcely a hope left, they are yet not without resource; for rescue will come to them from their heavenly home.

A. Clarke, in reference to the passage relating to Gog and Magog, says; "This seems to be almost literally taken from the Jer. Targum and that of Jon. b. Uzziel on Nu. 11; 26. The latter, which is the most circumstantial, is as follows:— 'Eldad and Medad prophesied together and said; Behold, a king shall come up from the land of Magog in the last days, and shall gather the kings together, and leaders clothed with armour, and all people shall obey them; and they shall wage war in the land of Israel against the children of the captivity: but the hour of lamentation has been long prepared for them; for they shall be slain by the flame of fire which shall proceed from under the throne of glory, and their dead carcases shall fall on the mountains of the land of Israel; and all the wild beasts of the field, and the wild fowl of heaven shall come and devour their carcases; and afterwards all the dead of Israel shall rise again to life, and shall enjoy the delights prepared for them from the beginning, and shall receive the reward of their works.'"

DIV. 7. THE FINAL PERDITION OF SATAN.

XX; 10. 1405–8. And the devil who deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where both the wild-beast and the false prophet [were cast]; and they will be tormented day and night throughout the ages of ages.

1405. The devil, &c. See on 810, 1372.
1406. The lake, &c. See on 1365, 1423.
1407. The beast, &c. See 1364.

This statement may most appropriately be taken to symbolize the fall and final termination of all hostile attacks on Christendom by heathenish or infidel powers. Such an interpretation will be most in congruity with the meanings of the former symbolizations of a similar character.—This is Satan's third and last downfall. He has now successively had a place in heaven, on earth, in the abyss, and in the lake of fire. His fourth abode is a final one (see p. 390).

Synoptical interpretation of the een-proper of the seventh seal, with the historical application thereof. This heptad is divided into two parts (vv. 1–8 and 9–10) by the different chronological stand-points which the seer takes. That of the former portion being the commencing epoch of the millennium, and that of the latter the termination of the Gogian
invasion. The former division is again divided into two chronologically consecutive portions, the one (vv. 1–6) having reference to the millennium, the other (vv. 7–8) to what is to follow it. The first of these, again, is divided into two chronologically parallel parts, the former of which (vv. 1–3) relates to Satan’s state, and by implication to the condition of the Church on earth during the thousand years, the latter (vv. 4–6) to the destiny of the departed saints, and specially of the martyrs and confessors. At present, the most convenient method will be to review the heptad under the three following divisions:—1. Vv. 1–3, relating to the earth and to Satan’s binding: 2. Vv. 4–6, relating to heaven and the first resurrection: 3. Vv. 7–10, relating to the Gogian invasion and to Satan’s final doom.

Vv. 1–3. In the first of these divisions, an angel,—the Angel of the Covenant, is brought to view as incarcerating and chaining Satan in his own hold,—in the bottomless pit,—that pit of which he had been designated (9; 11) “the angel,” and from which he had sent forth his most destructive and hateful agent and tool,—the beast, that sustained the whore in her fornicating and murderous course (17; 8). The terrestrial effect of this incarceration of Satan for 1000 years was twofold, extra-ordinary and ordinary,—spiritual and physical. First, that extra-ordinary liberty, which had been accorded to Satan, of possessing the bodies of men, and otherwise operating in a preternatural way to lead them astray, was withdrawn; and thus he was bound as ‘the old serpent’ and ‘the calumniator.’ Secondly, a restraint was put upon his ordinary acting by the withdrawal of his liberty to use the sword of persecution for the coercion of the saints; and thus he was bound as ‘the dragon’ and ‘the adversary.’ As to the time of his binding, and consequently of the commencement of the thousand years, our previous determination of the progressive stages of termination of the seventh trumpet gives as epochs A.D. 70, 320, and 476 (pp. 382–84, 387).

Vv. 4–6. The second part of this heptad relates to the celestial division of the symbolical universe during the same period of 1000 years, that was treated of in the first in reference to the terrestrial theatre. The symbolic scene presented in it first exhibits ‘the martyrs of Jesus,’ as being exalted to thrones of judgment in heaven, and having given to them the power, privilege, and honour of declaring, who were worthy to be admitted to the same celestial bliss. To all such,—to all, who had in any way suffered for righteousness’ sake in the cause of Christ, and not ‘drawn back unto perdition,’ were awarded a preferential life and reign of 1000 years with Christ. This life and reign they were to enjoy in precedence of their brethren; and thus to form during the sabbatic age of the Mystery the kingdom, over which Christ would reign in person. The rest of the righteous dead were
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not to rise, until the end of the millennium. But those, who were privileged to have part in the premillennial resurrection, were at once exalted to the highest bliss and glory in the heavenly regions, and were delivered from those apprehensions as to their future, which might be supposed to affect their brethren, who had not as yet had the joyful sentence proclaimed in their ears; 'Enter ye into the joy of your Lord.'

Vv. 7–10. The third part of the heptad relates to the terrestrial occurrences of the comparatively "short" period of Satan's loosing at the end of the thousand years of his incarceration. During it the heathenish nations, who dwelt in the extremities of the then known world, are represented as being seduced by Satan into invading the territory of the saints. They overrun it to such an extent as to put the faith of Christ in imminent peril of extinction, or at least of a subjection worse than that, which it had endured under the Roman beast. At this crisis the providence of the great Head of the Church interferes for its deliverance. The hosts of the enemy are stopped in their course; and the tide of conquest is rolled back, never to flow again. This is decreed to be the last of Satan's efforts to conquer by the sword; and he is degraded to the lowest depths of hell.—The two principal dates of partial and plenary commencement of the millennium, to which we have been conducted by the corresponding terminations of the seventh trumpet are A.D. 70 and 476. It necessarily follows, that there will be two eras of commencement of the Gogian period, namely, 1070, and 1476. We have, consequently, to choose between these two, unless it be deemed admissible to adopt both. If it be thought necessary to make a selection, there can be no doubt, that the latter ought to be taken. But if the nature of symbolical representation be considered,—that it would scarcely in any way admit within a limited space of a double representation of two similar series of events occurring at different epochs, it will appear to be very possible, that the one symbolization may have been designed to cover and serve for two such historical realizations. If, again, the existing state of the Christian Church be considered,—that it had become severed into two great parts, the Church of the East and the Church of the West, that state will be seen to have given appropriate occasion for, if it did not naturally lead to and involve, two such realizations. At the least, then, it will be proper to lay before the reader what history may present at each of the epochs, to which we have been brought.—With regard to the duration of the Gogian period, we have no other guide in the narrative than is contained in the approximative epithet "short" (ve. 3),—short, that is, in comparison with the thousand years. Supposing it to have been about 30 years, we shall arrive in round numbers at A.D. 1100 and A.D. 1500 as being the dates.
of termination of the periods symbolized. And consequently A.D.
1500 will be the terminating date of the Mystery contained in the
seven-seal roll.—This period of 1500 years may, then, be regarded as
being, in round numbers, divided into three semi-millennia, of which
we are led to expect, that the first will be a period of progressive
liberty and prosperity to the Church, as located on the territory of the
Roman beast; the second one of its highest exaltation; and the
third one of decline and cutting short. Consequently, between A.D.
250 and 1250 the millennium of the Church’s greatest extension may
be expected to lie.—That the history of the period accords with the
announcements of the prophecy, I now proceed to show by a brief
reference to the principal events.

But first let me take occasion to advert to an objection, which
should have been noticed before. It may perhaps be said in reference
to the chronological adjustments laid down on p. 385, by which the
millennium is made to commence by stages from two widely separated
ePOCHS, that it is an arbitrary arrangement, resorted to merely for the
purpose of carrying out the author’s theory, in a way that may make
it square with the facts of history; and that, in point of fact, such an
intercalary arrangement violates the principle of close chronological
consecutiveness by introducing a period of 500 years unknown to the
work itself. Now,—not to dwell again on the fact, that the symboliza-
tion in Cs. 16 and 18 of the ruin of Rome’s empire exactly measures
out this period,—nor on the precedent for such a transition-period,
proceeding by a series of stages, which is contained in the book itself
(as shown on p. 385),—nor on the necessity for such an intercalary
arrangement to make the natural course of events square with a nu-
merical reckoning,—I answer, that the author himself started from
data, which show, that he must have contemplated some such arrange-
ment. I conceive, there can be no reasonable doubt, that he held
the following opinions:—(1). that ‘the Mystery of God’ was to extend
to 7000 years:—(2). that the seventh son or age was to include a
distinct period of 1000 years:—(3). that he wrote in the middle of
the sixth millennium. The first appears from such having been the
opinion entertained by Jews and Christians before and after the time
he wrote (see Guide, pp. 98 sqq.: supra, p. 384 n.): the second from
his own statements (20; 2-6): the third from the LXX. chronology
being that which was received in his time, and according to which a
Longer period than 5500 years between the Creation and the birth
of Christ cannot be made out. He must, then, to arrive at the period
of 7000 years, have contemplated the lapse of 500 between the birth
of Christ and the commencement of his millennium, or (if I have
rightly made the era of the seventh trumpet synchronical with the
former event) between the sounding of his seventh trumpet and the
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beginning of his millennium. It is the seer, then, and not the
author of the present work, that introduces this semi-millennium.

In exhibiting the historical application of the heptad before us,
there will be two points to be illustrated. It will be necessary to
show, first, that the history of the period, to which I suppose the
prophecy to refer, exhibits such an extension and exaltation of the
Christian Church, as may be deemed to satisfy the symbolization,
which represents that great adversary of the Church, who had sought
to strangle her at her birth (12; 4), and to annihilate her in the per-
son of her Founder at the moment that her foundation was being laid
(12; 7), as having a restraint put upon his liberty of operating to
compass her destruction. And it will be necessary to show, secondly,
that at the terminating epoch or epochs, to which we have been led
to refer the Gogian outbreak, such an irruption on Christendom of
countless hordes of infidels took place, as might fitly be symbolized
by Satan's being again allowed to let loose his hosts, with the view to
effect the extermination of the faith of Christ.

1. Now, if first we take a broad and general survey of the first
fifteen centuries of the Christian Church, it will be evident, that the
period was, on the whole, one of wonderful increase and prosperity.
The Church increased from a company of 120 disciples to hundreds
of millions. From not having where to make its abode it spread, till
it occupied half the known earth. From being the most despised and
persecuted of sects, it came to rule over the kings of the whole
civilized world. A period of which this can be said might well be
figuratively described as one, during which Satan was placed under
restraint, and not suffered to mislead the nations into hostility to the
faith of Christ. And this may with truth be said, albeit there were
occasional irruptions of infidel barbarians, which wrested from Chris-
tianity some of the fairest provinces, which it had won. The most
notable of these was that of the Saracen Mahometans. They ob-
tained, however, in some places only a temporary supremacy: and,
on the whole, the losses which the Church suffered at their hands
may be considered to have been compensated by victories in other
quarters. Hence, because the position of the Church was not deter-
riorated on the whole, no account may have been taken of these
invaders. With the irruptions of the Turks the case was different.
They alone came originally from the land of Gog and Magog. Their
conquests were unmitigated and uncompensated: and the last was
especially distinguished by effecting the overthrow of the surviving
moiety of the Christianized kingdom of the beast. These, therefore,
might be regarded in a different light to that, in which the first invasion
of Mahometans was viewed.—If, next, we direct our attention more
particularly to the epochs, to which we have been led to refer the
commencing eras of the stages of Satan’s millennial binding, we shall
find, that the great events then occurred, which removed the main
impediments to the progress of the Christian faith, and gave free scope
for its development. In A.D. 70 the Jews,—the earliest and most
bitter enemies of the Christian name, lost the power to persecute.
In A.D. 476 took place the full and final overthrow of the empire of
great Babylon,—the city, where ‘Satan’s throne’ was, and which had
been to him a tower of strength, and the stronghold of his tyranny.
‘He who letteth’ was thus taken out of the way, and an opening
given, which resulted in the Head of the Roman Church becoming
temporarily the Head of the Christian world. That, which might
have been expected to entail a great drawback on the extension of the
Church,—the downfall of the then metropolis of Christendom, turned
out greatly for the furtherance of the faith.—If, again, we turn our
thoughts to the epochs, by which the millennium par excellence may
be considered to be marked out, we shall find history in full accord-
ance with our theory. In the middle of the third century the faith
of Christ had spread to such an extent as to share the Roman world
equally with heathenism: and in the beginning of the fourth it
obtained the throne; and Satan was then fully bound in respect of
the power to persecute. The Church continued to extend its sphere
and its power, until it culminated in the hands of Hildebrand.
Thenceforward a decline set in, which continued to progress, until it
could be saved from ruin only by a thorough reformation and re-for-
mation.—It will doubtless be objected by some to the view now pro-
pounded, that it sees in the corrupt Church of Rome the Church of
Christ. Undoubtedly it recognizes, that the Church of Rome formed
during the ages in question a part, and the principal part, of the
Christian Church. And it does so in accordance with the fact, and
with the requirements of the symbolization and consistency of inter-
pretation. Only two views of the Church can be taken:—either that
it is an invisible, spiritual body, consisting of the elect alone; or that
it is a corporation, composed of those who profess and call themselves
Christians. The Church, in the former sense, cannot be had in view;
because, as the elect are limited to no one visible body, and are known
to God alone, they cannot have been, as such, the objects of the
esteem or of the enmity of men. Of the Church, in the proper sense
of the term, the two principal features are visibility and possession of
the truth, the latter being incomparably to be preferred, where a
choice must be made between the two. Now, whether the Paulikians,
Waldenses, and similar bodies really held the truth in so much more
purity than the Church of Rome, as to entitle them to be esteemed
the true visible Church solely on its account, may well be doubted.
And this being the case, the mark of visibility must be taken as our principal guide. And being guided by this, there can be no doubt, that the Church of Rome must be allowed to have formed the principal part at least of the Christian Church. If it did not form in the main the Church, where is the Church to be found during the dark ages? Assuredly the gates of hell had prevailed against it, and it had ceased to exist. If we would not arrive at this conclusion, we must recognize the existence of the Church in Rome, despite all the errors and enormities of the Papal system. Consistency of interpretation, too, requires us to assume, that a visible body is contemplated in this as in all the other symbolizations. It were utterly incongruous to make an exception in this instance only by supposing, that the invisible Church is had in view. I think, that I have now said enough to obviate the objection, which I have supposed to be made.

2. We next, then, proceed to inquire, whether either the initial or the plenary epoch of commencement of the millennium will, when the thousand years is added to it, land us at such an invasion of Christendom as might fitly be symbolized by an irruption of the hosts of Satan. If either will do so, it will be a singular coincidence, considering the great length of the period, and that, at the end of it, there must be found a war on no ordinary scale,—a war, threatening the heart of Christendom, and the very existence of Christianity (see on 1376, 1394–98, 1401),—a war, not proceeding solely from the vile passions, the covetousness, rapacity, and ambition of men, but a war essentially of religions, prompted by and owing its life, vigour, and success to religious motives. Under such conditions it will be, I say, a singular coincidence, if at either of the epochs such a state of things should be met with; but if at both the coincidence will surely be allowed to be so striking, as strongly to recommend the hypothesis out of which it arises. Let us, then, see what results will be obtained by adding 1000 years to each epoch.—A.D. 70 + 1000 = A.D. 1070. What says history at this period? It tells us, that the Seljukian Turks, fighting for Mahomet and the Koran, now made their assaults on Christendom. In 1057 Togrul Beg was "constituted temporal lieutenant of the Prophet's Vicar, and so head of the secular power of Islamism." In 1065 his nephew, Alp Arslan, conquered Armenia. In 1071 he defeated and took prisoner the emperor of Greek Christendom. In 1072 he captured Jerusalem. In 1074, under Malek Shah, Suleiman conquered Asia Minor. And then, trembling for the fate of Christendom, the hosts of the Crusaders poured forth to the conflict.—Again, A.D. 476 + 1000 = A.D. 1476. What says history at this epoch? It recounts the conquests of the Ottoman Turks, fighting in like manner for the Mahometan faith. In 1453 Mahomet II. took Constantinople by storm, and until 1481 he carried on a series of...
successful aggressions on Christendom. And thus it appears, that exactly a millennium intervened between the downfall of the Western, and that of the Eastern portion of the Roman empire; though, there is this difference to be observed:—the former was effected by the sword of those who were, or conquered only to become Christians, in fulfilment of a sentence long before pronounced against Babylon, and which was executed upon this portion of the empire as having been the seat of the hostile heathen power: the latter was accomplished by the sword of a new race of heathens, permitted by God to be sent forth by Satan, in punishment of the apostasy of the Church from the purity of the faith.

So much as to the principal dates of the irruptions, which I suppose to be symbolized. As to the durations of those irruptions I will next speak, after adverting to one or two points, which appear to call for a few remarks.

There can be no doubt, I think, that both the Seljukian and the Ottoman Turks would be included under the generic designation of Gog and Magog,—a designation equivalent to 'barbarians' with us, and which probably included in the author's view all the nomadic hordes, occupying an undefined but extensive district to the north and east of Palestine (see on 1397). The Turkish hordes came originally from the steppes of Tartary. By pressure from behind, or the increase of their own numbers, they were led to move southwards, sometimes slowly, sometimes by eruptions of vast hosts, which swept everything before them. Those who took a south-westerly direction, on reaching the north end of the Caspian, would have their course varied by it according as they might follow at one time its western shore, and at another its eastern. Those who took the former course appear to have made the deepest impression on traditional remembrances; but this circumstance would not exclude those who took the other, nor those who may have come more immediately from the Oxus, from bearing the Gogian name. The character and the origin of all being identical, all would equally be known as 'Gog and Magog.' The description of them as "eastern Scythians," and as "extending even to India" (see on 1397) would prove this, if proof were needed. The case was very different in respect of the Saracens. They issued from Arabia in the south. And consequently, as not proceeding from the supposed gathering-place of Gog and Magog, they could scarcely be comprehended under that designation.—Gog and Magog are said to be "as the sand of the sea" for numbers. This well accords with the countless hordes of the Seljukian and Ottoman Turks. The war waged by each, considering its extraordinary character and success, might well be described as "the war." Both "went up on the breadth" of eastern Christendom. Both, not only overran and subjugated to
the creed and sceptre of Islamism the outlying Asiatic provinces of
the Greek empire, but threatened to break down entirely the bulwark,
which, like an entrenched camp, that empire formed to "the beloved
city," that is to say, the Church of the West (cp. on 1401). And in
this light Western Christendom regarded the matter in each instance.
Christian princes of the West felt, that the very existence and even
the name of Christianity were put in peril. And it was only by the
infusion of a new spirit in the West on both occasions (which, occurring
at those particular crises, may well be looked upon in each instance
as being an emanation from heaven,—a special working of Divine
Providence (cp. on 1403),—it was owing solely, I say, to this, that the
ultimate supremacy, if not the very existence, of Christianity was
secured. On the first occasion, Western Christendom was animated
by the spirit of war, and poured forth its innumerable hosts of Cru-
saders, which, if they accomplished little more, served at least to
check the further progress of the invaders. On the second, a spirit
of the love of truth and knowledge arose contemporaneously, which,
if not so immediately, yet much more certainly and permanently en-
sured the deliverance of Christianity, and its ultimate conquest of all
the territories of its last great foe. It was on this last occasion, that
the prophecy was most signally and fully accomplished. For on it,
not only were the length and breadth of the Christian world encom-
passed by the Satanic hosts of Islam; but, the last remains of the
Christian empire of the East having been swept away by the taking
of Constantinople, the infidels came in immediate contact with the
old empire of the West; and, by beleaguering "the beloved city"
itself, threatened to root out Christianity from the earth.

And now as to the epochs and durations of the Seljukian and
Ottoman conquests, that is, of the wars of the Gogians. I have shown,
that the victorious career of the former power may be reckoned to
have extended from A.D. 1057 to A.D. 1074, a period of say 20 years;
while that of Mahomet II., under whom the Ottoman power may be
regarded as having attained its climax, reached from 1463 to 1481, or
say about 30 years. These durations are sufficiently near to come
within the description of "a little season," according to the best ap-
proximation, that we have been able to make to its meaning (see on
1378). [Here let me, by the way, call attention to the curious coin-
cidence, that, in the former instance, the two great events of the war,
viz., the total defeat and capture of the Greek emperor in 1071, and
the taking of Jerusalem in 1072, should have taken place within two
years of the date, to which we are brought by the millennial reckoning.]
But as, in so large a round number as 1000, no exactness within 50
or even 100 years is to be looked for on the one hand: so neither on
the other, in so indefinite a phrase as "a little season," can the dura-
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tion be fixed with any accuracy (cp. p. 391). We may very well, therefore, in round numbers, assign 1450 as the commencing era of the full and final attack of the Gogian hosts (being about the time, when Mahomet II. began the aggressions, which ended in the sacking of Constantinople and the downfall of the Greek empire); and we may allow 50 years for the duration of the war, thus finding a terminus in A.D. 1500. Still this date is only to be regarded as an average one, adopted to suit the numerical reckoning; for in actual history political changes are more or less gradual and prolonged, and cannot exhibit the definiteness, which a numerical computation necessarily must do.

I have now shown, that the several details of the symbolization are capable of application to the events of the times, to which an independent chronological computation has led me to refer this portion of the prophecy. At both of the epochs determined by independent and remote events, invasions of Christendom, answering to the symbolical description, are found to have occurred. In both instances the invading hosts would most appropriately be described symbolically by the designation 'Gog and Magog.' Both of the attacking powers came from the quarter indicated by this name. Both were in number 'as the sand of the sea.' Both, but especially the last, may be said to have gone up on the breadth of Christendom, and encompassed it in its strong-hold, so as to threaten its very existence. In both instances the invasion was of that character (as being a war of races and of religions, animated by the fiercest bigotry, and envenomed by all that can render war most horrible), that it might fitly be described as 'the war' par excellence. In both the tide of conquest swept on for the space of time, which, in the present connexion, would most suitably answer to the phrase 'a little season;' and it was then stayed, and its ebb began to set in. In both (if man may ever presume to distinguish between the special and the ordinary actings of the Deity) it may be thought, that the deliverance of Christendom was due to a special interposition of divine Providence. All these coincidences must surely be allowed to be very striking.

Before closing my exposition of this heptad, and therefore of the seven-seal roll (for with this heptad the roll concludes, as I have shown in the Guide, p. 161, and on 368), I must advert to one or two points, for which a convenient place has not hitherto been found.

1. And in the first place, I would direct attention to two remarkable coincidences in my exposition with views, which appear to have been handed down from the earliest times.—It has been shown, that there prevailed in the East a tradition, that Gog and Magog would be allowed to burst their barriers and overrun the earth, only towards the end of the world. 'The end of the world' is an ambiguous phrase.
End of the Mystery of God.

It may denote either the termination of the existing state of things in a religious point of view, or the destruction of the human race. In the N. T. the word translated ‘world’ means ‘age.’ And so, in this tradition, the original idea may have been, that Gog and Magog would issue forth at the end of the Age, i.e., of the sabbatical age or the seventh in the system of ages, during which the present state of things, as it was believed, would exist. Now, in accordance here-with, we find them, on the exposition that has been given, going out on the breadth of the earth just at the end of the seventh seal. — Again, we have seen, that, according to an ancient tradition, this issuing forth of Gog and Magog was to take place in “the 7000th year, in which the heavens and the earth would be destroyed.” This allowance of 7000 years may be thought to receive something like Apocalyptic countenance, from the circumstance of the duration of ‘the Mystery of God’ being divided into seven ages, to one of which a millennium is assigned; for, taking 1000 years as the unit or the average duration of the ages, there would result 7000 years. Now I have shown (Vol. I: p. 285), that the LXX. computation of the chronology is the one, which ought to be followed; because it was that, which was received in the apostolic age, and which was the received authority for many centuries afterwards. This computation, according to the weight of ancient evidence, will place the birth of Christ at or about A.M. 5500. Thus, e.g., Abulfaragius computed, that this event fell in A.M. 5508, and the Greek Church has received this as the true date. Again, the Churches of Antioch and Abyssinia calculated, that the Christian era would synchronize with A.M. 5492. The Alexandrian made out 5502: and Julius Africanus exactly 5500. So that we may say, that, according to the computation received universally in the Church, and which was not called in question till Bede in the eighth century manifested a disposition to exchange it for the Rabbinical method of reckoning, “the 7000th year” of the world may be considered to have fallen about the year A.D. 1500. And thus, on my exposition, the seventh seal or θέαν will terminate synchronically with the world’s seventh millennium or chilid of years!

2. In the next place, I would advert to an apparent difficulty, which may probably have occurred to the reader. It may be objected; If the portion of C. 20 hitherto considered relates to the Christian Church, how can it be said, that we have now arrived at the end of the seven aeons or ages of the first or Jewish Mystery? or, to put the same from a different point of view; If the seven-seal roll be held to contain a symbolic history of the dealings of the Lord with his people during the seven ages of the Jewish Dispensation, with what propriety can the seventh θέαν be held to relate to the Christian Church? The view I take on this point is as follows.
The symbolizations of the non-proper of the seventh seal do not relate exclusively to the Christian Church. They consist (as I have shown) of two parallel lines,—one of which relates to the state in the unseen world of those, who may be considered to have belonged to the period, during which the old Dispensation had not wholly passed away,—and the other to the state of the Christian Church on the earth. What I have to account for, then, is the introduction of the latter into the Jewish Mystery. In order to do so I would first call attention to the fact, that I hold, that the primary object in the inditing of the Apocalypse was, not to symbolize the history of "the ages past" of the Jewish Mystery for its own sake, but as introductory to "the ages to come" of the Mystery of Jesus Christ, and in order to the benefit of the Christian Church during those ages, but specially of those, who lived in the time then current. To effect this object it was necessary, 1st, that the old Mystery should be exhibited in its completeness, so as to afford a perfect precedent of what the Lord's dealings with his people, in providence and in judgment, in time and in eternity, would be: 2dly, that the introduction of the Mystery of Christ during the times of the older Dispensation, and the present state and future prospects of living believers should form the principal topics, and consequently occupy the greater portion, of the seven seal roll: and 3dly, that the symbolic history should not be limited to the old Dispensation, but should indicate the condition of the Church of Christ in the time to come, at least so far as to cheer believers of all ages with the prospect of a glorious future being in store for their Zion. The first of these conditions necessitated the introduction of the unseen general judgment at the end of the seven-seal book. The second has been seen, on the exposition I have given of the seven-seal roll, to have been fully realized in point of fact. The third involved the carrying on of the symbolizations beyond the judgment appertaining to the old Mystery. If, then, the history of the old Mystery must be carried on through its sabbatic age to its general judgment, and if the history of the remote future of the new Mystery must also be symbolized, it necessarily follows, that the two must be carried on contemporaneously by two parallel lines, running through the sabbatic age of the old; for, considering the strictly chronological character of the whole narrative, the history of the Christian Church could not with propriety be taken up and carried on from the terrestrial end of the old Mystery, leaving a gap of a thousand years.

A partial objection, however, to this solution of the difficulty may perhaps be made. It may be said, that, if a new Mystery had been thus introduced into the middle as it were of an older one, some mode would have been adopted of distinguishing between the
two, and that the newer part would have been marked off in some way or other, just as (to borrow in part a similitude from a parable) when a new piece is put into an old garment, the surrounding seam makes a line of distinction between the old and the new. Now, as it would not be easy for an objector to point out, how this could be done in such a composition, I might say, that, while, if we did not meet with anything of the kind, the want thereof would be no sufficient ground for rejecting the whole hypothesis, yet, on the other hand, if we did find it, a strong confirmation of the validity of the theory would thence arise. Now, just such a boundary line, or marking off of the Christian Mystery is actually to be discerned. Of course, it is mystical in its character; the nature of the book requires, that it should be so; and indeed it could not be otherwise. Still, it is none the less clear and satisfactory on that account.

Before proceeding to show what I have in view I must remind the reader, that my theory supposes, that the partition-wall between Jews and Gentiles was fully broken down only at the invisible coming of the Lord Jesus (at the epoch of the destruction of Jerusalem) to 'remove Judah out of his sight,' by subverting the whole Jewish polity, and taking away the last vestige of the Jews' preferential privileges. Up to this time they had a preference given to them, in that "it was necessary, that the word should first be preached to them" (Acts 18: 46; 28: 17, 28); and if they as a nation had received it, they would still "for the fathers' sakes" (Rom. 9: 5; 11: 28) have continued a chosen race. But when they had now worn out the long-suffering of God, exhausted their time of probation, refused to receive the offers made to them, and fully and finally rejected Christ as their Messiah, he then fully and finally rejected them from being his people. Thenceforth they merged into the antagonistic world-power, and became a limb of the Satan-ruled Roman beast. Their Mystery had now reached its earthly terminus; and henceforth the distinction would be, not between Jews and Gentiles, but between Christians and Gentiles.—Now, just when the symbolic history has reached this epoch, and immediately before the coming of "the Word of God" is depicted, a remarkable interlude is introduced:—though, indeed, it might perhaps be more correct to say, that this interlude is introduced parenthetically into the very middle of the account of his advent. For, no sooner is it announced, that the time of "the marriage of the lamb" is come, and that his bride,—the new and virgin Church, is in a state of readiness for the espousals, than, instead of proceeding to describe the coming of the bridegroom, and the act of rejection and punishment of the unfaithful spouse, which necessarily must precede the contraction of a new marriage, the seer stops abruptly and steps aside as it were, in a manner that may appear
most extraordinary to an uninitiated reader. What, we are naturally led to exclaim, can be the meaning of the insertion of such a passage as this (I mean C. 19; 9-10), which appears so much to break the connexion of the narrative? Must it not be designed to mark the epoch of some great change? And what can that change be, but that which we have already been led to anticipate, viz., the full rejection of the Jewish Church, in order to the exclusive adoption of the Christian?

Let us examine the passage itself, and I think we shall find this view confirmed. It begins thus. "And he saith unto me; Write, Blessed they who are called to the marriage-supper of the lamb." Who spake these words? There is no immediate antecedent; but (as I have shown on 1317) we must take the angel of C. 17; 1 to be had in view: and he is specially a symbol of Jesus. The bridegroom himself, then, being meant, the dignity of the speaker indicates a special importance in the passage. So, also, the direction to write,—when John was already engaged in writing, and would without such a direction have written what was said, can only have been introduced to denote, that the words about to be spoken had an emphatic significance. And this is still more strongly shown by the addition of an affirmation after them. "He saith also to me; These words of God are true." Such a superadded declaration must certainly be intended to signify, that some deep meaning is connected with the words of the speaker. It might now be thought, that no addition could be needed or be made to so strong a previous and subsequent emphasizing. But such is not the case. The strongest emphasis of all is given by the effect, which the words are represented to have had upon the apostle. 'He fell prostrate at the angel's feet to worship him.' For a Jew and an apostle to represent himself as offering religious worship to an angel may be supposed to denote, that a communication had been made to him, which had so overpowering an effect upon his feelings, that he scarcely knew what he did. What, then, we ask, was there so important and so affecting in the words, which the angel spake? In part probably it lay in some hidden meaning. And that meaning may have been somewhat of this kind (see on 1320):—that, the Jews being now finally cast off, "the Mystery of Jesus Christ" had its full commencement, and altogether superseded "the Mystery of God;" and consequently, among 'the called to the marriage-supper of the lamb,' there would henceforth be no distinction into 'Jew and Gentile, bond and free, but all would be baptized by one Spirit into one body' (1 Cor. 12; 13).

It would seem, then, that we have in this passage, when taken by itself, internal indications, that it was introduced in part to mark the precise epoch of the casting off of the Jewish Church, and the nuptial
adoption of the Christian. But the principal evidence in support of this view is to found in the repetition of the same scene in the epilogue of the book (22; 6-9). That passage, however, is made to serve a double purpose, having reference not only to the one before us, but also to the prologue (1; 1-3); and it will therefore be necessary to compare it with both. This (as the most convenient method) I will do by placing the three in parallel columns, and transposing some of the clauses, so as to exhibit more clearly the agreement. I will also mark the correspondencies of expression by prefixing small italic letters.

1; 1-3.  

(9). And he saith unto me; These words of God are true.

(1-2). The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave him, to shew unto his servants what must speedily come to pass; and sending by his angel, he showed by symbols to his servant John (who testified of the word of God, and of the testifying of Jesus Christ) whatsoever he saw.

(10). And I fell at his feet to worship him. And he saith to me; See thou do it not: I am a fellow-servant of thee and of thy brethren who hold the testifying of Jesus; worship God. For the testifying of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy.

(8). Blessed he who readeth, and they who hear, the words of the prophecy, and keep in mind the things written in it! For the time is near.

xxii; 6-9.  

(8). And he saith unto me; These words are faithful and true.

And the Lord God of the spirits of the prophets hath sent His angel to show unto his servants what must speedily come to pass.

(8). And I John am he, who saw and heard these things. And when I heard and saw,

(7). Blessed he who keepeth in mind the words of the prophecy of this book!

(9). Write; Blessed they who are called to the marriage-supper of the lamb!
sally allowed to be the commencement of the epilogue to the book. It follows the account of the new Jerusalem; and consequently, while "the true words" to which it first refers may be supposed to be those generally of the whole book, they may at the same time very naturally be taken to be those specially, which had just been uttered, relating to the new Jerusalem,—the symbol of the Christian Church. The almost identity of this opening clause with that in C. 19; 9 must have a meaning; and so must that of the two last verses with C. 19; 10; and no less the alternating of the parallelism with the two former passages. What, then, can the object of this dovetailed or interwoven parallelism have been, but to denote, that the last passage has a common relation to the two former,—in fact, that it is to them as a common goal? The re-introduction of such a narration as that in C. 19; 10 must surely, as a repetition, partake of the character of a formula, and be used to connect together the two points at which the portions identical with one another are placed, and so to mark off the part lying between them, as having something peculiar to itself. As a general rule, indeed, the occurrence in different places of the same phrases and passages, if of a peculiar character, may be considered to have arisen from their being designed to serve as marks of connexion, like the letters used in the above comparative Table to denote a correspondence between those words or expressions, to which the same letters are prefixed, or like brackets, which serve to link together some one portion as having an independent coherency, while they separate it from the rest, as being distinct from what precedes and follows (see on 1372). Some such purpose as this, I say, these parallel passages may have been intended to subserve (see on 1318). And what they will in that case indirectly intimate is, that "the words" to which reference is made in C. 22; 6 are in general all those, which have been recorded since the prologue was written, but specially those recorded since the intermediate parallel passage in C. 19; 9–10 was penned. Thus, then, it would seem, that the part between the two occasions of John's tendering worship to the angel is distinguished from the rest of the book, as having a character peculiar to itself. It is put in a parenthesis, as it were. It is linked together in itself, and marked off from the preceding portion. And why should this have been done, but to denote that it relates mainly to a different subject,—in short, that it is chiefly occupied with that new Mystery, to which "the testifying of Jesus Christ" gave birth? The parallelism between the three passages seems to amount to saying this:—'The epilogue which follows is generally an epilogue to the whole book; but specially to that part of it, which relates to the new Mystery from the time of its superseding the older one.'

The variations, which are found in the narratives of John's first and
Second offers of worship to the angel, are not unworthy of notice, inasmuch as they tend to confirm the view now advocated. On the second occasion, "the words" spoken of are said to be not only "true," but also "faithful," which is an addition appropriate to the now completed revelation of Jesus Christ,—"the Faithful and True one" of C. 19; 11. John's act of adoration was then called forth by the whole of what he had heard and seen, which may be taken for an indication, that the announcement which evoked it before contained 'the spirit of the prophecy;' that is, 'the marriage of the lamb,' or Christ's ratifying the union with his Church (which took place at this epoch), was the salient point had in view in the whole book. On the first occasion, "the testifying of Jesus" was twice mentioned by the angel; but it was omitted on the second, probably because the need for martyr-testifying would be at an end, when the new Jerusalem state should be fully established; and also because the accomplishment of "the prophecy" referred to in the former had now been fully exhibited. In the last passage, "those who keep in mind the words of this book" is substituted for "those who hold the testifying of Jesus;" and this change is appropriate to the former having reference generally to the whole book, and the latter having in view the religion of Jesus. So, also, from the parallelism which follows, we may learn, that "they who are called to the marriage-supper of the lamb" are specially those, "who keep in mind the words of the prophecy of this book."

On the whole, it seems to me, that there is found just such a mystical marking off of that portion of the roll, which relates to the Christian Church after its superseding the Jewish, as might have been looked for, if my hypothesis was well founded. And consequently the objection is removed: and my solution of the supposed difficulty must be allowed to be unaffected by it.

Here ends my exposition of the seven-seal roll.

Interpretations of C. 20; 1-10.—1. Of the binding of Satan. Generally held to be co-extensive with the millennium. Denotes, that Satan will not be able to uproot Christianity [Luther]. An allegorical binding [Faber]. A.D. 33-70 [Lee]. Restraint of Satan's power, so that he cannot prevent the conversion of the nations [Huntingford]. Restraint, as to some peculiar species of error [Gipps].—2. The first resurrection. A literal resurrection of saints, but the change of their bodies to an angelic substance not to occur, till the end of the millennium [Methodius]. A spiritual resurrection, i.e., a revival of the doctrines and spirit of the martyrs: a reign of Christ in the hearts of men [Origen, Jerome, Augustine, and many others]. Vindication of the memories of the martyrs, &c. [Vitringa]. The Reformation [Brightman]. Conversion of the Jews [Fleming]. A literal pre-
millennial resurrection with a personal reign of Christ [Justin, Ireneus, Tertullian, Mede, Dabnus, and many others]. A resurrection from sin [Bullinger]. A peculiar privilege of confessors [Bp. Newton, Burgh]. The resurrections before and after the millennium are figurative: that of the rest of the dead' consisting in the revival of the principles of Antichrist [Faber]. A resurrection, not of the bodies, but of the souls,—the early martyrs, to whom it was given to judge [I. Williams]. The rising up of the Waldenses, Albigenses, &c., is the first, and the conversion of the Jews and of Gentiles, the second resurrection [Gippe].—3. The millennium. "As 10 is the number of the decalogue, and 100 signifies the crown of virginity, therefore the millenary number (= 10 × 100) indicates a perfect man; who may be said (i.e. while in his earthly state) to reign with Christ, and to have the devil bound within him, &c." [Tichonius]. An earthly Paradisiacal state [Mede and many others]. A prosperous state of the Church [Lowman]. A dispensation of unobstructed grace [Burgh]. The seventh millenary from the creation [The old Fathers and most others]. "A reign of the saints with Christ on the earth;" not of dead saints, but "the spirit and power of these" is to live again in others, who will be exalted to the governments of the earth under Christ [Gell]. Parallel to the seventh trumpet, and the new Jerusalem [Mede]. Parallel to the new Jerusalem [Primasius, Vitringa, Elliott]. A literal 1000 years [Papias, Justin, Ireneus, Tertullian, and the Fathers]. From Christ's resurrection till Antichrist [Augustine, Albert, Bale, Marlorat, Ribeira, Fleming, Faber]. A.D. 70-1070 [Luther, Bullinger, Chytrius, Pareus]. A.D. 324-1324 [Foxe]. A.D. 476-1476 [Alcassar, Hammond, Waldegrave]. From A.D. 1311 [Grotius]. From A.D. 320 to loosing of Satan at the end of the world [Bossuet]. 50 years from A.D. 98 [Weststein]. An indefinite period from A.D. 33 [Lee]. 1000 years from A.D. 2000 [Fleming and others]. 360,000 years [Driessen]. From A.D. 33 to Sylvester II. [Bale]. The interval between the two advents [Wordsworth]. A.D. 1866 to 2866 [Faber, Elliott, and others]. A.D. 800-1800 [Hengstenberg].—4. The loosing of Satan. Irruption of Ottomans, A.D. 1324 [Foxe]. Figurative, by a return to wickedness [Faber]. In the Reformation [W. H. Scott]: The great tribulation of Mt. 24, and identical with the conflict of C. 19; 11 ss. [I. Williams].—5. Gog and Magog. The Turks in 1071 [Luther, Bullinger]. The Turks, or the Scythians and Tartars [Vitringa]. Barchoab [Weststein]. The nations of America [Mede]. Unknown future enemies of the Church [Bp. Newton]. The German hordes [W. H. Scott]. A.D. 1800 ss. [Hengstenberg].—6. Downfall of Satan. The fall of the Roman empire [Lee].
CONCLUSION to the MYSTERY OF GOD.

PART V. Ch. XX; 11-15.

HEPTAD XXV. SCENE OF FINAL JUDGMENT.

Introductory remarks. In this place I propose to consider the four following points. 1. The connexion of this passage with that in Cs. iv-v. 2. Its connexion with the postmillennial war described in vv. 7-10. 3. The epoch of it. 4. Its relation to the millennium of vv. 1-6.

1. The tableau before us is to be regarded as identical with that depicted in Cs. iv-v (see Vol. I: pp. 166, 203). The scene presented in the two shows this; for in both it is a scene of judgment. And, as the symbolization of Cs. iv-v was a necessary introduction to the opening of the seven-seal book and the unfolding of its contents, so its reproduction for substance here was a necessary conclusion to both; for, unless that symbolization had been reverted to, the scene of the opening of the book would have been unmeaning and objectless, the lengthy exhibition of the contents of the roll would have been like an argument without a conclusion or a fable without a moral, and both as it were a tale half-told. The fact is (see Vol. I: pp. 19, 166, 203), that at the outset the author, taking for his stand-point "the day of the Lord,"—"that great day of God almighty,"—that on which His righteous decisions in reference to the Mystery of God are fully manifested, has commenced by describing the glorious Court of heaven as it appeared on that awful day of trial. He has then brought before the Court in orderly succession the evidence, touching the Mediator's dealings with and on behalf of his people. And finally, incidentally recalling the scene he had described at the outset, he has related the judgment given by the Court. While thus most appropriately and artistically (so to speak) arranging his matter, he has attained a further end (and one most important, as a guide to the interpretation of the work) in marking out clearly the termination of the seven-seal book, and so of the seventh seal in particular,—a point, which would otherwise have been open to much questioning, and which, as it is, has proved a fruitful source of erroneous interpreta-
tions in cases, in which interpreters, allowing themselves to be influenced by their own preconceived opinions, instead of seeking for the indications afforded by the work itself, have failed to discern the boundary line marked out by the author himself.—We ought, then, to conceive of the scene here presented to view as being in the main, but with such modifications as would make it appropriate to the special occasion, the same with that, which is described in C. iv—v. The scene in general being sufficiently shown to be identical with the former, there was no occasion to go over its details again. In fact, as the Judge is everything here, all the rest were appropriately merged in Him; and, in order to recall the whole, it sufficed to bring Him into view as on the throne of judgment. The only point, that can be thought to indicate a difference in the two scenes, is, that here the colour of the throne is mentioned. But this is not a positive difference; since in C. iv the colour of the throne is not mentioned at all; and consequently, for anything that appears to the contrary, the throne may have had the same colour there as here. Here a colour may be supposed to have been assigned to it, with the special object of denoting the purity and righteousness of the judgments about to be given from it: and certainly a symbolization with such an object would be introduced here with the greatest propriety.

2. The immediate consequenceness of this scene on that, which precedes it, is a point of considerable interest and importance. 'To argue,' says Stuart, 'that the end of the world with the general judgment will be immediately after the overthrow of Gog and Magog, would be quite unsafe. Whoever is conversant with the Hebrew prophets must know, that nothing is more common with them than to overlook all time, that intervenes between events, and merely to describe the events themselves. Thus, in cases too numerous to be particularized (but see Is. C. 3 cpd. with C. 4, Ca. 7–8 cp. C. 9, C. 10 cp. C. 11, C. 34 cp. C. 35, Ca. 40–66 passim, Eze. C. 37), the coming of the Messiah is connected (so far as continuity of discourse is concerned) immediately with the taking place of events, which happened centuries before his death. And as no one can justly argue, that that coming was closely consecutive on those events, so no one can justly conclude, that the end of the world is in point of time immediately connected with the destruction of Gog and Magog.' In reference to this argument I observe, first, that Stuart gratuitously imports 'the end of the world' into the question. No mention is made in this passage of the end of the world; and the opinion, that it was to ensue on the judgment here symbolized rests entirely on what Stuart would call 'constructive exegesis,' and is, as I shall show presently, destitute of foundation. Secondly, I deny the statement, by which Stuart seeks to support his assertion. I am prepared to maintain,
that there is no such hiatus, as he affirms that there is, in any prophecy of the Old Testament. In some instances the theory of a hiatus has no other support than arises from juxtaposition in the same book, the supposed single prophecy being in reality two prophecies, which have no connexion whatever with one another. And where this is not the case, there may be shown good reasons for thinking, that the two parts of the prophecy had alike a primary reference to the near future of the prophet's time, involving an unbroken chronological consecutiveness. But even on Stuart's view it cannot be pretended, that the examples alluded to furnish more than precedents, showing, that his view of the case may possibly be correct. They afford no proof or presumption, that it is so; and consequently they do not present the smallest impediment to the evidence to the contrary, which I shall adduce under the next head of inquiry.

3. The epoch of the scene before us is commonly said to be the end of the world. Now, as our inquiries hitherto have brought us down to a very different epoch, we may properly lay the onus probandi upon those, who maintain this opinion. — Consequently, I proceed to examine, in the first place, the arguments which are advanced in support of it. And first the clause,—"the earth and the heaven fled away"—may be adduced. This, however, is only a similar expression to that, which was used under the sixth seal (6; 14). And if I have satisfactorily shown, that that passage (which has, much more than the one before us, the appearance of representing the end of all things) does really symbolize only a political catastrophe, there can be no hesitation in admitting, that the one before us may represent a judgment at the end of a Mystery, but not at the end of the world. But, independently of the fair inference from this precedent, the clause in question will be seen to carry with it no weight at all, when it is known, that it has been derived from Is. 34; 4, where it denotes by a bold figure the fearful effects of God's wrath against Idumea. Again, it may be alleged, that the statement "Death and Hades were cast into the lake of fire," imports their utter annihilation. But, if the passage before us relates (as I contend, that it does) to an abrogated Dispensation, and is descriptive of the act by which it is finally terminated, it must be understood to speak only with a reference to that Dispensation; and then this particular phrase will be symbolically expressive merely of the final point having been reached. These two appear to be the only statements, having any apparent bearing on the question, that can be adduced in support of the view, which regards this passage as representative of the final judgment,—final, that is, not in reference to a particular Dispensation merely, but to the whole human race. Any force they may seem to have is derived from that, which is the most fruitful source of errors in interpreting this book,
naturally, forgetfulness that the scenes are symbolical. The reader forms a conception of the heaven and earth, death and hades spoke of, as being literal realities; and then he necessarily adopts the view, that the end of all things is contemplated: whereas, if he bore in mind, that these are but symbols, supposed to have been seen in a vision, it would at once be evident, that the flight of the one, and the casting of the other into the lake of fire, may very well be representative only of the abolition or termination of an existing state of things,—that state of things being in the present instance what is technically termed 'the Mystery of God.' There being, then, no internal evidence to show, that the judgment here symbolized is placed at the end of the world, we are justified in adopting that epoch, to which our investigations hitherto have conducted us.—The want of proof to the contrary might, indeed, alone suffice for our justification; but, nevertheless, let us proceed to inquire what may be advanced for and against the adoption of the epoch, to which we have been conducted. The nature of the case almost precludes the possibility of anything being advanced against our view; for, if this be a judgment in the unseen world, it must be out of the sphere of man's knowledge. On the other hand, the following considerations may be alleged in support of our view. First: in the absence of clear proof to the contrary, we are bound to adhere to that rule of unbroken consecutiveness,—which the ordinary method of composition justifies us in assuming, that an author adopts, if he gives no intimation to the contrary,—which is clearly indicated in the seven-seal book,—and to which we have hitherto found it practicable to adhere throughout in the closest manner, obtaining from its guidance the most satisfactory results. And this rule, when we come to the exposition of the passage, I shall be able to show may be applied to it without the least difficulty. Secondly: I maintain, that all the indications of the passage support the view, for which I contend. (1). The theatre of the general judgment at the end of the world is held to be the earth. But the scene of the judgment in this passage is the symbolical universe at large. The appropriate place for setting up 'the throne of God' is the heaven; and, if I have rightly identified this scene with that in Csa. 4–5, there can be no doubt, that it ought to be conceived of as being so placed in this instance. The unseen world then, and not the earth, may most reasonably be supposed to be symbolized as the scene of the judgment in question. (2). Again, an advent of Christ in the clouds of heaven,—"in his glory, and all the holy angels with him," is expected to precede the future judgment. But there is no intimation of any such advent in this passage. (3). Again, the judgment yet future is to be a judgment of "the quick and the dead." But no 'quick' are brought to view in this passage. In every in-
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stance, and four several times in two verses (as though the intention was to lay the strongest emphasis on the fact), it is said, that it was the dead that were judged. This emphatic mention of the dead, and the dead only, may well suffice to show, that the still future judgment cannot have been had in view. (4). Once more, the dissolution of all things is expected to ensue on the future judgment. But the context of this passage shows, that it will not ensue on the judgment here symbolized. Immediately after the symbolization before us, the author says; "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away." Now, the order of the narrative ought alone (in the absence of any intimation to the contrary) to be deemed sufficient to compel us to place this scene in chronological order after, and immediately after the one, which precedes it. But, indeed, "the new heaven and the new earth" are so evidently intended to take the place of "the first heaven and the first earth," which (it had been said) "fled away," that all doubt as to the consecutiveness of the order must be removed from the mind of every unprejudiced person. Such being the case, the only other question is; Where is the scene of the things signified by this new heaven and earth intended to be placed? Not in heaven exclusively; for earth, in no signification, literal or symbolical, can have place in heaven. It must therefore be, at least in part, on earth. And consequently there must exist a literal earth. And, that C. 21 relates to a terrestrial state of things is clearly shown by the new Jerusalem being represented as descending from heaven to earth, and by the fact of men, nations, and kings of the earth, and sinners as well as saints, being spoken of as co-existing. Seeing, then, that the new heavens and earth and the new Jerusalem state imply a terrestrial state of things, and that these were subsequent to the judgment, this judgment could not have been universal, so as to entail an extinction of the human race, nor could it have involved the dissolution of all things.—I think, I have now said enough to justify my adoption of the era at which we have arrived, namely, A.D. 1500 (= A.M. 7000), as the epoch of the judgment of this heptad.

4. With regard to the chronological relation of this scene to the millennium, Elliott has said; "The great white throne synchronizes with the beginning, not the end of the millennium." His object in thus transposing the scenes is to make the new Jerusalem parallel with the millennium. But what has just been shown is sufficient for the refutation of this view on the one hand, no less than on the other of the opposite extreme, which would place the white throne at some unknown date after the millennium. And who can, for a moment, tolerate such arbitrary and violent transpositions? The principle, if admitted, would enable an expositor to make anything out of any.
thing; and would, consequently, set the whole adrift in a sea of utter uncertainty. It is mainly owing to the principle of consecutive arrangement and chronological order having been so generally lost sight of in the interpretation of the Apocalypse, that such an endless diversity of views has been entertained with regard to it. In the present instance, can any good reason be given, why the scene before us should not have been placed before that of the millennium, if such had been its proper place in chronological order?

DIV. 1. THE EVANISHING OF THE EARTH AND THE HEAVEN.

XX; 11. 1409-12. And I beheld a great white throne, and him who sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled, and no place was found for them.

1409. And. While it is true (as Stuart alleges), that we cannot rely on the use of this word, as indicating immediate sequence on what precedes, yet the general rule of interpretation requires us to assume consequitiveness, unless there be some indication to the contrary, which is not the case here. The technical break (see on 285) would doubtless have been introduced, if any great interval between the scenes had been contemplated.—A great white throne. The throne is described as great for congruity with the greatness of the occasion; and as white to denote, that the ‘throne which He hath prepared for judgment’ is ‘established in righteousness,’ and that ‘righteousness and judgment are the habitation of His throne’ (Ps. 9; 7, 9: 97; 2: op. on 58, 213, 269). In like manner, the cloud, on which the Son of man came to judge his people Israel, was a white one (14; 14).—The heaven of heavens is the place, where the throne of Deity is set: op. 4; 2. This fact (and also the implied contemporaneous and subsequent existence of men on the earth: 21; 3, 4, 7, 8, 24) shows, that the final judgment of the Christian Dispensation, the scene of which is to be the earth, and the result the extinction of the human race, cannot be symbolized here.

1410. Him who sat on it. This phrase, according to Stuart, “designates the Redeemer, as the analogy of Christian doctrine (Jo. 5; 22: Ro. 14; 10), and C. 21; 5-8” (cpd. with C. 19; 9: 1; 8, 11: 22; 6, 15-15, 17: 2; 7, 11: 3; 5) clearly show. On the other hand, Hengstenberg says; “He who sits on the throne is God in the undivided unity of his being, without respect to the diversity of persons.” Perhaps an intermediate view may be taken, which will be nearer the truth than either of these. I have shown on 292-6, that He who sits on the throne in the scene described in Ca. 4-5 is the triune Jehovah, specially regarded in the second person, or the Deity manifested in the person of Christ: and, if the scene before us be a continuation of that, we are justified in assuming, that the Judge is
the same, and regarded in the same light, here as there. This view will be, too, in exact accordance with Acts 17; 31 and 2-Ti. 4; 1, in the first of which texts it is said, that "God is about to judge by a man, whom He hath ordained," and in the other; "I charge thee before God, and [or even] Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead." And, inasmuch as 'he who sits on the throne says (21; 5); Behold, I make all things new,' with manifest allusion to the original creation, with regard to which we are told, that 'God created all things by Jesus Christ,' we are hence too warranted in concluding, that it is the Godhead represented and acting by Christ, that is here symbolized. Similarly, in the judgment of the righteous and the wicked described in Enoch, Ca. 50, 60, 61, 'the Elect one, the Son of woman,' is said to be 'seated by the Lord of spirits on the throne of His glory' to act as Judge.

1411. From whose face, &c. This, says Stuart, is "a poetic portraiture of the effects of the divine presence. Even the natural creation shrinks back with awe, and seeks to hide itself: cp. Ps. 18; 7, 15: 77; 16-19: 114; 3-5. See the like in Enoch, 50; 3: 51; 10." Hengstenberg, on the contrary, says; 'That this is not a merely poetical description of the frightfulness of the Judge is plain from the appended clause, and no place, &c., which was also employed to denote a disappearing, a complete removal, at C. 12; 8.' There is a modicum of truth in what each of these writers says; but both have failed to exhibit the whole truth with exactness. In the description of the Babylonian catastrophe it was said (6; 14); "The heaven vanished as a roll rolling itself up." There the terms of the description are even stronger. The earth first, and then the heaven, is said to flee, not merely as from one place to another, but so as that "no place was found for them." There can be no doubt, then, that a complete disappearance is intended. But a disappearance of what? Not of the material heaven and earth: though Stuart and Hengstenberg, forgetting that all is vision, have had these in their minds as being the things, which are said, either figuratively or literally, to flee away. But it is the symbolical heaven and earth that vanish away.

The total disappearance of these, and not 'the frightfulness of the judge' (though this may be implied as the cause of the fleeing away) is the essence of the symbolization. The only question, then, is; What does their vanishing symbolize? Now, inasmuch as symbolic representation consists in a single point of similitude between things, which, on the whole, are as widely diverse as possible from one another (see Vol. I: p. 8), the point of similitude here being vanishing from sight, and the symbolic things being the heaven and earth, the a priori presumption is, that anything rather than the material heaven and earth are the things symbolized. Still, some doubt must
be allowed to arise in this case from the circumstance, that the nature of the heaven and earth would necessitate their being made symbols of themselves (Vol. I: p. 9). So that the natural heaven and earth may be symbolized. Yet, if the general use of these terms in this book be taken into account, and if the validity of our chronological exposition (which has led us to arrive at circa A.D. 1500 as the latest epoch of this scene),—if, I say, its validity be admitted, there can be no doubt, that the material heaven and earth cannot be intended. Indeed, such a construction seems inadmissible in any case. For, though this earth should be destroyed on account of man's sinfulness, is it credible, that all the heavenly bodies,—not to speak of what is commonly meant by the term heaven, namely, the abodes of the blessed,—would be involved in the destruction? Moreover, destruction is not in point of fact predicated, but removal and temporary disappearance, which is a very different thing, as may be seen by the precedents. In C. 6; 14 the heaven 'departed;' but only for a time. And in C. 12; 8, when it is said, that 'no place was found for the dragon and his angels,' this was not because they were destroyed, but because they were removed to the earth. We may venture to conclude then, on the whole, that the terms heaven and earth are used in what are their ordinary symbolical significations, when the Jewish Dispensation alone is in question, that is to say, the earth as representative of Judaism in respect of its existence in this world, and the heaven as significant of it in respect of its relation to the abode of God, that is, as having its origin, its type, and its abiding mansions in the highest heaven. And this conclusion will be seen to receive confirmation from the circumstance, that the symbolic sea is brought (in ve. 13) into contrast with the earth and the heaven of this verse. The result, then, will be, that the full termination and complete annulment of the Jewish Mystery is here symbolized.—The natural order of the terms heaven and earth may have been inverted to denote, that the disappearance had its origin in earth, and extended thence to heaven, thus signifying that the total removal out of God's sight of the Jewish covenant and people arose, not from any change in the purposes of God, but from the conduct of that people.

1412. And no place, &c. Hengstenberg, who interprets this passage literally, seeks support for his view in 2 Pe. 3; 7–12. But there is no proof of an identity of reference in the two passages. On the contrary, the entire absence here of any allusion to that consuming fire, on which S. Peter dwells so emphatically, and indeed the implied non-existence of it, is opposed to the supposition of the passages being identical in respect of the events, to which they refer.
XX; 12. 1413–14. And I beheld the dead, the great and the small, standing before the throne: and rolls were opened; and another roll was opened, which is [that] of life.

1413. The dead. I have already had occasion to observe, that it is a circumstance strongly confirmatory of the view I take, that the living do not appear in this judgment. Not only is the passage silent in reference to them, but the insertion of the article in the phrase before us may be thought to be intended to denote a contrast with the living, thus positively implying the absence of such from this judgment, and at the same time implying their existence on the earth. Any one of three modes of expression might have been adopted (cp. pp. 411–13). First: I beheld quick and dead. This would have been the proper expression, if that future judgment, at which the living and the dead are to appear, had been intended: see Acts 10; 42: 2 Ti. 4; 1: 1 Pe. 4; 5. Secondly: I beheld res popv— the Greek expression for the dead in general. This would have been the proper phrase, if the dead universally had been meant, without implying any contrast: see, e.g., 1 Co. 15; 12, 13, 15. Thirdly: I beheld the dead. In this phrase, either a contrast of some kind is implied (see, e.g., Mt. 8; 22), or a reference is made to a previous mention of dead persons (cp. e.g., Mk. 12; 26 with ve. 25): and this is the phrase, which is used in the passage before us. So that there must be here either a reference to some dead before spoken of, or a contrast implied, either as between the dead and the living, or as between a particular class of the dead and the dead in general. Now, if we call to mind the statement in ve. 5.—"the rest of the dead lived not, till the thousand years were ended,"—we shall probably think, that reference is made here to the dead, who were spoken of in that verse, and that these are 'the rest' of them. But this will not forbid, that a contrast should also be implied. On the contrary, there may be a special contrast,—a contrast, not with the living, nor merely with the dead in general, but with the confessors from among the righteous dead. "The dead" in ve. 5 I have shown (772, 1386) to mean righteous dead, in contradistinction from unrighteous. 'The rest' of these are all those, who were not raised to the life in the first resurrection, that is, all the righteous, except the martyrs and confessors. And to these, therefore, the reference will, on this hypothesis, necessarily be made in the phrase under consideration. So that the dead here will mean those righteous dead of the old Dispensation, who were left to await the second resurrection and judgment of that Dispensation. But if we suppose, that reference is not intended to be made to these, then a contrast must be implied with 'the living.' And, on this view, the proof will be complete, that a judgment to come of 'the quick and the
dead' cannot be symbolized.—The great and the small, i.e., all of every rank of the class referred to. The articles, which are found before these adjectives in the best authorities, tend, by the emphasis they throw on the whole phrase, to make it more probable, that a particular class of the dead is contemplated. But perhaps the addition of these epithets may be thought to imply greater comprehensiveness than would exist, when only the righteous dead are supposed to be had in view.—Standing. The proper attitude of servants (cp. 8: 2), and especially of persons on their trial.—Before the throne. The R. T. has before God. This reading would not militate against my view, that the person on the throne is Jesus; because the Messiah is qualified to act as Judge, only as being God as well as man. But the emended reading has the best claims to be considered the genuine one. And certainly the circumstance, that the Judge is not directly brought forward as God, when the occasion might seem to require that he should be, is rather in favour of my interpretation.

1414. Rolls:—symbols of records of the works of those before the throne. Some, indeed, suppose the rolls to symbolize records of the names of the wicked, and the roll of life those of the righteous. But the production of the names of the wicked, as well as those of the righteous, would have been superfluous. And the rolls are virtually said in the next sentence to contain records of works; while a non-production of a list of the wicked is implied in what is said in ve. 15. Moreover, the word another implies, that the roll of life is altogether of a different description to the other rolls. A single roll would have been appropriate to denote a simple list of names; but many rolls would be required to form a record of, and may therefore be supposed to be used as a symbol of, all the actions, internal and external, of the parties arraigned. The symbol need not, however, be supposed to be limited to records of works; but may be taken to include, (1). The book of the Law, to show, that a knowledge of God's will was possessed; (2). The book of Providence, to show, that abilities and opportunities to do that will were given; and (3). The book of Grace, to prove, that all necessary aid was afforded.—Another roll,—that of life. Cp. Ex. 32: 32-33; "Blot me out of thy book:" Ps. 40: 7: 56; 8: 69; 28; "the book of the living:" Da. 7: 10; "the books were opened:" and 12: 1; "Every one found written in the book shall be delivered." These texts may suffice to show, that, when one roll,—'the roll,' is spoken of, the book meant is 'the roll of life of the lamb slain from the foundation of the world,' in which have been 'written from the foundation of the world the names' of the faithful followers of the lamb (cp. 3: 5: 15; 8: 17; 8: 20; 15: 21; 27: 22; 19). And the fact of this being "the lamb's roll," shows, that Jesus must have been accounted the Mediator from the
beginning, and that it is he who, in virtue of his having been the Mediator,—God and man, sits on the throne as Judge.—The mere fact of the production of this roll is sufficient to show, that the righteous appear in this judgment, as well as the wicked. If the latter alone had been present, the production of a list of such would have been more appropriate. But the roll, which contains the names of the righteous, is alone produced, in order that (after the righteousness of the judgings of Him, who sitteth on the great white throne, has been fully manifested by an exposition of the contents of the rolls of the Law, of the Providence, and of the Grace of the Lord, and also of the principles and conduct of men) the sentences of each one of those arraigned before the throne may be pronounced by reading out of the roll of life (as the production of the roll implies was done) the names of the righteous; and then, when these have heard the joyful words pronounced, 'Enter ye into the joy of the Lord,' the residue,—whosoever was not found written in the roll of life, was cast into the lake of fire.'—The opening of the rolls of course symbolizes the vindication of the proceedings of the Judge, by means of showing, that the sentence passed on each one is 'according to the works,' which he has done in the flesh.

DIV. 3. THE JUDGMENT OF THE JUST.

XX; 12. 1415–16. And the dead were judged by the things, which had been written in the rolls, according to their works.

1415. The natural construction will of course be, that by the dead here the same class of persons as before is meant, that is to say (if we adopt the first of the two hypotheses suggested under 1413), 'the rest' of the righteous dead.

1416. By the things . . . according to their works. The righteous having in their lifetime been justified by the principle of faith, which was in them, and had their names written in the list of the Lamb's 'called, and chosen, and faithful ones,' now have adjudged to them severally such degrees of bliss and honour in the supercelestial regions, as would form suitable rewards for the fruits of faith, which had been produced by each. If we adopt the former of the hypotheses just alluded to, different degrees of reward must be implied in the phrase according to their works. But if the preference be given to the latter, the distinction may be as between the works of the righteous and those of the wicked; and then a severance into two classes will be implied. Such a severance appears in Enoch, Ca. 38, 45–62.

DIV. 4. THE RESURRECTION OF THE UNJUST.

XX; 18. 1417–18. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it: and Death and Hades gave up the dead which were in them.
This verse is apparently intended to be read as parallel to the preceding one. The circumstance, that both conclude with the clause according to their works, specially shows this. Thus an indication is given, that two distinct classes are spoken of in the two verses: in this the wicked; in the preceding one the righteous.

1417. The earth or land, and the sea of the symbolical world having been assigned as the territories respectively of those who were, and of those who were not the people of God, would be the appropriate receptacles of the mortal remains of each. The earth, however, could not be represented as giving up, previous to the judgment of the just, the dead that were in it; because it had been found necessary in this scene to describe it as fleeing away: and perhaps it was intended, that the reader should conceive of it as giving up its dead previous to its vanishing. But this was not the case with that, which stands contrasted with the earth, namely the sea. Accordingly it is represented as disgorging its contents. And from the circumstance, that this class of the dead proceeds from the symbolical territory of the adversaries of the Lord's people, I infer, that it consists of his enemies,—the wicked.—Even Hengstenberg, though taking the heaven and the earth in ve. 11 literally, yet remarks here most inconsistently; "The sea in the literal sense does not suit here. From the juxtaposition with death and hell the sea can be referred to only as the receptacle of the lost dead." This is one of the many instances, in which an erroneous exposition betrays itself by the inability of its concocter to maintain consistency of interpretation. Stuart, indeed, preserves consistency so far by taking the sea literally as meaning "the ocean." But it may well be demanded of such a literalist to show, how the ocean could remain after the earth had disappeared, and why the literal earth should not have been said to give up its dead as well as the literal sea.

1418. "Death and Hades are plainly personified," as Stuart says. That the dead are said to be in them, meaning in their keeping, and that they are said to be cast into the lake of fire, is sufficient proof of this.—The two together form a compound symbol: see on 72, 412. And this symbol appears to carry with it generally the idea of punishment. So that it may be taken to represent the place of temporary confinement and punishment of the souls of the wicked. And, in accordance with this view, Hengstenberg says (using however, as he is wont to do, too comprehensive expressions; for see Acts 2; 27, 31); "Hades is everywhere in the N. T. the place of torment for the ungodly."—The sea, then, giving up the bodies, and Death and Hades the souls of the wicked, the two are reunited to stand before the throne of judgment. It may be, however, that the sea is meant to stand as the symbolic receptacle of the worshippers of the beast, and Death
and Hades as that of other enemies of the lamb and his servants.—
The foregoing is the view, that must be taken on the hypothesis, that by the dead in ve. 12 the rest of the righteous dead are alone meant. But if the phrase be taken to be a general expression, which includes both these and the unrighteous dead, we must in this case suppose Death and Hades to stand for the receptacle of the righteous dead. And the circumstance, that Death and Hades is classed among the enemies of the Lord's people (see Vol. I: p. 16), and includes their "last enemy," may be thought to support this view. Death and Hades will then correspond to the Charon of the infernal regions, who keeps souls in duress vile. The following considerations suffice however, in my opinion, to show, that this is not the right view. The righteous are, according to it, made to be raised after the unrighteous, contrary to the order, which is apparently indicated in other passages of Scripture. The dead at large will then be represented (ve. 12) as standing before the throne before they are raised (op. ve. 13). Ve. 13 will be made to appear as little else than a repetition of ve. 12. The appropriate parallel arrangement, as shown in my divisions, will be lost.—Cp. Enoch 50; 1: Test. XII. Pat. III; 4: 4 Es. 7; 32: Apoc. Apoc.

DIV. 5. THE JUDGMENT OF THE UNJUST.

XX; 13. 1419. And they were judged each according to their works.

As compared with the corresponding statement of the third division, an omission and an insertion are observable here; and both tend to confirm the view, that, in the former division reference is made to the righteous dead, and in this to the unrighteous. It is not said here, that they were judged by the things which had been written in the rolls. And this omission may perhaps be thought to indicate, that the rolls symbolized records of the actions of the righteous alone, no such records being required in the case of those, who were not to have different degrees of recompense assigned to them, but to be all alike consigned to the lake of fire. On the other hand, the word each is inserted here; and this with the view (as Stuart says) 'to individualize emphatically.' The righteous having been justified, all alike and equally, through the merits and righteousness of another, made theirs by the one principle of faith, even the different degrees of reward which they receive come to them from the same source, and through the same means, and as a free gift; and hence, with much propriety, their recompense is not said to be assigned to each separately, as it is in the case of the wicked, each of whom, not being found clothed in the robe of Christ's righteousness, is tried on his own merits under the Law of works, and, being found wanting, is condemned for his own personal demerits.
DIV. 6. THE ANNIHILATION OF DEATH AND HADES.

XX; 14. 1420–21. And Death and Hades were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death, the lake of fire.

The lake of fire being the symbol for the mode of final and complete destruction, appropriate to the nature of the thing to be destroyed (see pp. 375, 378), the consigning to it of the symbols of the last and universal enemy, and of the receptacle of the dead, is a very forcible way of representing, that the Mystery has now reached its full and final termination.—The second death unquestionably denotes a state of the dead, and that one of punishment (cp. 2; 11). The consigning of Death and Hades to this state, and the emphatic definition in this place, that the lake of fire is identical with the second death, appears to be designed to show, that the symbols are to be regarded as persons (see on 413), who receive their designations from what they represent. And the nature of the place to which these persons are consigned indicates, that the wicked are implied in them; and thus confirms what was said on 1418 to the effect, that Death and Hades are here specially representative of the temporary repository of the wicked. To take these terms in any sense literally is clearly out of the question, as even Stuart and Hengstenberg could not but see. Death (in its ordinary sense) and the receptacle of the dead could not by possibility be represented as being committed to a place of continued torment. The merging, then (so to speak), of the symbol of the temporary in that of the final receptacle of the wicked,—or (to put the case in a different light) the exhibition of the final destruction of that which effects the destruction of all living—is an appropriate symbolization of the conclusion of the temporary Dispensation. As in C. 10; 6, Time shall be no longer, must be said in reference to "the Mystery of God," or as meaning the times of the first Dispensation (see on 684), so here in like manner the annihilation of death and hades must be predicated in reference only to the same Dispensation.

DIV. 7. THE SECOND DEATH OF THE UNJUST.

XX; 15. 1422–23. And if any one was not found written in the book of life, he was cast into the lake of fire.

The mode of expression adopted in this concluding statement seems of itself alone to show, that no 'book of death' was produced; and consequently that 'the rolls' could not have represented records of the wicked.—It indicates, too, that all are by nature in a state of death; since it follows from a man's name not having by a positive act been entered in the book of life, that he is in the state of death.—As the book is the lamb's (13; 8), we may infer, that by him alone can any name be entered in, or blotted out of it (cp. 3; 5).—And if any one is equivalent to And whatsoever.—Among those not found in the book of
life would be conspicuous the worshippers of the beast, of whom it was said (18; 8 cp. 17; 8); “All shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life.”—Inasmuch as the temporary receptacle of the unrighteous dead had been annihilated, it could only remain, that they must, after receiving their sentence, be consigned to the place of perpetual punishment. And this is appropriately made the final act of the judgment.—As the third and fifth divisions are marked out by each ending with the phrase according to their works, so the sixth and seventh are indicated by having each the same terminal phrase, the lake of fire.

On the whole, the author's conception of this scene appears to have been as follows. As soon as the white throne is set up in the highest heaven [or, as soon as the standing throne of C. 4; 2 assumes a white colour in token of judgment being about to be given], the earth gives up 'the rest' of the righteous dead. Then the lowest heaven and the earth or land of the symbolic world vanish away, as having severally served their purpose and being no longer required. At the same time, the righteous dead are translated to the presence of the throne in heaven. And the fact of their being capable of ascending thither might in itself be deemed sufficient proof, that they have during their lifetime 'washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the lamb; ' since there could enter into heaven 'nothing defiled,' and none could endure to stand on the fiery sea of glass in presence of the white throne, but those whom the great High Priest had 'clothed in white garments.' Next, two registers are produced. One of these is very voluminous; for it contains a record of all the righteous acts of every one of the saints, besides an account of the dealings of the Lord with them in providence and grace. The other is less so, being merely a list of the names of those 'ordained to life.' When the righteousness of the Divine proceedings has been made manifest, and it has been shown who they are, that have been justified by faith in Jesus, and also that the rewards adjudged to each are according to their deserts, the righteous enter upon the life of celestial bliss and glory. And when they have thus been removed from the scene, the receptacles of the unrighteous dead next give up their contents. The character of this class of the dead is too manifest to need to be recorded. Not having wedding-garments, they are refused admittance to the marriage-supper of the lamb, and are sentenced to be cast into the outer darkness. Their former receptacles being annihilated, they themselves go into the everlasting fire.

Synoptical interpretation of the last judgment of the old Mystery. The orderly and unbroken chronological interpretation, which I have
been able to maintain hitherto, has landed us at circa A.D. 1500 (which is equivalent to A.M. 7000, i.e., in the longer Jewish computation), as the full and final terminus of the seven ages of the seven-seal book.

The same principle of chronological continuity and consistency, as well as the obvious propriety,—not to say necessity,—of placing the judgment of the Mystery at its termination, and also the fact, that all the indications that can be gathered from other sources accord with such a view, require us to regard this epoch as being that of the judgment symbolized in this passage.—There is not the least unreasonableness in supposing this judgment to be past, nor does the smallest improbability attend such a view. For we know, and can know nothing whatever of the transactions of the unseen world; and consequently must be utterly incompetent to reason, or even form a conjecture, in reference to them. There is not greater a priori or inherent improbability in God's appointing a judgment in the 7,000th than in the 70,000th or in any other year of the world; and far less is there than, that Christ should appear, say in A.D. 1866, to reign with the saints in spiritual bodies on this material earth for 1000 years. Neither is there anything in such a view, that in any way interferes with a judgment to come of a Dispensation subsequent to the one symbolized by the seven-seal book.

If, then, A.M. 7000 be the epoch of the judgment before us, its theatre must undeniably be the unseen world. It is, indeed, obvious from the passage itself, that our earth,—especially on the view of those, who construe the terms heaven, earth, sea, literally,—cannot be the scene of this judgment; since, before the dead are brought forward for judgment, the earth and the heaven are described as vanishing. And who, I may ask, considers the vision of Ca. 4–5 to be, either symbolically or literally, a representation of things enacted on earth, or within the cognizance of mortals? That scene is, indeed, declared to be laid in heaven. If, then, the one before us is (as I have shown it to be) a continuation of, and one with the former, this must also be a vision of things in heaven, or at any rate in the unseen world; and consequently of things, of which men living on the earth would have no knowledge.

If, then, such be the epoch and such the theatre of this judgment, it cannot be doubted, that this must be the judgment of "the mystery of God" or Jewish Dispensation, including those converts to Christianity, who, having been converted previous to the time of the complete abolition of the Jewish Covenant (and therefore while the seed of Abraham had at least a preference or precedence, and Christianity might be regarded as an offspring or portion of the Jewish Church), including, I say, those believers in Christ, who were thus brought under that division of the one universal Church of God of all time.
Synoptical interpretation.

Here, then, we have symbolized the judgment of the rest of the dead of that Dispensation, that is, of all who had lived between the Creation of man, and the abolition of the Jewish Covenant and polity,—the righteous and the unrighteous,—with the exception of such as had endured persecution for the truth's sake,—for the testifying of Jesus or for the word of God, and to whom (as a special recompense for their zeal and faithfulness) there had been previously awarded a preferential life of celestial bliss and glory for a thousand years. The abolishing of the distinction into two Covenants is first symbolized. The righteous dead of all classes are then brought before the divine Mediator's righteous throne. The conduct of all during their lives, and the Lord's gracious dealings with them, are accurately exhibited; and a suitable reward is adjudged to each one. The resurrection of the unjust is next symbolized, and the awarding to them a recompense in accordance with their doings on earth. And then, Christ 'having now put down all rule and all authority, and power' (19; 19–21), and having 'reigned till he hath put all enemies under his feet' (20; 6–10), the arrival of 'the end,' when the Mediator 'delivers up the kingdom to his God and Father,' is symbolized by the destruction of 'the last enemy,' death, and the annihilation of the dark abodes, where he keeps his prisoners (cp. 1 Co. 15; 23–28). Finally, those, who are not found written among the righteous in the book of life, are left to the never-dying worm, and consigned to eternal perdition.

Miscellaneous interpretations.—This scene has been generally held to symbolize a future and general judgment of the quick and dead: some say of the righteous and the wicked; but others, of the wicked only.—The second resurrection is the second conversion of the Jews [Brightman].

SUPPLEMENT to the TWO MYSTERIES.

PART VI. Chs. XXI–XXII; 5.

HEPTAD XXVI. THE NEW JERUSALEM.

Introductory remarks. The history of the two Mysteries having now been traced symbolically from their commencements to the termination of the first, that is to say, that of 'the Mystery of God' or 'of the seven-seal roll' from the Creation (6; 1), and that of 'the Mystery of the seven stars' or 'of Jesus' from the epoch of his birth (11; 15), the history of the latter alone "unto the ages of ages" (22; 5) is now carried on as a supplementary Conclusion to 'the
Mystery of the seven stars' contained in Ca. 2–3, and to 'the Mystery of God' contained in Ca. 6–20; 10.—It has been a much controverted question, whether the tableau of the new Jerusalem exhibits a state of the Church in heaven or on earth. Among those, who have adopted the former view, may be mentioned Augustine, Andreas, the abbot Joachim, Albert, Aquinas, Alcassar, Pareus, Bossuet, Fleming, Lowman, Eichhorn, Faber, Stuart, Brown. In favour of the latter are Primasius, Eusebius, Hilary, Tichonius, Arethas, Ribeira, Brightman, Bullinger, Vitringa, Mede, Fyle, Wetstein, Bp. Newton, Croly, Fuller, Burgh, Lee, Cuninghame, Gell, Birks, Elliott, Hengstenberg. The latter may be divided into two classes, according as they make the new Jerusalem state to be identical with, or subsequent to the millennium. Or they may be divided into those, who interpret the new Jerusalem as representative of an ordinary state of the Church, and those, who suppose it to symbolize a paradisiacal state. Among the former are Eusebius (320), Hilary (400), Tichonius (450), Wetstein, Lee. Although opinions have differed so widely, I cannot but think, that there are sufficient indications to satisfy an unbiased inquirer, that a terrestrial, but not a paradisiacal state of the Church is symbolized; and these indications I will summarily bring forward after we have examined the passage in detail. So highly symbolical are the representations of this book, that the more correctly they are appreciated, the more will it be seen, that it is scarcely possible to make too large allowances on this account; and hence the reader may probably on mature reflection arrive at the conclusion, that a much less perfect and exalted state of the Church may be intended, than he had supposed from having on a first perusal taken the terms, more or less, in too literal or too spiritual a sense. It is also to be observed, that an introduction is prefixed to the new Jerusalem symbolization, throughout which, as well as throughout the scene itself, the Church appears to be represented as only advancing towards perfection. And hence how many ages might elapse before she would attain to the state symbolized at the commencement of the new Jerusalem scene, and much more at its perfection, it may be impossible to say. The general idea, however, to be formed of this scene as a whole is, that, commencing from the epoch, to which we have been brought down by the preceding symbolizations, namely, the era of the Reformation, it depicts the Church as entering on a new phase, and, as the light of the world, 'shining over more and more unto the perfect day.'

HRIPTADAL PRÆLUDI. Descent of the new Jerusalem. Reformed state of the Church.

Vv. 1–8 contain an introduction to the scene-proper, as appears from vv. 9–10 cpd. with ve. 2.
(1). The new heaven and earth. XXI; 1. 1424–26. And I beheld a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth have passed away, and the sea is no more.

1424. A new heaven, &c. It can scarcely have been accidental, that, on the occasion of the fleeing away (20; 11), the order of the words is 'the earth and the heaven,' but on that of the appearing anew 'the heaven and the earth.'—Most strangely and most erroneously have many interpreters taken the terms heaven and earth literally. If they had only adverted to the word I saw, and called to mind, that the seeing intended was that of an ecstatic Vision, they could scarcely have failed to perceive, that the symbolic universe is had in view, and that the heaven and the earth are symbols of the same general nature here, as in the previous instances in which they are mentioned, though some specific modification may be given to them by altered circumstances. There being no longer any sea, too, conclusively proves this; since the sea could be spoken of here only as a symbol, as Hengstenberg (while taking the heaven and earth in a literal sense) inconsistently recognizes, saying; "the sea is the sea of the peoples, the wicked restless world: the vanishing of the merely natural sea would not be in its proper place here."—The heaven, earth, and sea, then, being symbols, the following will be their significations in this place (cp. Vol. I: p. 11). The heaven will denote generally the covenant of salvation in the abstract, as devised from the beginning, and ordained by God in 'the super-celestial places:' the earth that covenant in the concrete, or as having a local habitation and manifestation upon our globe: the sea (as before) the antagonistic world-power,—the instrument of Satan as god and ruler of this world.—Then, a specific adaptation of the symbolic terms to the particular circumstances of the epoch will give the following as the general purport of this passage. 'The former constitution of things having been brought to a full end by the arrival of the final terminus of the first series of ages, and the Mystery of God having wholly 'passed away,' the Mystery of Jesus Christ assumes relatively a new, independent, and exclusive position. It now stands alone, being at once the Mystery of God and the Mystery of Christ; and from this epoch it begins to appear in a new and renovated form. And an especial characteristic of the new state of things is, that there is no longer a dominant world-power, competent to tread under foot the people of God; for Satan himself, the red dragon, has been cast into that lake of fire, into which the several instruments he had made use of in former times were cast, that is, he has been for ever deprived of the power of the sword, wherewith he persecuted and cut short the Israel of God.' —In accordance herewith we find the Christian Church undergoing at this time a wonderful revolution, and assuming, through the great
Reformation in religion, a new and better aspect, the dawning of a brighter day. So, also, about this time the ecclesiastical and civil power of Mahometanism,—the last and most dangerous of all the world-powers, which Satan successively raised up, having reached the limit assigned to it, began to decline; and the decree went forth against it; 'Thus far shalt thou advance, but no farther.' Now, too, a new world was discovered, over which Christianity extended its sway with a rapidity and to an extent, that eclipsed all its former conquests. So that, from all these circumstances combined, the Christian name speedily attained to a numerical superiority over every other form of faith.

1425. For the first heaven, &c. The reference is of course to the heaven and earth, which in C. 20; 11 were said to flee away. The word first appears to be repeated for parallelism with the repetition of new, the object of the repetition of the latter term having been to lay emphasis on the distinctness of the things signified by the heaven and the earth, and that of the parallelism to mark a contrast between the first and the second heaven and earth in respect of time. The reference to and the comparison between these show, that the terms are used in the same generic sense; since a reference could not be made from terms used symbolically in one place to the same used literally in another, or vice versa. If, then, a symbolic use has been satisfactorily established in the one place, the same must hold good in the other.—Hengstenberg, following some other writers, seeks to make it appear, that the passing away is limited to the desolations caused by sin. "Only these desolations," he says, "vanish: the kernel remains. Berleb. Bible: 'Nature will not be annihilated, but purified; all corruption shall be abolished; the work of God himself remains, and is merely set free from its dross.'" But the text says not; 'The corruption of the heaven and the earth,' but 'the heaven and the earth' themselves.—While literalizing expositors are thus floundering as it were in difficulties of their own making, there is a remarkable adaptation and appropriateness in the wording of the text to my view. It is said, that the first heaven and the first earth, that is, the old Mystery in its entirety, have passed away (referring to the epoch arrived at in C. 20; 11); and, according to my scheme, that Mystery reached its full termination at that epoch, viz. at A.D. 1500 = A.M. 7000. But it is not said, that a new heaven and earth were then seen to be created (that is, that a new Mystery had then its origin); but that, having (it may be) been created at some previous period, they then came into the seer's view appearing as new or renovated. If the former had been the mode of expression, it would not have suited my scheme; but that which is actually found is as accurately adapted, as the nature of the case would admit, to the view that the Mystery
which is symbolized was not now founded *ab initio*, but only reformed or made new.

1426. *And the sea is* (that is, *exists*) *no longer.* A reference must be made by the article here, equally as by those prefixed to *heaven* and *earth* in the preceding clause. If so, there can be no doubt, that the reference must be to *the sea* mentioned in C. 20; 13. In strictness, then, and looking at this phrase only, *that* is the sea here spoken of; and consequently the non-existence of that sea, and not the non-existence of any sea at all, is what is here predicated. Hence, the annihilation of the particular world-power, which had been symbolized by the sea under the old Mystery, that is, the Roman, may be thought to be what is here affirmed: and this, it is evident, would suit my scheme well; since the last vestige of the ancient Roman empire was swept away by the destruction of Constantinople in A.D. 1453. The circumstance too, that, while all the other standing symbols have been removed from the scene, one after another,—the whore, the beast, the false prophet, the dragon, and at the end of the old Mystery, the heaven and the earth, Death and Hades,—the passing away of the sea alone is not mentioned under that Mystery, but reserved until the appearance of a new heaven and a new earth has been adverted to, cannot but be allowed to be remarkable, and favourable to the view just stated. Nevertheless, the following considerations, namely, (1). that the expression in this clause is *is*, and not *was* (which it more naturally would have been, if the reference had been to the former sea exclusively; and probably the supposition, that such was the reference, led to the Greek word being rendered by *was* in the A. V.),—(2). that the declaration of its non-existence is reserved, until after the re-appearance of a heaven and earth had been announced (as though for the express purpose of not allowing the non-existence of a sea to be inferred merely from silence as to its existence),—and (3). that there is no mention made of a sea subsequently,—these considerations may lead us to think, that the reference is not intended to be made to the former sea exclusively. Still, the facts remain, that, if no reference had been intended, the proper expression would have been, *'There was no longer a sea;’* and that the proper place for making mention of the passing away of the sea appertaining to the old Mystery was in the times of that Mystery. On the whole, then, we may come to the conclusion, that the first sea is here had in view; and that the mention of its non-existence, coupled with the want of any announcement of the existence of a new sea, is to be taken, as implying the non-existence of any symbolic sea in the times of the new Jerusalem.

The precedent for this symbolization is in Is. 65; 17; *‘I create a new heaven and a new earth;* and the former shall not be remem-

vol. ii.
bered. . . . I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy." To this passage Is. 66; 2 refers. Is. 51; 16, with Wemyse's comment on it, runs thus; 'I covered thee with the shadow of my hand (i.e., protected thee in thy march to Canaan), that I might plant the heavens, and lay the foundations of the earth (i.e., make thee a state, and build thee into a political world), and say unto Sion; Thou art my people.' "To look for a new heavens or a new earth (2 Pe. 3; 18), then, may mean," Wemyse concludes from his investigation, "to look for a new order of the present world, or, as the Scripture phrases it (Mt. 19; 28: Acts 3; 21), the regeneration, or the restitution of all things." In principle I can agree with him.

(2). The new Jerusalem descends. XXI; 2. 1427-30. And I beheld the holy city, new Jerusalem, descending out of the heaven, prepared by God, as it were a bride adorned for her husband.

The R. T., which is generally rejected by critics, runs thus; And I John beheld the holy city, new Jerusalem, descending from God out of heaven, prepared, &c.

1427. The holy city is doubtless identical, for substance, with the beloved city of C. 20; 3, the different epithet being used to indicate a circumstantial diversity. If so, and if I have rightly interpreted the latter as meaning the Christian Church, then the holy city will denote the same in a comparatively purified and in a purifying state. As Jerusalem, standing for Judaism, and Rome for heathenism, were each represented by symbolic cities, namely Sodom and Egypt and Babylon, so must Christianity be similarly represented by a city, one object of the symbolization being to bring the latter into strong contrast with the two former (see Vol. I: p. 16). And hence the holy city is called new Jerusalem,—a name, which indicates the contrast with Jerusalem and Judaism, as the parallelisms of description, noticed on 1117, do in respect of Babylon and heathenism. These three cities may be considered to be respectively characterized by the epithets adulterous, fornicating (Babylon being "great" pre-eminently in respect of its fornications), and holy or chaste; or, to use the corresponding literal terms, unfaithful, idolatrous, and faithful. And when we consider the parallelisms and relations that subsist between the three, can we doubt, that a terrestrial state is symbolized under each, and not a celestial under one and a terrestrial under each of the others?—The city, of which Paul speaks in He. 12; 22-24 as 'the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, . . . the church of the firstborn enrolled in heaven, . . . the spirits of just men made perfect, and Jesus the mediator of the new covenant,' and in Ga. 4; 26 as 'the Jerusalem which is above, the mother of all Christians,' is here made a symbol, in order that by its descent from heaven to earth may be signified, that the Church on earth is now entering on a course
of progressive assimilation to that in heaven.—With the description of this holy city Eze. C. 40, ss. should be compared.—In Enoch the Christian Church is spoken of under the designation of "the plant of righteousness."—The name, new Jerusalem, has, as I have said, been derived from that city, which "was the city of God," and to which the epithet holy had been applied (see 11; 2), but which had come in its last days, and when its people had "crucified the Lord of glory," to be "called spiritually Sodom and Egypt." This, the new holy city (or, more properly speaking, the prototype of this), being the city of the new Covenant, it is the new Jerusalem; to be registered as a member of which is to be sealed unto eternal life (3; 12). In connexion and for congruity with it, 'all things are made new' (ve. 5): a new heaven and earth, new covenant, new name, new song, new birth, new creature, new life, new commandment, new wine.—Hengstenberg, in support of his opinion, that the new Jerusalem is not contrasted with the old, and does not represent, but forms the contrast to the militant Church, lays much stress on John's having reserved the name Jerusalem for the new Jerusalem, 'not having once,' as he asserts, 'used it to denote the militant Church, much less that lifeless corpse, the literal Jerusalem.' With regard to John's not having used the name to denote the militant Church, Hengstenberg's assertion begs the question at issue in this very place. And with regard to the seer's not applying the name to the literal Jerusalem, it is a matter of course, that he would not apply to Jerusalem its proper name; because this would have been a violation of symbolical congruity; and it would have led to utter confusion to use names, sometimes in a symbolical, and sometimes in a literal sense.—If, then, the new Jerusalem is a designation given to the holy city, in order to denote, that it forms the contrast to the former Jerusalem, and if the latter, as being the metropolis of the country, may be regarded (as it is in the passage just cited from Hebrews, in which the two are contrasted) as the representative of the Jewish polity and Church, the latter must be a symbol of the Christian Church.

1428. Descending out of the heaven. This is the salient point of the symbolization; as, in particular, is shown by the circumstance, that the descending from heaven is mentioned in C. 3; 12 as the distinguishing characteristic of the new Jerusalem.—The city being described as seen,—not in heaven, its proper place,—nor yet as descended to the earth,—but as being in the act of descending, denotes, that the thing symbolized, namely, the Christian Church, was, at the epoch from which the symbolization dates, entering on a progressive state of purification, which in course of time would bring it to the holy and blessed condition subsequently described.—Observe, that it is the city (which must include in its symbolization a polity or system), and
not the people of it, that descends. Hengstenberg and others write as though 'the citizens' were alone or chiefly had in view. A correct appreciation of the symbol will be of itself sufficient to exclude their theory.—There appears to have been a floating tradition among the Jews, to the effect that 'God would renew the world, and build Jerusalem, and cause it to descend from heaven.' So spake Rabbi Jeremias. Whether his words were really meant to be taken literally or spiritually may perhaps admit of doubt.

1429. Prepared by God. The subsequent description shows, wherein the preparation consisted.—If this be the genuine reading and the correct rendering (and C. 19; 7-8 leaves no doubt on my mind, that such is the case: see on 1313-14), our thoughts are directed to God, as being the author of the Church's purification and sanctification; and we are reminded, that to Him she will be indebted for the white robes of righteousness, and all the glorious habiliments and adornings, in which she will ultimately be clothed. Even if the reading of the R. T. be preferred, the ultimate result will not be materially different.

1430. As a bride. This simile (especially when ve. 9 is compared, wherein the new Jerusalem is directly designated 'the bride, the lamb's wife') at once directs our thoughts to C. 19; 7; "The marriage of the lamb is come, and his wife hath prepared herself." The identity of the symbols spoken of in the two places will, I suppose, be universally admitted. And if the symbol is the same here as there, the conclusion is natural, if not necessary (seeing, that the mention made of it in the former place has been shown to relate to the Church on earth), that a like earthly state of the Church is had in view here. Some have, indeed, not only recognized the identity of the symbols, but have gone so far as to account the epochs identical, interpreting the new Jerusalem as symbolizing the marriage-supper of the lamb. But a comparison of the passages in C. 19; 7 and C. 21; 9 shows, that the epochs are different. In the first, the Church is said only to have prepared herself to become the lamb's wife: in the second, she is shown, not only as having prepared herself, but as having actually become the lamb's wife. And the interposition of the 1000 years further shows, that there is a wide interval between the two epochs. The reason of the parallelism, that is found to exist between the two passages, will be shown on 1559 and 1569.—When, again, we observe that here, just as in the case of Babylon in C. 17, a double symbol or two symbols,—a city and a woman in each case, are used to represent a single thing, we are led to conclude that, however much the things signified may differ specifically, they must be generically identical. And the parallelisms between C. 17; 1-4 and C. 21; 9-11, 18 ss. indicate further, that the writer intended to
establish a connexion between the two symbolizations; and the connexion, as the character of the symbols themselves shows, could only have been in a way of contrast. But, in order to be generically identical, and at the same time to be brought into contrast with one another, both the things signified must be earthly, or both heavenly polities. A state of things in heaven, or even on a “glorified earth,” could with no propriety be compared with one on an earth polluted with sin. Since, then, it is clear, that the whore Babylon represents an ordinary earthly polity, so must the lamb’s wife, the new Jerusalem. And this is confirmed by the fact, that the whore of C. 17, the matron of C. 12, and the bride of C. 21 are manifestly companion-pictures. How can any one doubt, that these were designed to be symbols respectively of heathenism as embodied in the Roman world-power, of the Church of God under its Jewish form, and of the same under its Christian development?—Here let me notice, that, while Wordsworth recognizes the contrast between the whore and the bride, his interpretation makes it to be (in the literal sense) between a visible and an invisible body, which is manifestly incongruous.—Adorned. Cp. ve. 19; “The foundations . . . were adorned with every precious stone.”

The precedents of Nos. 1429-30 may be found in Is. 49; 18 and 61; 10: in the former of which texts, speaking of the Church of the future, it is said; “As I live, saith the Lord, thou shalt surely clothe thee with them all, as with an ornament, and bind them on thee, as a bride doeth:” and in the latter of which the Church says; “He hath clothed me with the garments of salvation, he hath covered me with the robe of righteousness, as a bridegroom decketh himself with ornaments, and as a bride adorneth herself with her jewels.” These precedents confirm the view, that a terrestrial, but not a paradisiacal state of the Church, is symbolized.—Cp. Test. XII. Patriar.; ‘An angel will proclaim the coming of the Lord. Heaven and earth will shake at the sound. The heavens will open, and the new Jerusalem descend with delightful odour, adorned as a bride for her husband.’

(3.) Declaration of a voice from heaven. XXI; 3-4. 1431-41. And I heard a loud voice out of the throne, saying; ‘Lo, the tabernacle of God [shall be] with men, and He will tabernacle with them, and they shall be His peoples, and God Himself will be with them, [and be] their God. And God will wipe away every tear from their eyes, and death shall be no more; neither shall there be mourning, nor crying, nor pain any more; because the first things have passed away.’

1431. Out of the heaven is the reading of the R. T.; but it has been rejected by Tregelles and Kelly. Hengstenberg contends however, that, the external testimonies for the two being nearly equal, the internal ought to decide in favour of the rejected reading. Out of the
he thinks equivalent to from God; whereas the use of the third person in what is said in reference to God, and the introduction of God as speaking when this voice ceases, indicate, that He is not the speaker here. We might compare the loud voices, which are introduced in C. 7; 10: 11; 15: 12; 10: 14; 2: 15; 3: 19; 1, 6; and thence be led to think, that the voice proceeds from the saints, who have previously entered into glory. But in these texts the voices are only said generally to proceed from the heaven. And we cannot in this work safely identify the throne, either with God, or with the heaven (see on 1301). The only other place, in which a voice is said to proceed from the throne is in C. 19; 5, in similar close connexion with the bride of the lamb. This text may lead us to suppose, that emission from the throne is designed to bring to view the sovereign attributes of the Deity.

1432. The tabernacle of God. This is a designation, the precise meaning of which may best be gathered from the construction and relations of the Jewish tabernacle or temple, and the symbolical significations attached to the several parts thereof. Philo and Josephus state, that the temple and its furniture were representative of the universe of God, including the visible and the invisible worlds, that is to say, 'the Holy place' of earth, and 'the Holy of Holies' of heaven. But S. Paul, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, makes the whole to be significant of the Church of God under its two forms or divisions,—the Jewish and Christian covenants or Churches. The two views, however,—the one relating to the material universe, and the other to the spiritual, are compatible, and might be held together: though, if a choice must be made between them, that of S. Paul would unquestionably be entitled to a preference, as coming to us on inspired authority.

The view taken by S. Paul and his contemporaries (cp. Asc. Enoch, Enoch, 4 Ezra, and Sibylline Oracles), appears to have been as follows. There was constituted in the heavens a society or Church of glorified saints, who worshipped God continually in a temple (cp. 7; 15), of which the Jewish tabernacle first, and the temple afterwards, was in all respects a copy. In this temple Christ officiated, as the great High Priest, 'ever making intercession' for those members of his mystical body, who had not as yet entered into the heavenly places. Now, this mystical body being divided into two parts,—the glorified and the unglorified,—the heavenly and the earthly, the two parts of the temple,—'the Holy place,' and 'the Holy of Holies,' might aptly be made a figure of these. But such was not the view taken by the apostle. He makes 'the Holy place,' and 'the Holy of Holies,' to represent respectively the two Covenants or Dispensations, or the two Churches founded on them. This will appear in the course of the
citations, which I shall now proceed to make from the Epistle to the Hebrews, with the view to establish the above enunciation of the doctrine. I shall be under the necessity of quoting the Epistle at some length; because I am unable to refer to the A. V., in consequence of the main features of the view not being fully brought out in it, owing to its want of closeness to the original. But, for the sake of brevity, I will make abstracts of the passages,—and will insert here and there, as I proceed, a few words of explanation.

"We," says S. Paul (He. 4: 14; 8: 1-6), "have a mighty High Priest, who hath passed through the heavens;" and "hath sat down on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens,—a minister of the holy places, and of the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man, who ever liveth to make intercession [in the heavenly temple] for those, who come unto God by him. For every High Priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices; wherefore this High Priest also must have somewhat to offer. Now, if he were on earth, he would not be a priest at all, since the priests are they that offer the gifts according to the law,—who serve for a copy ['an obscure delineation,' according to Theophylact] and shadow of the heavenly things, as Moses, when about to make the tabernacle, is admonished by God; for, 'See,' saith He (Ex. 25; 40), 'that thou make all things according to the model [lit. type] showed thee in the Mount.' [So the ancient Jews say, that, when Moses made one tabernacle, another was made by the angels in heaven: see Buxtorf: Hist. Arca, pp. 83, 84.] But now he hath obtained a higher ministry, by so much as he is the Mediator of a better covenant, established on better promises." "The first [the Jewish] covenant," the apostle says (9: 1 seq.), "had ordinances of worship, and its consecrated place was in this world. For a tabernacle was made [divided into two tabernacles or apartments], the first . . . of which is called, 'The Holy place,' and beyond the second veil was the tabernacle called, 'The Holy of Holies.' . . . Now the priests go continually into the first tabernacle . . . but into the second the High Priest alone goes once a year, . . . the Holy Spirit by this signifying, that the way into the [true, that is, the heavenly] holy places is not yet made fully manifest, while the first [or outer, cp. vv. 2, 6] tabernacle hath a standing place. [The apostle must mean:—while the first or Legal Dispensation, which 'the Holy place' represents, remains in force.] This [Legal] tabernacle is a figure serving for the present moment only, gifts and sacrifices being offered under it, which cannot accomplish the worshipper's object, but are carnal ordinances, imposed [merely] until a time of reformation [by the Messiah]. But Christ having arrived at his destination [in heaven], a High Priest of the good things which are about to come, through the greater and more perfect tabernacle (the one not made
with hands, that is, not of this [the earthly] creation, not by means of blood of goats and calves, but of his own blood, he entered once for all into the [true,—the heavenly] holy places, having effected [not an annual, but] an eternal redemption.” [Op. C. 8; 1–2; “A High Priest, . . . a minister [not διακονός, but λατρευτής, at Athens one who served public offices at his own cost]—a minister of the holy places, and of the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man.” Through the greater tabernacle may be grammatically connected, either with the good things to come, or with he entered. The writer in my opinion means to say on the whole in vv. 6–12, that, as the priests entered into the first tabernacle or ‘Holy place’ of the temple on earth, but were not suffered to enter into the second or ‘Holy of Holies,’ so, under the Law and so long as it was in force, men were conducted to the door of heaven as it were, but not permitted to enter in: and again, as the High Priest passed once a year, on the day of atonement, into the greater and more perfect tabernacle, to effect a temporal redemption for the people, so Christ, the High Priest of the better covenant, after he had made atonement, passed once for all, not indeed through ‘the Holy of Holies’ of the earthly but of the heavenly temple, into the immediate presence of the throne,—effected an eternal redemption—and obtained a perpetual liberty of access to God for all men.] The apostle goes on to show (9; 23 ss.), that “it was necessary, that the copies of the things in the heavens (i.e., the earthly worshippers, the book of the Law, the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry, ve. 21) should be purified with the blood of calves and goats, but the heavenly things themselves [the redeemed, the evangelic covenant, and the heavenly tabernacle] with better sacrifices than these [namely, with the blood of Christ]. For Christ entered not into holy places made with hands,—the antitypes of the true, but into [the ‘true’ holy places, the archetypes in] heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us.” The writer proceeds (10; 1 ss.); “For the Law, having a shadow of the good things about to come [cp. 8; 5; “The priests, who make the offerings according to the Law, serve for a copy and shadow of the heavenly things”], and not the very image of the realities, can never attain the object of the worshippers. Wherefore Christ came, saying; ‘Sacrifices Thou wouldest not: then said I; I come to do thy will, O God.’ He taketh away the first [the sacrifices of the Law], that he may make the second [God’s will, as revealed in the Gospel] to stand.” [The apostle still has in his mind indirectly the first or outer, and the second or inner tabernacle; and now contemplates the second as ‘standing,’ and the first as having ceased to ‘stand’ (cp. 9; 8).] He goes on (10; 13); “Having, then, a free admission for the entrance of the [heavenly] holy places by the blood of Jesus (cp. 9; 25, there
is an allusion here to a free admission to the Chorus of an Orchestra—a new and abiding entrance, which he hath opened for us through the [second and true] veil (that is to say, his flesh), and having a mighty priest [cp. 4; 14] over 'the house of God' [in heaven], let us approach, . . . our hearts having been 'sprinkled' [with the blood of Christ (alluding to C. 9; 13, 21: 12; 24)], who (12; 2, cp. 8; 1) hath taken his seat at the right hand of the throne of God [in the heavenly temple]. For (12; 18 ss.) ye are not come unto a mountain that may be touched [the Mount Sinai, and the giving of the Law]; but ye are come unto Mount Zion and to a city of a living God, a heavenly Jerusalem, and to myriads of angels in full assembly, and to a congregation of firstborn [Christians] enrolled in heaven, and to a judge who is God of all, and to spirits of just men [of the first Dispensation] made perfect [cp. Vol. I: p. 289], and to a mediator of a new covenant, [even] Jesus, and to blood of sprinkling, which speaketh in a better way than that of Abel [sc. Christ's for forgiveness, Abel's for vengeance]. See, then, that ye reject not Him that speaketh. Whose voice then [at the giving of the Law on M. Sinai] shook the earth: but now [in the promulgation of the Gospel] He hath promised, saying [in Hag. 2; 6, LXX.;] 'Yet once more only [cp. 9; 26: 10; 2, 10] will I shake not the earth alone, but also the heaven.' This, 'Yet once more only,' signifieth the removal of those things that are shaken, as being perishable, that the things unshaken may remain. Wherefore, since we receive a kingdom that cannot be shaken, let us be filled with thankfulness.' [In this passage the apostle seems to have had in his mind's eye the earthly tabernacle, as being representative—the outer tabernacle of the earth,—the inner of the first or starry heaven. The earth might then correspond to the Jewish Dispensation, in so far as it existed on earth; and the heaven to the same, in so far as it had a place in heaven. This view, on more mature consideration, I think preferable to that suggested on p. 71. If it be the correct view, the shaking will symbolize the total abolition of the Jewish Dispensation, and the things unshaken will be the holy places of the true tabernacle in the heaven.—We may note here a remarkable correspondence of this figurative shaking of the heaven and the earth, and receiving of a kingdom that cannot be shaken, with the freeing away of the heaven and the earth, and the appearance of a new heaven and earth, preparatory to the descent of the new Jerusalem, as related in Rev. 20; 11–21; 2.—The ancient Jews expound Hag. 2; 7 of the coming of the Messiah, and add, that as the first tabernacle and temple were built and destroyed, so was the second temple, but the Messiah should build a temple, and God had built a tabernacle and temple in the heavens, which should never be destroyed: Pug. Fid. pp. 304, 309.] The apostle afterwards remarks
(13; 10 ss.); "We have an altar, from which they who serve the [outer] tabernacle have no right to receive meat. For, just as in the case of those animals, whose blood was carried by the High Priest into the Holy places [and consequently into the inner tabernacle], their bodies are burned 'without the camp' (Lev. 16; 27, LXX. verb.), so it was in the case of our sacrifice and High Priest, who in like manner suffered without the gate [of the city]. Therefore let us go forth unto him 'without the camp.' For here we have no abiding city, but we seek that which is about to come [—the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem]."—Cp. Vol. I; p. 202; Vol. II; p. 419.

After this lengthy citation, which the attempt to compress a great deal into a small compass has, I fear, rendered somewhat obscure, it may perhaps serve to make the essential points clearer, if I lay before the reader in close juxta-position the various designations, which are applied severally to the heavenly temple, to the earthly temple, and to the model of the former, showed to Moses in the Mount for his guidance in making the latter. (1). The tabernacle or temple in heaven, with its throne or mercy-seat, its High Priest, its worshippers, and their "many mansions," or some of these, are called by the apostle 'the heavenly things' or 'places,' 'the holy places,' 'the true tabernacle,' 'the true holy places,' 'the kingdom that cannot be moved,' 'the good things to come,' 'the abiding city' (He. 8; 2, 5: 9; 23, 24: 10; 37: 12; 28: 13; 14), and by S. Luke (16; 9) 'the everlasting tabernacles.'—(2). The second,—the model showed to Moses, is called the ναός, type (7; 5: Acts 7: 44, cp. Ro. 5: 14: 1 Pe. 3: 21). This was a 'model' in reference to the first,—the archetype of it, and a 'type' or 'pattern' in reference to the third, which would be the antitype both of it and of the first. (3). The tabernacle or temple on earth, with its priests, people, sacrifices, book of the law, and vessels of the ministry (9; 19–21), are designated ἀντιόντως καὶ σκιά, 'a figure and shadow of the heavenly things' (8; 5), 'pattern [ἀντιόντως, copies would be the best word in both places] of the things in the heavens' (9; 23), 'a figure [παραπολήσις] for the time current,' and ἀντιόντως, antitypes of the true' (9; 24: cp. 1 Pet. 3: 21), 'things that may be moved or shaken' (12; 27).

However great may be the doubts and difficulties, which attach to some of the details of the passages, it is, I think, sufficiently shown by them, on the whole, in what sense the phrase, the tabernacle of God, would be used. It can refer only to 'the true tabernacle in heaven, which the Lord pitched.' This, then, has been made the prototype of the symbol before us. And hence we may conclude, that this symbol is intended to denote the most complete and intimate communion between God, and those, among whom His tabernacle is set up.

The great voice from heaven declares, that the tabernacle of God shall
be with or among men. Either men in general, or a particular class of men may be meant by the Greek expression. But, in the present instance, the context appears to show clearly, that the Greek article is emphatic, and that "the men" means a distinguished class of men. For we cannot suppose, that 'the fearful' and others, of whom it is said in ve. 5, that they shall be cast into the lake of fire, were meant to be included in those, among whom God dwelt. Moreover, the connexion shows, that allusion is made to the new Jerusalem; and consequently, that that holy city either is to be, or will contain within it, the tabernacle of God. The implication is, that, in consequence of the descent of the new Jerusalem, the tabernacle of God will be among men. And hence we may conclude, that this tabernacle is to be set up among the men, who are citizens of the new Jerusalem.

—In C. 7; 16 it is said of those, 'who are before the throne of God, and serve Him day and night in His temple,' that 'He who sitteth on the throne will tabernacle over them.' The tabernacle, which, in the times of the old Dispensation, was in heaven is here exhibited as coming down to earth.—Hengstenberg says; "We are not to explain; 'Behold this new Jerusalem is the tabernacle' (for a city cannot properly be called a tabernacle); but, 'The tabernacle is the centre and kernel of the city.'" The 'abiding' and 'holy city' includes 'the true tabernacle,' and 'the everlasting tabernacles' or 'many mansions' of 'God's servants.'

1433. And He will tabernacle with them. The addition of this clause confirms the view, that a special dwelling place of God is spoken of in the preceding clause; since otherwise this would be wholly tautologous. And if this view be well-founded, then the purport of the two together will be, that God has a special place of abode in the new Jerusalem, and will dwell therein permanently, and "not withdraw Himself as He had done more than once from the Jewish sanctuary" (Stuart). Cp. Ex. 40; 38: Eze. 37; 28: 43; 7.

1434. And they shall be His peoples. People is the reading of many copies, but not of the most ancient Codex. The plural may be used to denote the greatness of their numbers.—The precedent is in Le. 26; 11, 12: cp. 2 Co. 6; 16–18: Je. 24; 7: 31; 33: Zec. 8; 8.

XXI; 4. 1437. And God will wipe away, &c. "The idea is not, that God will so compassionate sufferers in the heavenly city as to wipe away their tears, but He will constitute such a state of things that no more tears shall be shed; as the sequel plainly shows" (Stuart). The significancy of this symbolization will be shown under the next number.—This clause occurred verbatim in C. 7; 17. Cp. Is. 25; 8.

1438–40. And death shall be no more, &c. To this sentence corresponds in C. 7; 16; 'They shall hunger no more: neither shall they thirst any more: neither shall the sun strike them, nor any scorch-
ing heat.' Rightly taken, each will be found to be appropriate to the state, to which it has reference,—that before us to a terrestrial, the other to a celestial state. In the celestial state, 'the spirits of just men made perfect' are absolutely set free from all the external trials of an earthly life: in the new Jerusalem state, when it has attained its full perfection, Christ's faithful servants will be delivered from all those causes of sorrow, which spring from apprehended misery in a future state. The meaning of the sentence before us will be found to hinge on the first term. Now it seems clear, that death in the common literal sense is not meant; because the Greek term has the article prefixed to it, which it has not (cp. 6: 18: 8), when physical death is spoken of. Death, either in a symbolical or in a special sense, is indicated by the article. It cannot be the former; because Death, as forming part of a symbol, has been consigned to the lake of fire (20: 14); and, that reference is not made to that annihilation of Death appears from the difference of the mode of expression here as compared with vs. 1,—here 'Death shall be no more,'—there 'The sea is no more.' That, then, which is death par excellence, viz., spiritual death, leading to eternal death, must be meant. And hence, to accord therewith, the 'mourning, and crying, and pain' must denote chiefly such a state of feeling, as proceeds from a sense of being under the power of the former, and liable to all the horrors of the latter of these deaths.—Hengstenberg remarks here; 'On the expression no more Bengel says; 'Therefore till now it had not wholly ceased.'—a memorial for those, who would ascribe more to the 1000 years' reign than what may be found in the period already past.'

1441. Because the first things have passed away. The first things, in consistency with the previous exposition, will be the things of the first Dispensation,—things, 'which stood only in meats, and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed until the time of reformation;' but, more especially, the Legal covenant based on the doctrine of justification by works. This doctrine, and as a necessary consequence these things (for they are the natural fruits and concomitants of the doctrine), had been gradually gaining ground in the Church during the thousand years, which preceded the epoch, at which the symbolizations have arrived: insomuch that the state of things under the Law had been practically restored, and the Gospel of the grace of God excluded and made of none effect through traditions. The object of the Reformation was to revive and restore this Gospel, and to make the things of the first Dispensation pass away. This it sought to effect mainly by the re-promulgation of the doctrine of justification by faith. And, by making the former things to pass away, it banished from among the faithful ones of God's holy city death, spiritual and eternal, with all the train of sorrows that
spring from the fear thereof, and all the concomitant evils which enter with the rival doctrine.—It may be observed, that one portion of the parallel passage, viz., C. 7; 17, "For the lamb... shall feed them, and lead them to living fountains," is not found here, though the thing itself is more than supplied in the new Jerusalem by the gift of the river of the water of life, of the tree of life, and of the lamb to be the light thereof. And indeed the promise of 'the fountain of the water of life' is made in the immediate context: see ve. 6.

In this division:—in ve. 3 there may be reckoned five affirmations of blessings, and in ve. 4 five negations of evils.

(4). Declaration from Him on the throne. XXI; 5. 1442–43. And He who sitteth on the throne said; 'Lo, I make all things new.'

1442. He who sitteth, &c. From this clause it appears, that, while the symbolical heaven and earth had been changed (symbolizing a change of the Mystery or Dispensation), the unchangeable One maintained His position on the throne, as Ruler and Lord of all. Here we may cite in illustration the words of S. Paul, who, after having arrived at the conclusion, that "a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law," goes on to say (Ro. 3; 29); "Is He the God of the Jews only? Is He not also of the Gentiles? Yea, of the Gentiles also, seeing it is one God, which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and the uncircumcision through the faith." Jehovah-Jesus is now the God and the Judge (in right of His Mediatorial office) under the Gentile, as he had been under the Jewish Covenant, and as such He still occupies the throne.

1443. Lo, I make all things new. One object in the introduction of different speakers appears to have been to mark more emphatically a reference to different epochs. Here we observe, that a return is made, from an announcement of a future state of things, to a declaration of what would take place at the time present of the symbolization, that is, circa A.D. 1500. The 'things' (including doctrines and practices) proper to the former Dispensation, and which lay 'in the oldness of the letter,' being made to pass away, 'all things' would be restored to the original 'newness of the spirit.' And this renovation or reformation is declared to have for its first cause Him, 'from whom all good counsels proceed.' How entirely all things were made new by the Reformation may be judged from the differences, which pervade the Romish and Reformed religions, and which extend from the most minute rites to the most important doctrines.

(5). Instruction from the enthroned One. 1444–45. And he saith [to me]; 'Write; because these words [of God] are faithful and true.'

1444. And he saith. The natural construction is, that he who sitteth on the throne is still the speaker. But the change of word and tense in the Greek,—he saith or tells between the double said, and
the similarity of the matter to C. 19; 9, indicate, that here (as in the case there) the angelic hierophant is meant to be conceived of as being the speaker. That angel was, however, shown to be a special representa-
tive of Jesus. And from ve. 6 it is evident, that, if he who sitteth on the throne be immediately referred to, that personage is Jesus. And thus there is no ultimate difference with regard to the person symbolized.

1445. Write; because, &c. ‘Record the declaration just made; for this making new again shall surely come to pass, as surely as I am the Faithful and True one (19; 11): yea, it hath been decreed by Him, who is the first and the last, the amen God.’—Stuart’s inference from this command, that the Apocalypse was written while the visions were passing, is an unsound one. The intention in giving it may have been only (as Hengstenberg says) ‘to point to the high importance of the word spoken (see on 1320). But, as the repeated introduction of this form of words indicates, that it has the nature of a technical formula, I am more inclined to think, that (as I have shown on pp. 353, 456 ss.) one object in using it was to indicate wherein the newness would consist by pointing, by means of the parallelism with C. 19; 9 and 22; 6, to the epoch, into accordance with which the state of things would be brought.—Here we may fitly call to mind the saying of Jesus; “Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass away.” In a sense ‘heaven and earth’ had passed away (cp. 20; 11), but ‘the words of Jesus’ still remained ‘faithful and true.’

(6). Promise and threat of the Alpha and Omega. XXI; 6–8. 1446–60. And he said to me; ‘They are done.’ ‘I am the Alpha and the Omega, the Beginning and the End. To Him who thirsteth, to him will I give of the fountain of the water of life gratuitously. He who conquereth shall inherit these [things]; and I will be to him a God, and he shall be to me a son. But to the fainthearted, and faithless, and abominable, and murderers, and fornicators, and usurers, and idolaters, and all liars,—their part [shall be] in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death.’

1446. He said to me. “The express addition of the to me here is explained by the hortatory character of the discourse in vv. 7–8. In John the Church is addressed:” Hengstenberg.

1447. ‘They are done.’ This phrase may be taken to mean, ‘They (sc. the all things of ve. 5) are made’—new. But the change of word here, and the manifest allusion to the same phrase in C. 16; 17 (the Greek verb is in the singular there, as some copies have it here also), lead me to think, that the phrase is equivalent to ‘It is decreed:’—the decree is gone forth; and therefore the making new is as sure as if it were already done. See on 1101.—The word may have, too, a prospective as well as a retrospective aspect: or perhaps preferably
the former, if a choice must be made between the two. In 1101 the
same word is prefixed to the symbolization of the utter destruction of
Babylon, and with the intention apparently of representing in the
most emphatic manner the going forth of the irrevocable decree of
doom. Here it precedes the final decree of Jehovah-Jesus, touching
the destiny of saints and sinners in connexion with that holy city,
which is the contrast to great Babylon. The decree is to this effect:
"To them, who, by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory
and honour and immortality, eternal life; but to them, who obey not
the truth, . . . indignation and wrath, &c." The insertion, in this
place, of such an announcement of future reward and punishment,
prefaced by a solemn 'It is decreed,' and by a declaration of the
speaker’s eternal duration to serve as a basis for it, appears to indi-
cate, that, at the epoch at which the Vision has arrived, a similar plain
and bold statement of the true doctrine of 'eternal judgment' would
be especially called for, and also boldly promulgated. Accordingly we
find, that the sale of indulgences, based on the Romish doctrine of
Purgatory, was the immediate cause of the Reformation; and we
know well how uncompromisingly the Reformers set forth, that 'the
Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, &c., is a fond thing,
 vainly invented,' and that 'the sacrifice of masses, in which it was
said, that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to
have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and danger-
ous deceits.'—With regard to the rival readings of the word before us,
the weight of authority is in favour of the plural form; but this does
not necessarily make any material difference in the meaning, since we
have met with many instances in this book, in which the plural is
used only to give greater emphasis. There is also a reading, sup-
ported by Codex B, and some cursive MSS., which would give, 'I am
become the Alpha, &c.' This at least favours the hypothesis of a
connexion with the succeeding rather than with the preceding context.'

1448-49. I am the Alpha, &c. Substantially the same declaration
is made in C. 1; 8, 11, 17: 2; 8: 22; 13, and always by the same
speaker, namely, Jesus, who is in like manner elsewhere described, as
'the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever' (cp. He. 7; 3). Hence
we may safely conclude, that it is he, 'who sitteth on the throne.'—
In every instance this declaration stands at the head of some state-
ment of more than ordinary importance and solemnity. Whence it
may be inferred, that, besides the stichiohal reasons for its introd-
uction (Guide, p. 193), it is made to serve as a kind of formula for call-
ing attention to some important announcement. Thus, as ve. 5
contains two independent statements, so do vv. 6-8 stand apart as an
independent passage.

1450. To him who thirsteth. Of those, who had 'come out of the
great tribulation,' and 'entered into their rest' at the epoch of the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem, it was declared (7; 16), that they should 'thirst no more.' By Zechariah (13; 1) and by Joel (3; 18) the announcement had been made; "In that day there shall be a fountain opened for sin." Here, at the commencement of the description of the new Jerusalem, the promise is made, to give 'to him who thirsteth of the water of life,'—a promise, which is repeated in the conclusion thereof in the form of an invitation (see 22; 17), and almost in the very words of Isaiah's invite; 'Ho, every one that thirsteth come ye to the waters,' and again of that of Jesus himself in John 7; 37; 'If any one thirst, let him come unto me and drink.' Such a promise and such an invitation necessarily imply, that there will be those in the new Jerusalem, who may, and to whom it is a matter of life or death, that they should, feel such a thirsting after life eternal. But if so (and especially as compared with the declaration, that in the celestial regions men shall thirst no more), it must follow, that the new Jerusalem symbolizes a state of the Church on earth, and one by no means so absolutely perfect and free from sin and sorrow as many have supposed.—The identity of the promise here with that, which in C. 22; 17 is said to be made by Jesus, and its similarity to those, which Jesus made while on earth (see Jo. 4; 14: 6; 35, 53: 7; 37), furnish additional testimonies to the fact, that 'he who sitteth on the throne' (20; 11: 21; 5) is Jesus.—*To him will I give.* Strong emphasis is laid on the *him and* η by the insertion of the pronouns in the Greek. 'To him, even to him alone who thirsteth, but trusteth not in himself, η, even η, who am the Faithful and True witness, all whose words are faithful and true, and who alone am able, will give.' It is proper to state, however, that the Greek pronoun for *to him* is omitted in some copies.

1451. *Of the fountain of the water of life.* See on 519.—Some copies omit of the fountain, and some of life.—*Gratuitously.* The use of this word again in C. 22; 17 indicates, that it is a most important one to the sentence. The Greek word does not mean freely, that is, abundantly, but gratuitously,—of free grace and favour.—The aim and the result of the Reform was to restore and to exalt the doctrine of the free grace of God, namely, that 'salvation is by grace through faith, and that not of ourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any one should boast' (Ep. 2; 8, cp. Ro. 5; 15-18: 6; 23). This doctrine had been overlaid, and practically obliterated from the creed of the Christian Church, by the introduction of doctrines of Pardons, Indulgences, Intercessions of saints, Masses, and meritoriousness of man's works. But now, to prepare the way for the new Jerusalem, and to lay, in the teaching of the apostles, its foundation (see ve. 14, and cp. 1 Co. 3; 11; 'Other foundation can no man lay
than Jesus Christ”), this doctrine was to be promulgated anew, and re-laid as the chief corner-stone. And accordingly this re-promulgation is symbolized in the most emphatic manner. The Reformation was in this respect a re-opening of the fountain of the water of life, as it was also in leading to the free circulation of the Scriptures a giving anew of the bread of life.—Hengstenberg has remarked; ‘All that is here said to ennoble the period, when God makes all things new, is at the same time an evidence of poverty in respect to the thousand years. In it the thirsty did not drink to satisfaction from the fountain of the water of life.’ So that we may see here a contrast implied between the state of things at the epoch, to which the symbolizations have conduced us, and that, which prevailed during the preceding millennium. The one state was characterized by great external prosperity of the Church, accompanied by a relapse into the old and abolished state of things: the latter by the revival of the truth, and the free flowing forth of its blessings.

XXI; 7. 1452. *He who conquereth.* The word conquer necessarily implies a previous conflict; and in the Apocalypse, in the form in which it is used here, it has reference invariably to a persecution for religion. Hengstenberg says; ‘The practical aim plainly meets us in this verse. It is to impart strength to the Church groaning under the cross’ [necessarily to the Church of the epoch, to which the symbolization relates], ‘so that from regard to the coming glory she may stand fast amid temptations.’ To perceive how appropriately such an allusion to persecution might be introduced in reference to the time of the Reformation, we need only call to mind the fulminations in Papal bulls, and all the horrors of the Inquisition.—It can scarcely be necessary to observe, that the implication, that a persecution would, or even that it might occur in connexion with the state of the Church here symbolized is utterly inconsistent with the notion, that the true Church would enjoy under it exemption from all evils, or even be at this time a paramount power on earth. Much more cannot this be a celestial state of the Church. At the same time, there is nothing in the occurrence of such a persecution inconsistent with the non-existence of a sea, that is, of a dominant heathen power, capable of persecuting.—Shall inherit. This word carries with it an allusion to ‘the death of the testator’ (He. 9; 16), who bequeaths the inheritance, and who is the speaker here. It rests, proleptically or by an anticipation, on the last clause in the verse; ‘he shall be to me a son:’ ‘if a son, then an heir of God through Christ:’—“joint heirs with Christ; if we suffer, we shall also be glorified together.”—Again, the word inherit seems to look forward in this case to a future state, i.e. a heavenly: cp. 2; 7, 11: 8; 5, 12, 21.—These things is, on every account, a preferable reading to all things. The latter would in strictness vol. ii.
include things good and bad; whereas the latter of these cannot be meant here. The things intended must be those, which had just been promised, namely, intimate communion with God, freedom from all spiritual sorrows and fears (vv. 3, 4), and participation in the waters of life, which would include or imply all the blessings, that flow from being made, by the grace of God through faith, a true "member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven." Cp. Mt. 19; 29; 'Every one who hath forsaken houses, &c., shall inherit everlasting life.'—This is the eighth instance of the formula, with which each of the seven epistles concludes.

1453. And I will be to him a God. If we compare 2 Sa. 7; 14; "I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a son," taking as explanatory of it the words which follow in ve. 15; "My favour will I not take from him," we may conclude, that the meaning is this:—I will stand to him in the relation of one, who with all the affection of a father unites all the power of God, and who consequently can and will keep him from all harm, and bestow upon him every blessing: I will be to him an almighty Protector, Preserver, and Saviour.—In 1434–36 a declaration, similar in form to the promise here given to conquerors individually, is made in reference to the peoples of the holy city collectively.

1454. And he shall be to me a son. Emphasis is laid on he by the insertion of the Greek pronoun: as much as to say, 'He, who does not succumb under persecution, shall be, in particular and above all others, &c.'—The article is inserted before son in very many cursive MSS., but not in the two ancient Codices. Its insertion here would at any rate be very pertinent, inasmuch as it would intimate, that such an one should be the son par excellence, that is, in a higher sense than others.

XXI; 8. 1455. The fainthearted or fearful are those timid Christians, who, 'moved by persecution' (as Stuart says) desert from or fear to join the ranks of those, who, they are secretly convinced, hold the truth in its original purity. This is the class of temporizing time-servers, who fear man rather than God, and who, 'when affliction or persecution ariseth for the word's sake, straightway are offended.' Here is another indication, that a celestial or even a paradisiacal state of the Church cannot be contemplated in the scene before us; and the circumstance, that the term which implies persecution is placed first on the list, is an intimation, that persecution would be a salient feature of the time referred to.—The faithless, or those who have not faith, will include, not only professed unbelievers, but also those professing Christians, who are destitute of that faith which justifies and sanctifies. These fitly pair with the former class; though they are perhaps a degree worse, being destitute of 'the root
of the matter,' which the others may not be, though their root has
not vigour enough to show a stem above ground.—Hengstenberg has
remarked; "With fearfulness unbelief is united into a pair, as its
inseparable companion. Where there is no faith, there is no courage;
for the foundation of courage is confidence in God's help: and where
no courage is, there is no faith; for faith must necessarily manifest
itself in a spirit of invincible strength."—We find the two brought
together in our Lord's words in Mk. 4; 40; "Why are ye so fearful!
How is it that ye have not faith?" The word fearful occurs elsewhere
only in the parallel place in Mt. 8; 26.—Scholz inserts after the faith-
less, the sinful or transgressors; but the weight of authority is generally
considered to be against the reading; and the fact, that it appears to
have been the author's intention to make four pairs of classes, is also
opposed to it.

1456. The abominable. This word occurs in three other places of
the Apocalypse, viz., 17; 4, 5; "A cup in her hand full of abomina-
tions;" "The mother of harlots, and of the abominations of the earth:" 21; 27; 'There shall in no wise enter into the new Jerusalem any-
thing that defileth, nor that worketh an abomination.' Cp. Ti. 1; 16:
1 Pe. 4; 3. The term is evidently used to denote some heinous
offenders; and from the connexion in which it stands in the places
referred to may probably designate those, whom S. Paul describes in
1 Co. 6; 9 as "the effeminate and abusers of themselves with mankind,"
and in 1 Ti. 1; 10 as "defilers of themselves with mankind," and in
Ro. 1; 24–27 as those who give themselves up to "vile affections,"
and whom S. Jude stigmatizes as "filthy dreamers who defile the
flesh" in like manner as the Sodomites did, and by those sins to
which the term 'abominations' is applied in Le. 18; 22. In a par-
allel passage in C. 22; 15 there are six terms, the last five of which
are identical with the last five here. This circumstance makes it
highly probable, that the first term there, namely, dogs, is a technical
term convertible with the first here, namely the abominable. If so,
the sense I have now attributed to the latter term will be fully con-
firmed by the parallel example, as will be seen, when we come to the
exposition of that text.—Murderers. Those who would interpret this
term spiritually may perhaps allege in support of their construction
the text; 'Satan was a murderer (that is, as they would explain, 'of
the soul') from the beginning.' But it may well be questioned, whether
this text was intended to convey a spiritual meaning. And certainly
the connexion excludes such a sense in the present instance.—The
propriety of pairing together the two most heinous of all crimes is
obvious.

1457. Fornicators. This word, like the preceding one, might be
interpreted spiritually, and taken to mean idolaters. But, if it were,
offenders of this class would be twice mentioned; and this may suffice to show, that such a spiritualizing interpretation is inadmissible here. —Wizards will include all, who participate in any superstitious acts or opinions, such as incantations, witchcrafts, spells, magical arts, divinations, exorcisings, vaticinations from dreams and omens, fortune-tellings, lucky and unlucky days, and the like. Cp. C. 18; 22, and see on 1594.—Fornicators and wizards "have this in common, that their attempts on the well-being of a neighbour, unlike those of the murderer, are made covertly:" Hengstenberg.

1458. Idolaters. The epoch to which this scene relates, and the general bearing of the context forbid the supposition, that heathens are had in view. Hence we are constrained to interpret this term as referring to those, who are practically, though not professedly worshippers of idols. Wherever images are used in worship, the result will be the same: the educated classes may perhaps regard them as representatives only, but the uneducated will, more or less according to their knowledge, superstitiously reverence and even worship the image itself.—All liars, that is, liars of every description and degree, of whom 'the name is legion.' Cheats, disseisers, hypocrites, and all who seek in any manner or by any means to deceive or impose on others will be included. Stuart, however, limits the meaning to 'the false doctrines of idolaters:' and if idolaters be taken in the sense just indicated, as denoting those, who do not 'hold the truth in incorruptness,' I can have no objection to this construction. Indeed, C. 2; 2, the form of the original (lit. 'all the liars'), and the connexion which will appear between the members of this pair, if Stuart's interpretation be adopted, make it probable, that deniers of 'the truth as it is in Jesus' may have been specially had in view (cp. on 90, 940). At the same time, it may be thought, that the insertion of the word all, in this instance only, is opposed to limiting the meaning to these. Hengstenberg's view is as follows. "In the last pair the idolaters are the species, liars the genus: and generally all liars. Idolaters are liars, since they change God's truth into a lie, and have given glory and worship to the creature along with the Creator. In respect to the idolaters it is indifferent, whether they worship what are more commonly called idols, or mammon and their belly (Ep. 5; 5: Co. 3; 5: Ph. 3; 19)."

1459. Their part, &c. In order to make the sentence grammatically correct, an insertion must be made before these words, so as to read; 'and to all liars [I will not be a God, but they shall have] their part, &c.'

1460. In the lake, &c. Cp. 19; 20: 20; 10, 14. It may be observed, that the expressions differ in all the three places.

1455–58. Eight classes of sinners (in 'four pairs,' as Hengstenberg
notices) are here specified. Of these the first two are transgressors of the first table of the Law (being those who, through fear of man, fail to worship God in spirit and in truth, and those who are destitute of saving faith in God), and the last six are offenders under the second table. Below is a comparative Table, showing the points of agreement between the list before us and two others, and making manifest sufficient indications to prove, that the arrangements of the crimes have not been wholly fortuitous, though the object in view in each instance may not be discoverable.—In the first list the sin of idolatry holds the first place, as coming under the first table; while in the two others it occupies the fifth place under the second table. This assignment of the same sin to each table in turn may be accounted for by supposing, that professed idol-worshippers (that is, heathens) are contemplated in the one case, but those who are only virtually such (that is, heathenizers and papistical Christians) in the others. For a distinction may be made between these and the heathen in this respect,—that the heathen are both theoretically (or doctrinally) and practically idolaters, while heathenizers and papistical Christians are only, more or less, practically such. The remarkable difference between the first and the two last passages in the mode of describing the transgressors seems strongly to confirm this view. What Hengstenberg says of fornicators and wizards,—that they are here viewed as injurers of their neighbour, may probably be extended to heathenizers, who in truth by seducing men by example, if not by precept, to forsake the worship of the true God, or to worship Him in a way that He has expressly forbidden, do them the greatest possible injury.—The order of arrangement of the several crimes will be seen to be different in the three lists. Murder and sorcery stand first in No. 1, but they occur interchangeably in the second and fourth, and fourth and second places in Nos. 2 and 3 respectively. Fornication has the third place in each list. Theft, which occurs last in No. 1, is not found in Nos. 2 or 3; but its place is supplied by liars, which holds the last place in Nos. 2 and 3. The abominable in No. 2 has the first place, and corresponds to dogs in No. 3. The number six in C. 21 and 22, to accord with the number of the commandments on the second table, is perhaps not accidental. In C. 21; 27 defileth, abomination, and a lie correspond respectively to fornicators, abominable, and liars in the passage before us.

No. 1. ix; 20–21. No. 2. xxi; 8. No. 3. xxii; 15.

A. First table. A. First table.
1. False gods, and 1. Fainthearted.
   idols of, &c. 2. Faith-less.
B. Second table.      B. Second table.      B. Second table.
3. Fornication.       3. Fornicators.    3. Fornicators.
[Cp. 1 Ti. 1; 9–10:]  5. Idolaters.       5. Idolaters.

The passage, which we have now been considering, is commonly diverted from its true application by the assumption, that it was designed to be applicable, either generally to all times, or otherwise to the time of the author. No one would deny, that the denunciation herein contained may be applied, wherever and whenever the sins specified prevail; but to suppose, that such a denunciation as this was introduced into the symbolization of the new Jerusalem, either with a loose general reference, or with an application to a state of things, which existed so many ages previous to the time to which the symbolization relates, is utterly incongruous. All the precedents in the book are opposed to such a view. In every instance (take, e.g., the parallel one in C. 9; 20–21), the statements have reference to the epoch, at which the Vision has arrived. If there be any exception, it is when a passage has a prophetic form, instead of the ordinary historical (I saw), as, for example, C. 11; 2–11. But this is not the case here. And in no instance, that I am aware of, has any statement a merely general or a retrospective bearing. Here, the contents of the passage itself fully sanction the opinion, that the state of things which was being described was had in view. It was a state, consequent on a making new of all things: ve. 5. The word conquer implies, that a conflict of some kind was going on. The specification of certain classes of offenders, while others are omitted, indicates a special prevalence of particular crimes; and thus shows, that the declarations are not merely general. Further, the arrangement, by which this passage has been introduced after the announcement of the descent of the new Jerusalem, seems to have been made on purpose to indicate, that the contents of the passage have immediate reference to, or are closely connected with the new Jerusalem state. If, then, the view be well-founded, that the denunciation before us has reference to the time, to which the symbolization relates, it ought to appear, that there was at that time a special call for such a denunciation.

We must proceed, therefore, to show, that such was the case in the early days of the Reformed Church. And, 1st, the offenders under the first table of the Law, who would be brought into special prominence by the circumstances of the time, and would need to be specially warned and threatened, would be the fainthearted and the faith-less. The greatest impediment to the speedy purification of the Church
must unquestionably have been the unwillingness (through fear of persecution) of those, who were convinced of the corrupt state of the Church in doctrine and in practice, to avow their conviction, and join in the demand for a reformation. And, 2dly, if justification by faith be the "articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiae," then to denounce those who held not this doctrine, and had not this faith, must have been a point of primary importance at such a crisis. 3. The class of crimes coming under the second table of the Law, which might most appropriately be selected to hold the first place, in a denunciation having reference to this epoch, would be vices of an abominable character; for such must, in the nature of things, have been the product of the seclusion of the sexes in the solitude of monasteries and convents, coupled with constrained celibacy in the vast extent to which it was now carried; and such, as a matter of fact, we know to have prevailed to a fearful extent:—witness, e.g., the history of many even of the Popes themselves. 4. Murders might well stand next; for, besides those, who were carried off by poison or assassination in various ways, what but murdered were they, who perished at the stake, or under the tortures of the Inquisition, in so many countries? 5. In respect of fornication, what was said in reference to the first-named crime will have a vastly wider application. 6. Sorceries of various kinds were prominent among the superstitions, which had been introduced into the Church, as, e.g., the belief in and practice of bewitching, charming, an evil eye, touching for the king’s evil, pseudo-miracles, apparitions, necromancy, contracts with the devil. 7. As to idolatry, it may be superfluous to say anything. The universal use of images in the Church of Rome, and the superstitious reverence paid to some more than others by the bulk of the people, speaks for itself, and proves that Church to have been then practically, if not theoretically idolatrous. And, for a Christian people to be idolaters is a crime of the deepest dye, and deserving of the highest degree of punishment. 8. With no less truth may it be said, I fear, that true liars above all others might be found, at the epoch of the Reformation, in the Church of Rome. For, to what a height of iniquity must that Church have reached, when the doctrine, that no faith was to be kept with heretics (meaning those, who professed to derive their faith exclusively from the word of God), was boldly avowed and openly taught by the heads of the Church! And what must have been the consequence of sowing such seed?—especially when a vast society, based on the principle of unscrupulous dissimulation and deceit, was instituted to carry the seed into all lands, and spread it through all classes from the highest to the lowest? Under such circumstances it were impossible, but that every kind of lie must flourish and abound; and history shows, that such was the case.
There is yet an inference from this list of transgressors, which strikes us as very obvious. A denunciation of such offenders are enumerated here would be altogether out of place, unless they might and would exist under the state of things symbolized in this prelude. And if so, the condition of Christendom at the commencement of, or as preparatory to the new Jerusalem state, so far from being a pure and exalted condition of the Church (considered as including all professors of Christianity), must be far indeed from that state of purity, which the Church may reasonably be expected to attain on earth. How remote, then, is this symbolization from depicting a paradisiacal, to say nothing of a celestial state!

1442-60. While vv. 5–8 stand apart from what follows and precedes them, so as rightly to be placed in a separate paragraph, it is obvious, that there is a subdivision in the paragraph, insomuch as ve. 5 forms an introduction to or basis of the remaining portion. Vv. 6–8, then, hold out a reward on the one hand, and a punishment on the other, to be awarded to certain characters; and in doing they describe the salient features of the parties intended in a way, which seems to identify them with the people of the epoch, to which we have been led by a regular and systematic evolution of the Vision to refer the present symbolization. For, first, we have the promise made to him, who is thirsting after the knowledge of the way of salvation, that he shall have free access given him to the well-springs of life, and, if he persevere unto the end in spite of the terrors of persecution, shall be made the child of God and an heir of eternal life. And, next, we have eternal perdition set forth as the doom of those, who should be partakers in the prominent sins of the period.

The portion in vv. 5–8 may be regarded as having somewhat of the character of a digression. The narrative opens with an announcement of the descent of the new Jerusalem, and of the blessed consequences, which would result to men, from the setting up of the tabernacle of God upon earth. But, instead of proceeding with the description of the holy city, the narration is suspended for the purpose of introducing the portion contained in these verses. And it is only when this has been completed, that the hierophant comes forward to describe in detail the glories of the heaven-born city. We may, then, rightly take the following view of the tableau described in C. 21–22; 5. The author's primary object was to depict the Church of Christ on earth in that pure and perfect state, to which it will ultimately attain. But in order thereto it was chronologically necessary, that first of all the era of the incipient commencement of that state should be marked. Accordingly its advent on earth at the time, when (in fulfilment of the Divine decree) all things in religion would be renovated, is symbolized; and the blessings resulting therefrom
are figuratively depicted in general terms. The condition of the Church, during the struggles attendant on the birth of the reformed faith, is then by implication set forth, in declaring the reward which the faithful reformers should receive, and the punishment which would await the upholders of the corrupt system. And it is only when, by way of introduction, this has been done, that the narrative passes to the primary object had in view. By necessary implication, it will follow from this view of the relation to one another of the two portions,—the former describing the Church at the era of its incipient renovation, and the latter at the time when it would be advancing towards the last and perfect stage of its purification,—that the intermediate period is one of progressive advancement from the former to the latter state. To the length of each period no clue is given.

(7). An hierophant appears. XXI; 9. 1461–66. And one of the seven angels who had the seven bowls, which are filled with the seven last plagues, came and spake with me, saying; 'Come, I will show thee the bride, the lamb's wife.'

1461–62. And one of the seven, &c. It is more easy to see, why one of these plague-angels should have been the hierophant selected to exhibit the judgment on the great whore, Babylon (17; 1), than why he, in particular, should now be brought forward to 'show the bride, the lamb's wife.' Still, an explanation may be found in the circumstance, that the present is manifestly a companion-picture to that in Cs. 17–18. The bride, the holy city new Jerusalem, forms the contrast to the whore, the great city Babylon. And, the better to bring them together in contrast, they have the same hierophant. And not so inappropriately either, as may seem at first sight; for the angel, who on the former occasion was a messenger of judgment to God's enemies, was at the same time a messenger of mercy to His people. The companionship too, in a way of contrast, is still further indicated by the introductory sentences being, as far as the contrast would permit, verbally identical: see on 1117.

1463. Which are filled, &c. Cp. C. 15; 1, 7.

1466. The bride, the wife of the lamb. Here, as in the parallel case of heathen Rome, the body corporate is represented by a twofold symbol, a woman and a city (see on 948, 1127). The reason is, that a single symbol was inadequate to exhibit the points required to be brought to view, namely, reproductiveness (associated with the idea of purity or of impurity, as the case might be), and corporate greatness (allied either with the symmetry of order, or with the deformity of licentious and unbridled tyranny). As the salient point in the two cases was different, and to be made a matter of contrast, in the one a female figure, habited in all the meretricious ornaments of a common
prostitute, is made the visible symbol, while the city comes to view only nominally (as the whore’s designation), and descriptively (when the course of narration necessitated its introduction); whereas, in the other case, the city resplendent from an order, decoration, and illumination, surpassing the work of man, appears as the visible symbol, and the woman is introduced only as a descriptive term, denoting the relation of the corporate body to its Lord, and the quality it possesses of perpetual reproduction in fidelity and purity. Licentious unfaithfulness, and open hostility to the Lord are the prominent features to be exhibited in the one case; and, in contrast with these, the order and beauty of holiness, based on faithful and pure devotedness, in the other. The contrast is carried out in the details, as far as two so widely differing things as a woman and a city would admit. This I will show, after expounding the details.—I may here observe, that, as the Greek word for city is feminine, and consequently the pronouns she and her are always used in speaking of a city, this may possibly have suggested the conjoining of a woman with a city, to form as it were a single symbol, having two sides or aspects.—Both Babylon and the new Jerusalem may represent a visible body-corporate, civil and ecclesiastical; but the former is viewed mainly under its civil aspect, while the latter is regarded almost exclusively from the ecclesiastical or spiritual point of view.—It can neither be doubted, that the bride here must be substantially identical with the bride in C. 19; 7 (see on 1430), nor yet,—as well from the term itself, as from the descriptive statements, and from parallel passages (Is. 54; 5: 62; 5: Mt. 9: 15: 25; 1 ss.: John 3; 29: 2 Co. 11; 2: Re. 14; 4),—that this is a symbol of the Church of Christ. The use of the same designations, bride and wife, shows, that substantially the same thing is symbolized in the two places; while the application of the name ‘new Jerusalem,’ in the latter place only, indicates, that it there appears under a different phase to that, in which it appeared in the former. But if so, and if the bride in C. 19; 7 has been satisfactorily shown (see on 1312, 1314) to represent the visible Church, as it came perfect in doctrine and discipline from the hands of its apostolic founders, then assuredly “the bride, the lamb’s wife,” called “new Jerusalem,” must symbolize that Church as restored to its pristine and apostolic purity, and ‘presented anew as a chaste virgin to Christ,’ being ‘espoused to one husband,’ to be formed into ‘a godly matron,’ ‘the mother of many children.’—Hengstenberg says; “That the bride of the lamb is here spoken of shows, that the glory of the Church is here behold in its becoming and beginning; and corresponds to the circumstance of the prophet seeing, in ve. 10 as in ve. 2, the new Jerusalem coming down.” This becoming and beginning must certainly be taken to be becoming the new Jerusalem and beginning anew in a
renovated state; for it is clear, that, at the least, more than a millennium is placed between the two appearances of the bride.—The new Jerusalem may be described as a bride, not only with reference to recency of marriage, but also (and perhaps chiefly) in order to indicate her perfect purity. She is further described as a wife, to denote her faithful attachment to her Lord; and, as the wife of the Lamb, to signify, that in her alone (as a general rule) is there, through the blood of the Lamb, admission to peace and perpetual bliss.

**THE NEW JERUSALEM: THE SCENE PROPER; Ch. xxi; 10–xxii; 5.**

"After the Introduction," as Hengstenberg says, "we have now the main theme, the lengthened description of the new Jerusalem."

DIV. I. THE SEER'S TRANSLATION, AND FIRST VISION OF THE NEW JERUSALEM.

XXI; 10. 1467–72. *And he carried me away in spirit to a great and high mountain, and showed me the city, the holy Jerusalem, coming down out of the heaven from God, having the glory of God.*

1467. *And he carried me away in spirit.* So in 1126.—See on 37 and 290.—Four changes of the seer's locality are explicitly noticed, of which this is the fourth.

1468. *To a great and high mountain.* The place of vision appropriately assigned, when the Church in a persecuted and backsliding state was to be contemplated, was a desert island (1; 9); when the trial of those who had lived under the first Mystery was to be symbolized, a court of judicature in heaven (4; 1); when the coming desolation of the Babylon of heathenism was to be depicted, a desolate wilderness (17; 3); and here, when the Church's exaltation upon earth is to be represented, it is a great and high mountain.—Inasmuch as a mountain is a symbol of a kingdom, the seer's being placed on a great and high mountain might possibly be intended to denote, that, for a person to be a spectator, and much more an inhabitant of God's holy city, the true Church, he must put under his feet as it were 'all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them.' But, more probably, the locality of vision assigned was intended to be referred to the city, the mountain being designed for its ultimate site. All the precedents just referred to show, that the locality is intended to be taken in reference to the things symbolized, rather than to the seer himself; though he, as the acting representative of the Church, for whose sake the things are shown, must needs be included. In particular, as in the case of Babylon the 'desert' intimated her approaching desolation, so in the case of the new Jerusalem the 'great and high mountain,' to which she is seen approaching, denotes her future abiding pre-eminence over the kingdoms of
the earth. 'Great Babylon' stood on hills of small elevation; but such will be the ultimate exaltation of 'new Jerusalem,' that to inspect her interior, so as to appreciate her full spiritual excellence, the beholder must take his stand as it were on a great and high mountain.—'That the mountain,' says Hengstenberg, 'is destined for the site of the new Jerusalem (which was denied in their perplexity by those, who would transfer the new Jerusalem to heaven), appears first from the consideration advanced by Bengel; 'In the wilderness, whither John himself had been carried, was the whore herself, therefore also on the great and high mountain, to which he is now borne, is the city itself.' The same thing is further manifest from the Old Testament fundamental passages.' Ezekiel was, in like manner, placed on a very high mountain, 'whereon there was like the building of a city' (40:2). In Ez. 17; 22, also, a lofty mountain is spoken of in respect to the future glorification of the kingdom of God: cp. Mi. 4; 1. Is. 2; 2 ss.; 'In the last days the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it.' C. 25; 6 ss.; 'In this mountain shall the Lord of hosts make unto all nations a feast of fat things, &c. And the Lord shall wipe away tears from all faces, &c.' There is, however, this difference to be observed in the precedents—that they (having reference to 'the last days') represent the city as being established on the top of the mountain; whereas in the symbolization before us it is described as only just issuing from the heaven on its descent towards the mountain; and, in order to see it, a man must take his stand on the mountain-top, above the clouds, which intervene between earth and heaven. By this it is signified, that, at the epoch to which the symbolism refers, the Church would be only entering on the course, which would issue in her ultimate exaltation; and that he who would discern her excellence must rise above the low, dark, fleeting things of earth. At the same time, by the subsequent description of the city being based on the supposition, that she is built upon the mountain (as appears from her having foundation-stones, being surrounded by nations of the earth, having a river flowing from her, &c.), it is denoted, that she is then described at the epoch of her attaining to her state of ultimate purity.—Cp. Enoch 29; 8; 'Michael answered me, saying; That mountain which thou beholdest, the extent of whose head resembles the seat of the Lord, will be the seat on which shall sit the holy and great Lord of glory, when he shall come and descend to visit the earth with goodness.' See also Enoch, Cs. 21, 24, 31, 51: 4 Ezra 2; 12: Apocr. Apoc. of John: Hermas, Sim. ix; 177.

1469. And showed me the city. The reading of the R. T., the great
city, is accredited by "very many MSS., but not by A or B, nor by near thirty cursive." Its correspondence, however, with the parallel clause in ve. 2, in respect of inserting a second adjective, gives some additional probability to it.—The resumption of the narrative here in the same terms, that were used in ve. 2, shows plainly, according to the technical practice in several places, that the intermediate portion is to be regarded in the light of a parenthetical Introduction to the principal portion contained in Cs. 21; 10: 22; 5.—The prototype of this city may be found in Eze. Cs. 40-48.

1472. Having the glory of God. The idea intended to be conveyed seems to be, that the symbolic city was resplendent with a dazzling brilliancy, like to that with which the sun shines in his meridian strength, and too great for mortal eyes to endure: cp. Acts 26; 13. This resplendence denotes the special presence of God in His Church: Is. 60; 1, 19. 'God is present—this was the noblest ornament even of the Church of the Old Testament, its most glorious privilege, its fundamental distinction from the heathen world. But in the new Jerusalem the presence of God shall manifest itself in a way hitherto unknown.' "Jehovah therein" is the crowning point in Ezekiel's city. Hence this is an item proper to stand alone, and at the head of all the rest.—Here let me observe once for all, that I believe it will be found impossible to assign a specific signification to all the details in the new Jerusalem symbolism; and hence it may be inferred, that some, at any rate, have been inserted only for the general effect.

DIV. 2. GENERAL VIEW OF THE EXTERIOR.

XXI; 11-17. 1473–1501. Her luminary [was] like to a most precious stone, as it were a jasper-stone clear as crystal. She had a great and high wall. She had twelve gates, and over the gates twelve angels, and names written thereon, which are the names of the twelve tribes of the sons of Israel: on the east three gates, and on the north three gates, and on the south three gates, and on the west three gates. And the wall of the city had twelve foundation-stones; and on them twelve names of the twelve apostles of the lamb. And he who spake with me had a golden measuring reed in order to measure the city, and her gates, and her wall. And the city is laid out as a tetragon; and the length of her [is] as much as the breadth. And he measured the city with the reed for twelve chilindres of stadia: the length and the breadth and the height of her are equal. And he measured her wall [for] a hundred [and] forty-four cubits, man's measure, that is, an angel's.

1473. Her luminary was like to a most precious stone. The and is omitted in critical editions; and its omission, considering that it occurs in the Apocalypse at the commencement of almost every sen-
tence, is an indication of a wide break here.—The original word rendered by light in the A. V., properly means, not light, but that which gives the light, a luminary. The idea is, that, in consequence of the presence of God in the holy city, she becomes herself a splendid luminary (op. vs. 23). The generic signification is obviously related closely to that of the preceding item; but the latter directs the thoughts more immediately to the cause, and the former to the effect of the city's splendour: as thus, the grace of God works out the sanctification of all the citizens, who in consequence shine, like to 'the sun' and 'the stars,' in all the beauty of holiness. The more specific design may be to represent 'the city of God,' the true Church of Christ, as being 'a light to lighten the nations,' even to the most distant parts of the earth. Such, by its missionary efforts, the Protestant Church has already in some degree proved to be.

1474. As it were a crystal jasper-stone. The jasper was accounted by John the noblest of precious stones, as appears from his selecting it to form the first foundation (ve. 18), and also the superstructure of the wall of the city (ve. 19), and still more from his using it (4; 3) to convey an idea of the glorious appearance of Him, who sits on the throne. Perhaps he may have had the diamond in view. Dioscorides and Psellus, however, speak of a crystal kind of jasper.

XXI; 12. 1475. She had a great and high wall—for the exclusion of "everything that defileth, &c." op. vv. 17, 27. Here the strength and magnitude of the wall, as a means of affording protection, is had in view: cp. Zec. 2; 5: Is. 26; 1. By it the protection afforded by a pure and perfect system of doctrine and discipline may be denoted.

—Hengstenberg, having remarked "by the walls great and high is here represented the security of the new Jerusalem against all hostile assaults," was constrained by his erroneous view, that the locale of the new Jerusalem will be a glorified earth, to seek to turn the edge of the necessary implication by adding, "The dangers, against which the wall protects, could be no real, but only conceivable and possible ones." The city of God provided with a defence against imaginary dangers! What next shall we be asked to believe?

1476. She had twelve gates—to give the freest admission to every one, who might come thirsting after the water of life, and to prevent the entrance of all others: op. 22; 14; that they may 'enter in through the gates,' and ve. 27; 'there shall in no wise enter in, &c.': Is. 26; 2; 'Open ye the gates, that the righteous nation, which keepeth the truth, may enter therein:' Ps. 118; 20; 'The gates of the Lord, the righteous enter into it:' on which Cruden remarks; "These are those of the Lord's tabernacle, where the righteous, the priests of the Lord, the true Israelites, paid their vows to the Lord; where none were to enter but purified Israelites."—"Gates," accord-
ing to Wemyss, "are the symbol of power, government, security."—
The number was chosen as being a perfect number, and the number,
which is used symbolically to denote a dynasty or nation in its com-
pleteness or entirety (see Vol. I: p. 38): also, because it allowed
of the same number of gates being assigned to each of the four sides of
the city; and because this number was requisite, in order to allow of
the inscription of the names of the twelve tribes, a gate for each
name.

1477. And over [or of] the gates twelve angels. These stand as porters
or "watchmen" (Is. 62: 6) to give or refuse admittance, their number
being of course determined by that of the gates. Cp. 1 Chr. 26: 13;
2 Chr. 8: 14.—According to the use of angels throughout the Vision,
these may represent Jesus; and then it will be denoted, that admis-
sion to his true Church will be given by himself alone. See Jo. 10;
9: 'I am the door' and cp. C. 3: 20; 'I stand at the door.' Mt.
25: 10; 'the door of mercy.' Lu. 13: 25: Acts 14: 27: 1 Co. 16: 9:
Co. 4: 3.

1478-79. Names . . . of Israel. Cp. Eze. 48: 31; "One gate of
Reuben," &c. And in Syn. Sohar, p. 115, it is said; "In the palace
of the world to come there are twelve gates, each of which is inscribed
with one of the twelve tribes, as that of Reuben, of Simeon, &c. He,
therefore, who is of the tribe of Reuben is received into none of the
twelve gates but his own; and so of the rest."—This quotation would
help to show, if there were any occasion to do so, that the meaning
is, that the names were on the gates, and not on the angels, as the
connexion might at first sight lead some to suppose.—The inscription
on the gates of the names of the patriarchs and representatives of the
Law (see on 238) shows, that the gates represent the Law. Now, the
gates of a city serve two purposes,—to exclude enemies, or those who
are unworthy of admittance, and to admit those, to whom the Gover-
nor of the city grants admission. In like manner, the Law of God
serves both these purposes in reference to 'the city and church of the
living God.' It bars the gates of the holy city, and gives admission
to none but those, who can satisfy its demands. Now satisfaction
may be given in two ways,—in person or by proxy,—by a man's own
righteousness, or by his being made a partaker in 'the righteousness
of God, which is by faith in Jesus Christ.' But, inasmuch as no
fallen being can satisfy the Law by his own righteousness, the Law
bars the gates of 'the kingdom of heaven' against all, who come trust-
ing in any merits of their own, and, by excluding any other way of
entrance, 'shuts up all unto the faith of Jesus.' Thus it becomes 'a
schoolmaster' or 'pedagogue' [conductor] to guide men's steps to
Christ,—even to him, who is here symbolized as the doorkeeper, that
alone can open 'the strait gate' of the Law, and throw wide the portals
of the holy city; and who is thus represented as being virtually the very gate and "door" of heaven. And so the Law becomes 'a savour of death unto death to some, but of life unto life to others.' Like a gate, it serves both for exclusion and for admission.—A name being on every gate alike, and no gate without a name, may import, that no exception is made. There is no bye-way nor side-way; but the entrance of all, from whatever quarter they come, must be made by the same 'strait gate,'—by the same 'door,' that is, by faith in Jesus, the satisfer of the Law; for, as the apostle says, 'there is salvation in none other; for there is no other name but his given among men, whereby they may be saved.'—Cp. on 469.—In this item, again, we find plain indications, that a militant state of the Church is symbolized.

XXI; 13. 1480–83. On the east three gates, etc. Cp. Eze. 48; 31 ss. But, in the order, neither Ezekiel nor Isaiah (43; 5), but rather our Lord (Mt. 8; 11) is followed.—The object of this specification may have been to intimate, that access to Christ's true Church should be given equally to all, whether they came from the East or from the West, from the North or from the South.

XXI; 14. 1484–85. The wall had twelve foundation-stones. From there being twelve foundation-stones, it follows, that a single stone filled the space between every two gates; and each was a precious stone (ve. 19). Twelve were required, in order that there might be one for each apostle's name. Cp. Ha. 11; 10; "He looked for a city, which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." Pr. 10; 25.

1486–87. And upon them twelve names of the twelve apostles of the lamb. The precedent may be found in the inscription of the twelve names of the founders of the Church of the Law on the High Priest's breastplate: see Ex. 28; 17–20.—The apostles' names being put on the foundation-stones denotes, that they as a whole (that is, their doctrine) formed the foundation of the new Jerusalem. Now, of what are they or their doctrine, speaking literally, the foundation. Undeniably, of the Christian faith, or of the Church as built there-upon. For thus writes S. Paul (Ep. 2; 20); "Built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets (meaning inspired Christian teachers), Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone" (cp. Gal. 2; 6). And so in Mt. 19; 28 (cp. 16; 18) their appointment to be assessors in judgment in the regenerated Church rests on their apostolic office, as founders of the Church. The new Jerusalem, then, must be a symbol of the Christian Church, as restored to that pure state in respect of doctrine and discipline, in which it came from the hands of its apostolic founders. As the Law is the cause of entrance, —'the pedagogue,' whose office it is to conduct to Christ and his Church, so the Gospel in its fundamental truths, as they were taught
by the apostles and other inspired men, is the foundation, on which
the superstructure of the Church of Christ, and its godly discipline
and order, are built up.—According to the most approved reading, the
twelve is thrice repeated in this verse. This circumstance, in addition
to the frequent repetition of the word elsewhere in this chapter, in a
way that appears unnecessary, leads us to look for some reason, that
may account for the redundancy. It may have arisen from the exi-
gencies of the stichóical arrangement; but, more probably, the object
has been to make twelve repetitions of the number; for six occur in
vv. 12, 14, in connexion with the wall, and six more will be found
subsequently.

X XI; 15. 1488-91. He who spake had a golden measuring reed, &c.
This measuring of the new Jerusalem recalls to mind that of parts of
‘the holy city’ in C. 11; 2; and the parallelism confirms the view,
that the latter was meant to be a symbol of the Jewish Church, and
the former a symbol of the Christian. There are, however, several
differences between the two cases observable. 1. In C. 11; 1 the
reed was given to the seer to measure; but here the angel himself
measures. 2. In the former instance the reed was ‘like a rod;’
but in this it is a ‘golden reed.’ 3. In ‘the holy city’ the temple,
the altar, and the worshippers, but not the court, nor yet the city,
were to be measured; in ‘the holy Jerusalem,’ the city, the gates,
and the wall. 4. In respect of the former, there is no mention of
the measuring having actually been made; while, in the latter, the
result of the measuring is given. The widely differing circum-
stances of the two cities fully account for these differences. The old
Jerusalem ‘had no glory in comparison with the excelling glory’ of
the new; for ‘if that, which was to be done away, was glorious, much
more did that, which was to remain, exceed in glory.’ A golden
reed and an angel’s hand were, therefore, appropriate to the latter,
while they would have been out of place in respect of the former.
The first ‘holy city’ was measured for the excision and destruction
of everything in it, that was of a temporary nature; but the second
to show forth its excellent and abiding qualities: the former for dis-
crimination between its parts; the latter in its entirety. Op. on C.
11; 1-2; and see Eze. 40; 3; 42; 16-19: Ze. 2; 1-2: Am. 7;
17.—The last clauses must be taken as equivalent to—the city, in-
cluding both her gates, and her wall. As the admeasurements of
the city and of the wall are afterwards given, but not that of the gates, the
two last clauses were probably inserted to show, that the gates were
not excluded from the measurement.—And her wall is omitted in B,
and at least twenty-four MSS.

X XI; 16. 1492-93. The city is tetragonal, &c. A square was by
the ancients, and in the mystical system, accounted the figure of peri-
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fection; insomuch that the Pythagoreans represented the Divine nature and absolute perfection by this figure. The Greeks styled a man of unsullied integrity, and perfect in all respects, a **tetragonal man**: see, e.g., Aristotle, *Eth. I*; 10: *Rhet.* III; 11: *"τετράγωνος ἄνδρα ἴσος."* [See further in Vol. I: pp. 32, 37, 39.] That great stress is laid on the form of the new Jerusalem is evident from the laboured and repetitive description of it. It is described as being a cube, and thus presenting a square in every direction. And by this is signified, that it is the *se plus ultra* of perfection in the symmetry of its construction. It is solidity itself; and hence qualified for the utmost permanence and endurance. ‘The solid square intimates,’ according to Bede, ‘the subsisting in perfect peace.’ ‘The form has respect also,’ Hengstenberg says, ‘to the ecumenical character of the new Jerusalem, it being indicated by it, that an equal right to the city was presented to all the four quarters of the earth.’ Thus, the Church, when made pure and perfect in her system of doctrines and code of discipline, will present to view the ideal of symmetry, order, and strength,—be capable of resisting all assaults,—the abode of perfect peace, and adapted for universal comprehensiveness and permanence.—In the description of the new Jerusalem picturesque effect is obviously sacrificed, for the sake of the exactness and regularity given by numerical admeasurement, and the idea of perfection attached mystically to the square.

1494. *And he measured the city.* It was not sufficient, that the city should be declared to be tetragonal in its form. It must be shown to the eye of the seer to be a perfect square on every side: and that, too, on Divine authority; for the angel, here as elsewhere, is a symbol of Jesus, the divine Head of the Church. Hence the ultimate perfection and permanent durability of the purified Church of Christ are certified on divine authority.

1495-7. *For twelve chilindas of stadia.* The number here also has doubtless been derived from the number of ‘the tribes of the sons of Israel,’ a thousand being allowed for each tribe, as in several precedents. It must thus be regarded as being composed of two distinct numbers, twelve (‘the signature of the Church,’ as Hengstenberg calls it), and each of the twelve as consisting (like the Jewish regiments: see Ex. 19; 21: Nu. 31; 5: Re. 6; 15: 19; 18) of a thousand units: and we have already met with several numbers similarly compounded, to wit, the ‘twelve times twelve chilindas’ of the redeemed (twice), ‘the chilindas of chilindas’ of angels, and the ‘seven chilindas’ of names slain in the old Jerusalem (see on 468, 752). But here we have a city, covering a square area containing 12 times 12 or 144 thousands of thousands of square furlongs, and containing as a solid pile of buildings 12 times 12 times 12 or 1728 thousands of thousands of
thousands (= 1728,000,000,000) of furlongs, or (to state the same in Jewish measure) a square area of 1,440,000 square miles, and a cube of 1728 thousands of thousands of cubic miles. In English miles these numbers would be greatly increased; but unquestionably they ought to be looked at in Jewish measure, more especially as the symbolic numbers are lost sight of by converting them into a foreign measure (cp. on 1000). These vast sums convey the most enlarged idea, that can be conceived, of the immensity of the city, particularly as compared with the symbolical numbers of the redeemed, who are brought to view in connexion with the old Jerusalem. What are 12 times 12 chiliads, or twice that number, as compared with the number of souls, that a city comprehending 12 times 12 times 12 chiliads of chiliads of chiliads of cubic furlongs would be capable of containing? But it is not magnitude only, nor even perhaps chiefly, that is meant to be symbolized. The most exact numerical uniformity and completeness are prominently exhibited in the symbolization, showing the ecclesiastical edifice not to be defective in a single iota of doctrine or discipline. How grand and pleasing an idea is here presented of the ultimate perfection and greatness of the Church, and of the countless multitudes, which will be received into her bosom! "As," says Hengstenberg, "the immense extent of the new Jerusalem—300 geographical miles—points to the vast multitude of members belonging to the triumphant Church, rendering 'many mansions' absolutely necessary, so does the enormous height point to its glory. People have often been at a loss to comprehend the reason for such vast dimensions—12,000 stadia in length, breadth, and height; and hence have gone about to lessen the measurements. Thus it has been supposed, that the 12,000 stadia announced belong to the circumference of the whole city, and that each side is only to be regarded as extending to 3000 stadia. But it is against this view, that in Eze. 48; 16 the sides of the city were each measured." The natural construction, also, is opposed to it. "Some, again, would understand the height, not of the houses, but of the mountain—of which, however, no mention is made in this connection. Others, still again, would refer what is said of the height to the circumstance, that all the buildings were equally high. But the height is manifestly made equal to the length and the breadth, and the relation of the houses one to another is not the subject of discourse. . . . Nor can we understand how, in a description which everywhere rises above the common, any one should think of constraining the particular parts into ordinary bounds." How Hengstenberg, on the view he advocates, arrives at 300 geographical miles as 'the extent of the city,' I am unable to discover. I can only suppose, that there must be a typical error. Lowman and Stuart make the city to be "375 [Roman] miles square, and the
height the same." But this is by reckoning on the assumption noticed above, that "12,000 stadia" represents the measurement of the circumference of the city. Stuart does not appear, however, to have adopted this hypothesis, as a way of escape from the 'too great dimensions.' For he, on the contrary, considers 375 miles square to be 'too small' to contain all the redeemed; and deems it necessary to seek 'relief from any painful doubts by calling to mind, that all is symbol; and, moreover, that subsequent parts of the description bring to view country as well as city!' The difficulties felt on both hypotheses arise mainly from a want of due appreciation of the nature of symbolical representation; and it is really almost amusing to see, how expositors can stumble in opposite directions, through a too literalizing tendency, and from bringing into comparison things, which were never intended to be so closely compared.

XXI; 17. 1498-99. He measured her wall for 144 cubits. 144 cubits = 216 feet or 72 yards.—It has been made a question, whether the height or the thickness of the wall is meant. Against the latter it may be alleged,—that it is not the natural construction,—that it is more usual to notice the height than the thickness,—and that the height of a city's wall is often mentioned without the thickness, but the thickness never without the height.' On the other hand,—the probability, that it was intended in stating the height of the city to give that of the wall,—the extraordinary incongruity of representing buildings 12,000 stadia, or 1200 [Jewish] miles high, as being surrounded by a wall only 72 yards in height,—the want of accordance (while standing in such a contrast to the city) with the statement in ve. 12, that the wall was 'great and high,'—and the propriety of stating the thickness in order to exhibit the 'greatness,' and to indicate substantiality and durability, may be advanced as furnishing strong grounds for believing, that the thickness of the wall was meant. Moreover, a wall not so high, as the walls of ancient Babylon are said to have been, would, not only be out of all proportion to the height of the city, but glaringly incongruous in respect of a city, which in every other detail is brought into contrast with "great Babylon," as far surpassing it in that magnitude, which was its especial boast. The ideal model, after which the holy city was drawn, probably was a city set on a high hill (as was commonly the case in respect of the cities in Palestine), and of which, as seen from the plain below, only the wall might be visible. On the whole, I think it most probable, that the thickness of the wall was intended.—The square of twelve was doubtless assigned as the thickness, in order to show congruity with the other admeasurements and numbers; and because 144, as being a square number, and especially as the square of 12, would denote perfection. And so, in this particular also, the Church's bulwarks of
holy doctrine, cemented by godly discipline, are exhibited as 'a sure defence.' "Mark well her bulwarks: consider her palaces;" for unto 1500-1. *Man's measure, that is, an angel's.* Not being able to offer any better explanation, I must give the ordinary one, which is, that, lest it should be supposed, that an angel's admeasurement would differ from man's, the writer explains, that it is the same. But I must add, that this does not appear to me satisfactory. I am inclined to think, that the phrase *a man's measure* is a technical one, similar to *a man's number* in C. 13: 18, and has a hidden mystical significance, which we are not able to fathom. Why else has this clause been inserted in reference to the wall in particular?—Hammond supposed, that by 'a man's measure' was meant 'a man's stature;,' and he refers to Eze. 40: 1 sa., where it is said; 'In the visions of God brought He me into the land of Israel, and set me upon a very high mountain, by which was as the frame of a city. . . . And, behold, there was a man, whose appearance was like the appearance of brass, with a line of flax in his hand, and a measuring reed . . . of six cubits long by the cubit and a handbreadth. And behold a wall on the outside of the house round about. So he measured the breadth of the building, one reed, and the height, one reed.' If we suppose, that the intention is to state, that the 144 cubits were gigantic cubits, each being equal to six ordinary cubits, still the difficulties will be as far as ever from being removed. In particular, it will not at all appear, why the clause, *that is, an angel's,* has been added.

1488-1501. It is remarkable that, although we had been led in ve. 15, according to the most natural construction of its last clauses, to expect a specific admeasurement of the gates, equally with those of the city and the walls, none is given. Why is this? We may perhaps find the reason by looking to the thing signified by the gates, namely, the Law. The Law, in one point of view, is no part of the Gospel, but rather stands contrasted with it; yet, in another (as an indispensable introduction and necessary mean of entrance) it may be regarded as a portion, though but as it were a porch, of the Evangelical edifice. We may hence see, then, how the Legal gates might be included in the general admeasurement of the city, as a whole, but not be deemed worthy of separate admeasurement.

DIV. 3. DETAILS OF THE STRUCTURE WITHIN AND WITHOUT.

XXI; 18-23. 1502-31. *And the superstructure of her wall was jasper. And the city was pure gold, like to pure glass. The foundations of the wall of the city were adorned with every precious stone. The first foundation-stone was a jasper; the second a sapphire; the third*
a chalcedony; the fourth an emerald; the fifth a sardonyx; the sixth a sardius; the seventh a chrysolith; the eighth a beryl; the ninth a topaz; the tenth a chrysopeia; the eleventh a jacinth; the twelfth an amethyst. And the twelve gates were twelve pearls, each one of the gates severally was of one pearl. And the broad [street] of the city was pure gold, as it were radiating glass. And I beheld no temple in her; for the Lord, the almighty God, is her temple, and the lamb. And the city hath not need of the sun, nor of the moon, that they should shine in her; for the glory of God did illuminate her, and the lamb was her lamp.

The precedent of vv. 18–21 is in Is. 54: 11–12 ("Behold, I lay thy stones with fair colours, &c."); together with Ex. 28: 17–20 and 39; 10–13, which relate to the precious stones composing the High Priest's breastplate. The 'gold,' 'precious stones,' and 'pearls' of vv. 18–21 have their correspondents in the counterfeit 'gold, precious stones, and pearls,' which constituted the adornments of the whore Babylon (17; 4). On this correspondence Hengstenberg has remarked; "The world may for a time carry itself proudly; it may have a transient glory granted to it; but the Church can look on with a quiet and composed spirit, for she knows, that it must soon come to an end."

XXI. 18. 1502. The superstructure, that is, the building or wall, or (more strictly speaking) the material of which the wall-proper, in contrast to the foundation, was composed. The Greek word properly means that, which is built within anything. In the only other instance of its use (Jos. Ant. XV: ix; 6), it is applied to a mole, built in a harbour. Building-on (having regard to resting on, and close connexion with) a foundation, may be considered to be a kind of building-in.—The next clause shows, that the interior of the city is had in view in this verse. So that we should not limit our conception of the material of the superstructure to the outside, but regard what is said of it, as being equally applicable to the inside of the walls. Then it will appear, that the wall properly so called was wholly composed of the white pellucid jasper, to which, as 'the most precious' of stones, He who sitteth on the throne (4; 3), and the effulgence of the glory of God (ve. 11), had been likened. This presents to us the grandest idea conceivable of the brilliant resplendency of the city. And especially would its brilliancy appear and be magnified in contrast with, and when reflecting, the bright gold of the interior of the city. By this it may be signified, that, in order fully to appreciate the excellence of the complete system of doctrines and duties, which is built up on the fundamental truths of the faith, it must be viewed from within the Church. None but the initiated, who have practical experience of the doctrines and precepts, can have any adequate idea of their loveliness. What is beautiful, when seen
from without, is a thousand-fold more beautiful, when experienced within.

1503–4. *The city was pure gold, like to pure glass.* The idea seems to be, that the gold was of such purity and so highly polished, that it reflected, like a mirror of the purest glass.—There is a reading, sanctioned by A, B, and twenty-nine cursives, which makes the gold like to glass; but that found in very many MSS. makes the city to be like to glass. The result will be ultimately the same in respect of the thing signified. As the city is here mentioned in contradistinction to the wall, the internal buildings or "mass of houses" would seem to be intended. And as Christians are frequently spoken of figuratively, as being stones composing an edifice, the reflection of the perfect law of God in its purity, in the character of those, who, in their several spheres or stations, compose the new Jerusalem Church, may be here symbolized.

XXI; 19. 1505–6. *The foundation-stones, &c.—Were adorned.* This term appears to have been suggested by its use (in vs. 2), in the comparison of the city to 'a bride adorned for her husband.' It might lead to the supposition, that the several foundation-stones, the jasper, the sapphire, &c., were adorned by having jewels set in them. And if this were the case, inasmuch as the foundation-stones represent the apostles, the jewels inlaid (and which may have been conceived of as being set, so as to form the 'names of the apostles' on the several stones: cp. vs. 14) might denote the apostles' converts,—'their joy and crown of rejoicing' (cp. 1 Co. 3; 12). But, on the whole, I am more inclined to think, that the intention was merely to convey, that the foundation between every two gates consisted of a single and different precious stone, and that the adornment of the foundation, as a whole, arose from the varied effect of the several foundation-stones. As Bengel says; "Not only did each precious stone form an ornament in the foundation, but it constituted the foundation itself."—It is common to conceive of the foundations of the new Jerusalem as consisting (as Stuart speaks of them) of "twelve courses of stone." But, if this had been the case, inasmuch as there must have been (at the least) one stone between every two gates, there would then have been twelve horizontally and twelve perpendicularly; and consequently 144, instead of twelve, as stated in the text. Besides, the first course in a building is alone properly the foundation. We may, therefore, conclude, that the true view is that of De Wette, namely; "Every twelfth part of the walls between the several gates had a foundation-stone, stretching along the whole length, which was exposed to view." By the foundation will then be understood the portion of the wall, which was lower than the gates. And if we call to mind, that the conception is of a city placed or to be placed on 'a
great and high mountain, it will be seen, that the lowest course of
the wall might be exposed to view, and yet form a proper foundation:
since the sharp inclination of the ground would admit of its being
visible on the outside, but below the level of the ground on the inside
of the wall.—With every precious stone:—meaning those, which are
about to be mentioned.—Compare what was said of the temple of the
old Jerusalem: Mk. 13; 1; “Master, see what manner of stones,
and what buildings are here!” Lu. 21; 5; “how it hath been
adorned with goodly stones.” Josephus states, that the stones of
Herod’s temple were 25 cubits (about 45 feet) long, 8 cubits (14 feet)
high, and 12 cubits (21 feet) broad. The vastness of the stones, he
says, in the foundations of Solomon’s temple (being on the side of the
hill) were plainly visible on the outside. The compass of the outer
wall of the temple was four furlongs, each side being a furlong.—
Perhaps in ancient times there may have been reckoned to be twelve,
and only twelve precious stones. And it is not impossible, that each
may have had its distinct symbolical significance in the mystical
system. But even if so, it were too much to expect, that we should
now be able to determine the signification of each. We may well be
content, if we can discern the general symbolical meaning, intended
to be expressed by the precious stones, as a whole. And perhaps we
shall not greatly err, if we suppose them, in the present instance, to
denote the varied excellence and completeness (especially as united
into one whole) of the fundamental doctrines, on which the apostles
reared the edifice of the Church, and of which each is so essential,
that the building could not stand without it, and at the same time
each so excellent, that by it a new and special feature of beauty is
added, and without it the effect of the whole would be marred. This
interpretation accords sufficiently well with that of the Indian in-
terpreter, which is, that precious stones are to be interpreted of the
divine oracles, and of the wisdom and knowledge of God.—We might,
indeed, particularize the several details by having recourse to the
ancient tradition, that each apostle contributed an article to the Creed.
But I decline to follow the example of those writers, who indulge in
what must be at the best baseless and fanciful conjectures; and I
only allude to this, in order to call to mind the coincidence between
these twelve foundations assigned to “the apostles of the lamb,” and
the twelve articles of the apostles’ Creed, which contain the funda-
mental truths of Christianity. Hengstenberg has justly remarked;
‘So that, rejecting special applications of the several stones, as of the
several articles of the Creed, we must rest in the conclusion, that by
the variety in the precious stones is symbolized the richness of the glorious
gifts of God, which unfolded themselves in the apostles,’—rather, in their
work. Much to the same effect writes Lowth on Is. 54; 11; ‘These
seem to be general images to express beauty, &c.; and to have never been intended to be ... particularly explained, as if each had some spiritual meaning.'—There is a somewhat similar description of the new Jerusalem, as built with precious stones and gold, in Tobit 13; 16, 17.

1507-18. The first a jasper, &c. "That S. John," says Hengstenberg, "in his enumeration of the precious stones intentionally departs from the order of Moses in describing the arrangement in the High Priest's breastplate, is plain from the fact, that he sets the jasper in the first place, which there holds the last." If this view be correct, the places of the jasper, in what may be regarded as symbols of the Jewish and Christian churches respectively, may be supposed to denote, that the latter begins from the point, where the former terminates. To this effect it is said in the Berleb Bible; "The last on the breastplate of Aaron, and the first here is one, and unites together the Alpha and the Omega,—ends the Old and begins the New." It is not, however, quite certain (that is, on the view of those, who think, that the foundations were meant to be conceived of, as consisting of twelve courses of the precious stones laid one upon another) that the places of the jasper in the two enumerations are really interchanged. We may certainly infer from the high estimation, in which the jasper was held (as the precedents in C. 4; 3, and vv. 11, 18, show), that John's intention was to assign to it the most honourable place. And this, in the case of a foundation, would be the lowest place; for there it would constitute the foundation-proper. That this must have been, on this hypothesis, the contemplated place is also shown by the circumstance, that, if it had formed the uppermost course, there would have been no difference perceptible between the highest foundation-stone and the wall, which also was of jasper. We should suppose then, if we adopted this view, that John began his enumeration from the bottom. And consequently, if in both instances it be made from the top, the jasper will come last in both. This inversion of John's list, however, would not bring the order of the two lists into nearer approximation; for only one stone will be found occupying the same place on either reading. And indeed only seven of the names occur in both lists.—After what I have said in reference to the futility of attempting to discover the symbolical significations of the several stones, I can have nothing to add, in reference to them separately. I will only subjoin the following remarks from Stuart's Commentary. "In looking over these various classes we find the first four to be of a green or bluish cast; the fifth and sixth of a red or scarlet; the seventh yellow; the eighth, ninth, and tenth, of different shades of the lighter green; the eleventh and twelfth of a scarlet or splendid red. There is classification, therefore, in this
arrangement; a mixture not dissimilar to the arrangement in the
rainbow, with the exception, that it is more complex. The splendour
of such a foundation or basis of the wall admits of no question.
As to the order of the arrangement of colours, it is difficult to say
what rule is followed; and mere mental conception about propriety
of order is hardly adequate to guide us. Whether this arrangement is
in conformity with some ornamental arrangements of the day, which
were regarded as beautiful, we cannot positively affirm, yet in itself
this is highly probable.”

XXI; 21. 1519–21. The twelve gates were twelve pearls. Pearls
were not reckoned as precious stones: op. 17; 4: 18; 12, 16. Their
appearance is dim as compared with these; and hence they may have
been selected, as being the articles of this description, which were best
suited to represent the Law (see on 1478), which has ‘no glory,’
when brought into comparison with ‘the excelling glory’ of the
Gospel. The High Priest of the Law wore the twelve precious stones
on his breastplate; but these have now been transferred to the founda-
tions of the new Jerusalem, there to symbolize the glorious truths, on
which the Church of the Gospel is founded. At the same time, less
brilliant symbols have been assigned to the Law.—Each one, &c.
This almost tautologous addition may have been intended to signify,
that the way of admittance to the city was uniform, and that not the
slightest deviation from, nor abatement as to the smallest tittle in, the
Law could be allowed.

1522–28. The broad [street] of the city was pure gold. The broad
street designates the chief thoroughfare, and place of public resort for
business or pleasure, and which in modern times would be called in
different places the High Street, the Market place, the Corso, or the
Boulevards. The roads, which enter at the several gates, and are all
precisely alike, are doubtless to be regarded as comprehended under this
designation. “The whole of the streets,” says Hengstenberg, “are
thrown together into one ideal street.”—In ‘the broad street’ of the
old Jerusalem the slaughtered witnesses of the Lord lay 3½ days un-
buried; but in that of the new Jerusalem is ‘the tree of life,’ and the
street itself (like the buildings, see ve. 18) is of the purest gold,
glowing as it were in the rays of the sun with unspeakable splendour.
The broad street being of pure gold may denote, that the way in
which the inhabitants walk is par excellence that, which is variously
described in the Scriptures as ‘the way of uprightness’ and ‘of holin-
ness,’ ‘the way of the righteous,’ ‘the path of the just, which shineth
more and more unto the perfect day,’ ‘the way of the Lord’s precepts,’
‘the way of truth,’ ‘the way of the saints,’ ‘the narrow way’ that was,
but which is now become in the new Jerusalem a ‘broad way:’ in
short, ‘the way of life.’—As it were radiating glass. There are two
readings of the epithet applied to glass; but they have substantially the same meaning, that is to say, primarily diaphanous, but secondarily (as here) glowing or radiating, as glass radiates the rays of the sun, when they impinge on it at a particular angle.

XXI; 22. 1524–27. I beheld no temple; for the Lord . . . is her temple. In vs. 3 it was said; “The tabernacle of God shall be with men” in the new Jerusalem (cp. ve. 2). How is this apparent inconsistency to be reconciled? Not by drawing a distinction between the tabernacle and the temple. For they were in all their uses and objects essentially one, and the differences between them arose merely from the different circumstances, under which the two were erected. That too, which, when seen descending in the new Jerusalem, is called ‘the tabernacle of God,’ is the same, that in C. 3; 12 is spoken of as ‘the temple of my God’ in the new Jerusalem in heaven. Moreover, if any distinction be to be drawn between the Apocalyptic applications of ‘the temple’ and ‘the tabernacle,’ it may most probably be thought, when the use of ‘the tabernacle’ in several places (12; 12: 13; 6: 15; 5: see on 571) with a distinctive reference to Christianity is considered, that this designation has, in the new Jerusalem tableau, a specially Evangelic aspect, while ‘the temple’ has in view the Law, its mediating priests, sacrifices, and burdensome ceremonies. But we must rather solve the seeming discrepancy by marking the wide difference between the times, to which the two statements relate. The earlier refers to the commencement of the new Jerusalem state,—to that reformed condition of it, which is but as it were a preparation for the new Jerusalem proper, and may be many ages distant from it. The later has respect to the new Jerusalem in its fullest development.—The temple was the glory of the old Jerusalem (cp. Ps. 122; 1: Jer. 7; 4); but in the new there is none. Why is this? Because the temple was a building set apart for the special inhabitation of the Deity, and in which, too, he might be approached only by priestly mediators and intercessors. ‘Whoever sought God under the old covenant could find Him only in the temple, in which He confirmed His word spoken in Ex. 25; 8 (cp. 29; 40, 46); “They shall make me a sanctuary, and I will dwell in the midst of them.” The name itself of the temple in its first form, Ohol Moed, the tent of meeting, characterized it as the place, where God was to meet with His people.’ But the case is very different in the new Jerusalem. In the state preparatory for or introductory to it, God had, indeed, His particular tabernacle or ‘tent of meeting’ (ve. 3), but in the new Jerusalem state itself, when, ‘in the last days, the mountain of the Lord’s house shall be established on the top of the great and high mountain,’ God will make the city as a whole his tabernacle, wherein He will dwell with men. He will
therein be to them a God, and they will be in a special sense His sons; and thus their city will indeed be 'the city of the living God.' Inasmuch, then, as the whole will be His dwelling-place, and all the citizens will have free access to and communion with Him as His children, no one house in particular can serve as a temple, nor can priestly mediators have scope for the exercise of their office. 'The glory of God' having so filled the city in every part (vv. 11, 23), that she has become a most brilliant 'luminary' (even as, in old time, 'the glory of the Lord filled the house' built by Solomon: 2 Ch. 7; 1), the Lord Himself has become as it were the temple of the city by making the whole city a temple.—The Lord,—the almighty God, and the Lamb: or rather, I think, even the Lamb. I consider, that at any rate by the Lord is meant Jesus, and that by the clauses following the Lord it is intended to designate him in his divine nature, and in his mediatorial character: see on 759.—From C. 3; 12 and 7; 15 it appears, that there is a temple in the heavenly world. And as there is said to be none in the new Jerusalem, we may infer, that the latter as here exhibited does not symbolize a heavenly state.—Hengstenberg's remarks on this verse are so excellent, and for substance I so fully agree with them, that I cannot forbear quoting from them at some length. "What," he says, "was the highest privilege of the old covenant, that was not the highest, which God was able and designed to give to his people? Union with God, the eternal good and source of all good, as it was represented by the temple, was only a provisional, an imperfect one. The privilege of the Old Testament was at the same time its defect. How imperfectly the fellowship of God with his people was represented by the temple, appears from the longing eye directed toward the future by those who enjoyed it, especially the liveliness of their hope toward the Messiah. All Messianic hope was a proof of poverty in respect to the temple. But, because in the kingdom of God the imperfect is a prophecy of the perfect, the temple pointed forwards to a real union between God and his people. . . . Because in the militant church the presence of God is still not perfectly realized, from the bodily presence of the Lord having been soon withdrawn from it again (cp. C. 12; 5), and from the agency of his Spirit being subjected to manifold restraints, it is only the triumphant Church, that is to be regarded as the full antitype of the Old Testament type. There only the words, "Behold the tabernacle of God is with men," and "I saw no temple therein, for the Lord God the Almighty is its temple and the Lamb," however they may be verified even during the period of the Church's warfare, will find their complete and perfect realization. We have an Old Testament parallel passage in Jer. 3; 16, 17; "It will then no more be said, The ark of the covenant of the Lord! neither shall it come to
mind, neither shall they remember it; neither shall they miss it, nor shall another be made. At that time they shall call Jerusalem the throne of the Lord, and all the heathen shall be gathered to it, because the name of the Lord is at Jerusalem." The ark of the covenant was the heart of the temple, the kernel and centre of the Old Covenant. How infinitely great must be the compensation that was to be given for it, if this were to make the desire after it to cease, and itself to be forgotten, as belonging to the beggarly elements,—to the image and shadow. We have here the announcement of an entire annihilation of the earlier form of God's kingdom, but of such an annihilation of the form, as is, at the same time, the highest perfectionment of the substance, a dissolution like that of the seed-corn, which dies only that it may bring forth much fruit, or of the body, which is sown in corruption, that it may be raised up in incorruption. . . . That the temple once existed is a pledge of its everlasting continuance. No truly divine institution can be of a merely temporal nature (Matt. 5; 17). That the temple is only in a certain sense wanting in the new Jerusalem is evident, even from the assertion here. For, the temple is not simply denied to it; it is accorded as well as denied. The designation of God: The Lord God the Almighty, points to the glory of the compensation. Where he is in the whole glory of his being, with the whole fulness of his gifts, there the loss of the poor temple with its imperfect manifestations of God's presence is to be considered real gain. Along with the Almighty God the Lamb is named. Bengel: 'Thus are the same glorious properties ascribed to God and the Lamb, ver. 23, C. 22; 1, 3, 7, 10.' Cp. 5; 13: 6; 16: 7; 10. It is precisely through the Lamb, that the Almighty God has become for the Church the reality of the temple. Till John knew the Lamb the temple was to him his one and all. From the entire cast of his mind we may be sure, he clung to it with the most profound regard. That the Lamb still did not exist, was the cause of the old temple's poverty, of the imperfect manner in which it displayed God's presence. Immanuel! so was it proclaimed at the moment of Christ's appearance in the flesh; so still more loudly was it proclaimed when he finished the atonement; and so yet again, most gloriously of all, will it be proclaimed in the new Jerusalem.”

XXI; 23. 1528-31. The city hath not need of the sun, &c. The fundamental passage is Is. 60; 19; "The sun shall no more shine to thee by day, and the brightness of the moon shall not give light to thee; but the Lord will be thy eternal light, and thy God thine ornament:” cp. Is. 24; 23. And so in Yalcut Rubeni, fo. 7, 3, it is written; “In the world to come the Israelites shall have no need of the sun by day, nor of the moon by night.”—Of old it was said; "Thy word is a lamp to my feet, and a light to my paths:” “the
entrance of thy words giveth light:" "the commandment is a lamp, the law is light." Hence the sun may perhaps stand here for Gospel doctrines, and the moon for Legal ordinances (see on 778–79). Of these the Lord’s people in the new Jerusalem, though they walk in perfect conformity with them, will have no need; because the light of God’s Providential dealings, and the grace and mediation of the Lamb (as he himself says in Jo. 8; 12; "I am the light of the world") direct their paths, and "make all their ways plain before them." As living under the Dispensation of the Spirit, and being ‘governed and sanctified’ by his special influences, they need neither teaching nor precepts. Their heart being knit to the Lord, their understanding is instinctively guided into the way of truth, and their conduct made conformable to his law.—The glory of God and the lamp of the lamb form a parallelism, the members of which (as is the case in the precedent in Isaiah) denote the same thing. So that we ought not to refer God and the lamb to two persons. And this confirms what has just been said as to God and the lamb meaning the Lord.—The glory of God in forming the lamp or luminary of the city makes her a luminary to the surrounding ‘nations’ (cp. ve. 24), as was intimated in ve. 11. The Church, in proportion as ‘the Spirit of Christ’ dwells in her and illuminates her, is ‘a light in the world.’—Lamp. The five following terms, having kindred significations, occur in the Apocalypse. 1. λαμπαρν. 2. λαμπας. 3. λαμπται. 4. φως. 5. φωτισμός. These I have rendered respectively by the following English words. 1. A candelabrum. 2. A lamp. 3. A torch. 4. Light. 5. A luminary. The first denotes the lamp-stand in contradistinction from the second, which means the lamp or burner (see on 53). The second is the word used here, and in C. 18: 23; 22; 5. And it was similarly used by Jesus, when he said of John Baptist (John 5; 35); "He was the burning and shining lamp." The third is used in C. 4; 5 to form the symbol of the Holy Spirit, and in C. 8; 10 in the simile "a star blazing like a torch." The fourth occurs in C. 18; 23; "no light of a lamp,"—in 21; 24; "the nations shall walk by her light,"—and in 22; 5; "no need of the light of a lamp or of the sun." Jesus is called (by John 1; 9) "the true light," (8; 12) "the light of the world," and (Acts 13; 47) "a light of the Gentiles," and his people are designated as "the light of the world" (Mt. 5; 14), and "the children of light" (Lu. 16; 8). The fifth word is found in the N. T. only in ve. 11 and in Ph. 2; 15; "among whom ye shine as luminaries." Closely related to it is the verb, which I have rendered in C. 18; 21; 21; 23; 22; 5, by ‘illuminated.’ cp. in the Gk. Jo. 1; 9: Eph. 1; 18: 3; 9: 2 Ti. 1; 10: He. 6; 4: 10; 32.
DIV. 4. EXTERNAL RELATIONS OF THE CITY.

XXI; 24—27. 1532—39. And the nations shall walk by means of her light; and the kings of the earth do bring their glory into her. And her gates shall not be locked at all by day; for there shall be no night there. And they shall bring the glory and the honour of the nations into her. And there shall never enter into her anything common, neither he who worketh an abomination and a lie; but—they who are written in the lamb's roll of life.

1532. The nations shall walk, &c. The precedent for ve. 24 is Is. 60: 3; “The heathen walk in thy light, and kings in the brightness, which goes forth on thee:” cp. 49: 23; “Kings shall be thy nursing fathers,” &c.—There is here a most important variation from the R. T.; for it reads, according to the A. V., the nations of them which are saved, the Greek phrase being the same, that in the A. V. of Acts 2: 47 is rendered; “The Lord added to the church such as should be saved,” but which means those in a state of salvation: that is, He brought them into a state, in which they might be saved. But I need not enter into the meaning of the reading; since it is destitute alike of MSS. authority and of compatibility with the context, and has in all probability been introduced into the text, either from the comment of Andreas, or to support an erroneous interpretation. The saved must clearly be within the city, while the nations designates peoples out of it (cp. ve. 26: 22; 2). The terms, therefore, are not likely to have been applied conjointly to one of the two classes.—The Greek word for nations, “in the usage of the Revelation,” says Hengstenberg, "means not nations generally, but always heathen nations. That we are to think here only of converted heathen is clear as day. No room for conversion can be found on the further side of C. 20: 15; for everyone, who had not been found written in the book of life, had already been cast into the lake of fire.” In the first statement I agree, but not in the second: and the only argument, by which the latter is supported, will be seen to have no validity after the exposition I have given of the text, on which it rests. The heathen cease to be the heathen or nations, when they are converted. But if the heathen properly so called are meant, then it is clear, that such must be in existence, and consequently that the new Jerusalem cannot be a celestial, paradisiacal, or glorious, but only an ordinary earthly state.—Shall walk in the light of her. The nations being in ‘the outer darkness,’ or darkness that covers all that is without the city, have no other light than what this glorious luminary’ gives. She, like her Lord, is ‘a light to lighten the Gentiles.’ “The light here, as in Isaiah,” says Hengstenberg, “is the glory of the Lord manifesting itself in the Church, which is to shine forth in the new Jerusalem with the fullest and most cloudless splendour.”—The literal
purport of this statement seems to be, that, so great and brilliant will be the illumination, which the Church in the latter days will shed abroad, that it will afford sufficient light, even to the most distant parts of the earth, to guide the Gentile nations into the way of truth and life, if they refuse not to walk in her light. Such, though in a comparatively insignificant degree, has been, and more and more is becoming, the case with the Reformed Church. By her missionary efforts she is even now 'a light to lighten the Gentiles' in every region of the globe. But the light, which one branch of the Church Catholic sheds, is but as 'gross darkness' to that which may be expected, when the whole has been brought to emit a perfectly pure light.

1533. And the kings, &c. It was said by the prophet; 'All kings shall see thy glory:' 'kings shall come to the brightness of thy rising,' and shall 'minister to thee:' 'thou shalt also suck the breast of kings;' and, according to the earnest given, when kings came from afar to present their gifts to her infant Lord, so shall it come to pass in the latter days of the Church. 'It does not mean,' says Bengel, 'that all kings of the earth with their earthly glory shall come into the holy city. Very many fail in respect to it. But what is really glorious among the kings of the earth, and is sanctified through faith in Christ, that will be regarded as an acceptable present, and as a becoming addition to the fulness of the holy city. As it is in respect to kings, so it is also proportionately in respect to their subjects.'—The word bring indicates, that we should conceive of there being regularly constituted kingdoms and nations (ve. 26) without the symbolic city. And this must denote, that, during the state symbolized, there will be peoples and classes forming no part of the Church, but being more or less, though increasingly more and more, friendly towards her. She is, then, still a Church in the midst of the world, and perhaps we might say, of a generally 'wicked world.'—Stuart is led to remark here; 'The conception of the Apocalypticist is modelled by the representations of the Old Testament respecting the universal subjection of the nations to the metropolis of the Church in the Messianic period.' Has there ever yet been such a subjection? And if not, must we not look for it in the distant future?—This verse presents another point of contrast between the new Jerusalem and great Babylon. With the latter 'the kings of the earth committed fornication, and the inhabitants of the earth were made drunk with the wine of her fornication' (17; 2).

XXI; 25. 1534–35. Her gates shall not be locked at all by day, &c. This verse is modelled after Is. 60; 11; 'Thy gates shall stand open continually: day and night they shall not be closed.' 'Day and night,' as the parallelism shows, is here equivalent to 'at any time:'
see on 962.—On reading this clause, especially with the precedent in view, the inquiry would naturally arise, Why is not the night mentioned? Anticipating this question, the reason is given; for there is no night there. And this being the case, not by day becomes equivalent to not at all, as in the precedent.—'Neither here nor in the precedent is any respect had to rest and security, as the reason for the gates standing open.' Hengstenberg. This is true. But it is so, not because no enemies are in existence, but because the symbolism has not enemies in view at all; for by the gates not being locked by day is signified, that admission into the holy city will not be barred against any, who seek it seasonably, and by the appointed way. Thus, the contemporaneous existence of those, who stand in need of admittance into the city is as much implied, as if enemies were contemplated, on account of whom it was necessary to take steps 'to guard against surprise' [Stuart].—We may, then, understand the meaning to be, that Christ, having fulfilled the Law by His death, has taken away the bar which it had set up, and has thrown wide the gates of the Church to all comers: and he now evermore stands at the door ready to give free admittance and welcome to all those out of the nations, who are willing to enter into 'the city of the living God.' More especially, in respect of the new Jerusalem, seeing that 'night denotes a state destitute of blessing, such as always enters, when the gracious presence of the Lord is withheld' [Hengstenberg], there can be no night there; because he, who is the light of the city, stands ever ready to enlighten by the beams of his gracious countenance all, who are desirous to seek refuge in 'the continuing city.'—Cp. C. 22; 5.

XXI; 26. 1536. They shall bring the glory and the honour of the nations into her. Even those without shall render the tribute of their homage and highest reverence to the purified Church of Christ, and she shall be 'a praise upon earth.' Cp. ve. 24.—The repetition of the article appears to be for emphasis, that is, to denote the highest degree of glory and honour.—Here is a great contrast to what had been said (11; 2) of the old Jerusalem and her temple: 'It is given unto the nations, and the holy city shall they tread under foot.'

XXI; 27. 1537. There shall never enter anything common. Cp. Mt. 15; 11, 18, 20; 'The things which proceed out of the mouth come from the heart, and these defile [make common] a man:' Acts 10; 14, 15, 28; 'God hath showed me, that I should not call any man common or unclean:' Ro. 14; 14; 'nothing unclean [common] of itself, etc.'

1538. Neither he who worketh an abomination and a lie. Cp. and see on ve. 8: Nos. 1456–58.

1539. But—they, etc. The construction is, similarly as in ve. 8 vol. ii.
and other places, but they shall enter who are written, &c.—In the roll of life. See on 882.

1537–39. Here again is implied the co-existence of two classes, a class without—workers of abominations, who need to enter the city; but are not allowed to do so, and a class within, who are written in the roll of life.—"The new city shall not, like Jerusalem of old, be open to clean and unclean, to the evil-minded and to faithful citizens: all that is unclean, base, polluting, abominable, all who mislead and deceive men by false doctrine and feigned revelations, shall be excluded" [Stuart]. Who would think of making a statement to this effect in reference to heaven? Are men wont sententiously to inform us, that fire will burn, or that ice is cold?

DIV. 5. THE SUPPLY OF WATER TO THE CITY.

XXII; 1. 1540–43. And he showed me a river of water of life, bright as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the lamb.

1540. He showed me. What could have induced the editor of the R. T. to place a capitular division here, it is difficult to conceive; for the first five verses of this chapter manifestly form part of the description of the new Jerusalem, and the epilogue of the book begins at the sixth verse. The mode of introducing the river of the city, he showed me the river, parallel to the commencement of the description of the city, he showed me the city, certainly indicates a divisional break here, but not one of a magnitude, corresponding to that of chapters.—A river. The pure of the R. T. and of many cursives is rejected in critical editions. Observe, that here it is not merely a fountain as elsewhere (7; 17: 21; 6), but a river; and this to convey the idea of a great abundance of water (cp. 12: 15); and so to denote "the great fulness of life," that is in the new Jerusalem.—The prototype is the river, which went out of Eden to water the garden.' But the immediate precedent is in the river, which flowed from Ezekiel's temple in various directions. Cp. also Ps. 46; 4; 'The river of the flood thereof shall make glad the city of God, &c.

. . . God is in the midst of her; therefore shall she not be removed.' Ps. 36; 8; 'Thou shalt make them drink of the river of thy pleasures:' Joel 3; 18; 'A fountain goes out of the house of the Lord, &c.' Zec. 14; 8; 'Living waters shall go forth out of Jerusalem, &c.'—Of water of life. We should understand living, i.e., flowing, water in respect of the symbol, and water of life, i.e., life-sustaining (meaning spiritual and eternal life) in respect of the thing symbolized. And, to see the full force of the symbol, we should call to mind the inestimable value of an abundant supply of water in 'a barren and hot country, where no water is.'—To this corresponds literally the river of life, that is to say, the glad tidings of free and full salvation
and an eternal life to all, who are willing to share therein,—a river, flowing from the throne of God through the heart of the Church into the barren wilderness of the world, according as channels are cut for it by the labourers in the word and doctrine. To this effect runs Eze. 47; 8; 'Then said he unto me; These waters issue out towards the east country, and go down into the desert, and go into the sea (the territory of the heathen), which being brought forth into the sea, the waters (which 'are peoples, &c.' 17; 15) shall be healed.'—Cp. on 519.

1541. Bright as crystal, like the sea of glass before God's throne (4; 6), and uniform with the luminary, which the city herself appeared to be (21; 11). This simile is used, when the intention is to express the highest degree of brilliancy, such as pure and limpid water will sometimes present, when the sun's rays fall on it. A river of such brilliancy is a splendid conception; and one in perfect keeping with that, which the city would convey, both when viewed from a distance, glittering as a dazzling luminary, and when closely inspected in all the splendour of its rich and varied details. What a glorious idea does this give of the excellence, to which Christ's Church will ultimately attain!

1542. Proceeding out of the throne of God and of the lamb. 'The heathen, in order to represent the universal power and beneficence of Jupiter, used the symbol of a river flowing from his throne; and to this the sycophant in Plautus alludes (Trium, act 4, sc. 2, v. 98) in his saying, that he had been at the head of that river:

Ad caput amnis, quod de coelo exorbitur, sub solio Jovis.'

—Salvation is of the Father, as having been of His devising and granting, and of the Son as being of His procuring.—It is worthy of notice, how often 'God' or 'He who sitteth on the throne,' and 'the lamb' are mentioned together: no less than seven times. They are conjoined in the same ascriptions of 'glory, &c.' and of 'salvation.' They occupy the same throne. Their wrath is equally dreaded. They are conjointly 'the temple,' and also 'the light' of the new Jerusalem; and from their one throne her 'river' takes its rise. If we ought not in all the instances to read of God, even the lamb, it must at least be allowed, that the two are named together in an apparent association of equality. For my part, however, I cannot doubt, that even the lamb expresses the author's meaning. I think, that the phrase before us is intended to be descriptive of the Mediatorial throne of God the Son. He will rule over, and bestow all blessings on his Church, as being the Mediator of the Covenant on which it is founded.
DIV. 6. THE SUPPLY OF FOOD TO THE CITY.

XXII; 2. 1544-48. In the midst of her broad [street], and of the river, on this side and on that side, [he showed me] a wood of life, bearing twelve fruits, rendering each its fruit every month; and the leaves of the wood [were] for the healing of the nations.

1544-45. In the midst of, etc. There are two readings in 1545: ἐν δεύτερον καὶ τρίτον and ἐν τῷ δεύτερῳ. The latter is the reading of the R. T. and of very many MSS. The former is supported by A, B, twenty-eight cursive, and some versions; and hence it obtains the preference in critical editions. But the latter is considered to receive strong confirmation from John 19; 18,—the only other place in the N. T. in which the phrase occurs. It is also supported by the precedents in the LXX.: cp. Nu. 22; 24: Da. 12; 5: Eze. 47; 7.—

The mode of expression here is not very perspicuous. To make it clearer Stuart, referring to C. 5; 6, renders by between instead of in the midst of. And certainly the author could scarcely have had any other meaning than, that through the broad street or place of the city flowed the river, on each bank of which grew, either a tree (as some think) or a row of trees (as others suppose) to mean. The objection to the latter hypothesis lies in the Greek word, which is in the singular, being taken to mean trees, in the plural. Stuart, however, holds, that the phrase is 'generic, and means something equivalent to our word grove,' in short a wood: and hence, as well as because wood is the literal correspondent to the Greek word, I have adopted it in my translation. The precedent in Eze. 47; 7, 12, especially as rendered by the LXX., strongly supports the latter construction.

"Lo, on each bank of the river there was wood very much [or, there were very many trees], on the one side and on the other. . . . By the bank of it on this side and on that shall they grow up: no wood fit for food shall grow old beside it; neither shall its fruit fail in the bursting forth of its freshness, for their waters they go forth from the sanctuary, and their fruit shall be for food, and their growth for healing." Moreover, if the word each in 1547 be taken to refer (as it may be, for the construction is ambiguous) to wood, then it will clearly be implied, that the author had more than one tree, and probably many, in his mind. And that such was the case will be rendered still more probable by quotations to be presently adduced from contemporaneous writings. It may, however, be thought, that the prototype in Gen. 2; 9 is opposed to the supposition, that more than one tree is contemplated. But the term that is used here is also used there, and likewise in Eze. 47; 12, by the LXX. So that, if they understood more than one tree to be included in it in the one place, they would do so also in the other; and, as they were more competent judges of the
ancient Hebrew usage and opinions than we can be, this precedent may be entitled to but little weight, or may even have a favourable bearing. Besides, as Hengstenberg notices, "the tree of life in Genesis had conjoined with it as a type "every tree, that is pleasant to the sight and good for food," which the Lord is said, in the immediately preceding context, to have made to spring out of the earth, and which we may suppose, according to vs. 10, to have grown on the banks of the river. We must still think of these trees as trees of life in the more general sense, the tree of life only as such in the highest degree."

—The river running through the wood, and forming the mean of junction and communication between its two parts, may denote the union of the two Dispensations through the life-giving Spirit, and their being made efficacious unto life by His influences.

1546. A wood of life. See on 107, and cp. Ps. 1; 3: Pr. 11; 30: 15; 4: Je. 17; 8: Rev. 18; 12; "every fragrant wood, and most costly wood."—The first Greek substantive in this phrase means literally 'wood ready for use;' and it was only by a 'later usage, that it came to denote a tree' [Liddell]. Elsewhere in the N. T., even in the Apocalypse itself (cp. 7; 1, 3: 8; 7: 9; 4), it is never used, when a tree is spoken of. And as there can be no doubt, that a tree or trees must be meant in the present instance, we are naturally led to inquire, why the usual term has not been used. Conjectures only can be offered, of which I suggest the following. 1. The term that is used here is put five times for the cross, on which Christ suffered, as, e.g., in the saying; "He bare our sins in his own body on the wood." Possibly, then, there may have been a design to intimate a connexion between the cross of Christ, and the tree of life. Through the wood of the cross, that is, through the atonement made thereon, we obtain the wood of life,—"the meat which endureth to everlasting life." The former gives life: the latter sustains it. Again, there may have been an intention to intimate the necessity there is, that those, who would be partakers of the tree of life, should 'take up the cross,' and follow Christ in the endurance of persecution. 2. The same word is used five times in the account of the officers' coming to take Jesus "with swords and clubs" (lit. woods), and again in the statement; "They made the apostles' feet fast in the stocks." Hence, from the word wood being used to denote an instrument of coercion or punishment, it may have been intended, that it should carry with it mystically the notion of persecution; and so the phrase before us may be taken to imply, that those, who would 'reign in life with Christ,' must first 'suffer with him.'—In like manner, the expression in the Latin version of 4 Ezra 2; 12 is "lignum vitae."—Three modes of receiving the tree of life appear to be spoken of, or alluded to. In vs. 14 it seems to be implied, that persons must have authority over,
or a claim upon the tree of life, before they can enter by the gates into the city. This may possibly imply, that a counter made of the precious wood, similar to the white counter of C. 2; 17, and serving the same purpose as a ticket of admission to the holy city, should be given to approved candidates. Another mode of partaking of the tree of life is ‘eating of the wood’ (2; 7), that is, after having been admitted into the city, feeding on one or more of its different kinds of fruit. The third mode consists in partaking of the leaves of the tree. This last denotes the way of admission for the heathen into the Church. The first seems to signify the way of spiritual conversion as necessary for those, who are only members of the Church in name, but who thus become obedient ‘doers of the word.’ The second symbolizes the feeding of true members with the food, which endureth unto eternal life.—Bearing twelve fruits: A. V., “twelve manner of fruits.” But Stuart renders twelve fruit-harvests. Such a rendering, however, does not give the true meaning of the word (cp. 14; 15, 18: 18; 14: Mt. 13; 26, 30); and here it would make the next clause to be little better than tautologous, for “each month yielding its fruit-harvest” is equivalent to “producing twelve fruit-harvests in a year.” The A. V. has in its favour the precedent in Eze. 47; 12; “By the river grew every kind of edible fruit.”—Cp. Ha. 12; 11; ‘Chastening yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness.’

1547. Each rendering its fruit monthly. This clause may admit grammatically of two constructions, or possibly three may be given to it. Each may be referred to fruit-harvest, or to month, or to wood. Thus, the A. V., Schlesner, and Hengstenberg agree in the rendering, the tree yielded its fruit every month: while Stuart has each month yielding its fruit-harvest. The first two would make this clause little better than a repetition of the one, which precedes it. The third, when joined with the preceding clause, gives the best sense. The purport of the two will then be, that the wood of life produced twelve different fruits, each tree yielding its fruit monthly. If, then, we suppose (as the precedent would lead us to do), that every tree produced a different fruit on each occasion, and that there were twelve trees, there would be in all twelve times twelve different kinds of fruit, giving a number corresponding with that in C. 21; 17. At any rate, not merely ‘abundance’ (as Stuart says), nor merely ‘variety’ (as Luther), but abundance, and variety, and an ever-ready supply will be predicated. And, on the whole, the inexhaustible supply of grace, that is provided for the members of the purified Church, and which will flow to them through an endless variety of channels, is forcibly symbolized.—There are various readings of the words rendered by bearing, each, and yielding; but no material difference is made in the meaning by any reading, that is well supported.
1548. And the leaves were for the healing of the nations. Green leaves are of course intended. And these are generally emblematical of an improving spiritual state (Gen. 8; 11: Je. 17; 8: Da. 4; 12), as dry and withering leaves are of the contrary (Ps. 1; 3: Is. 1; 36: 34; 4: 64; 6).—In Eze. 47; 12: “Its fruit serves for food, and its leaf for healing.” John did not add of the nations, without a meaning. He clearly implies, that nations or heathen would exist contemporaneously with the new Jerusalem, who would at least need to be healed, and for whose healing it was right, that provision should be made, whether or not they availed themselves of it. A specimen of the sophisms and subterfuges, to which those are driven to have recourse, who interpret the new Jerusalem as symbolizing a celestial or a glorified terrestrial state, may be seen in Hengstenberg’s Exp. in loco.

1544–48. The author’s intention appears to have been to represent the wood of life, as deriving its power to bear ‘fruit to serve for food’ to the inhabitants, and ‘leaves for the healing of the nations’ without, from the river of life, which proceeds from the throne of God and of the lamb. And this may signify, that the means of grace (of which the administering of the bread of God’s word by His ministers is a principal one) derive their power to sustain the spiritual life in those, who have been new-born, and to regenerate those, who have need of healing, from the grace of God, flowing as a river from the side of the slain lamb, and carrying with it the renewing and purifying influences of the Spirit. The higher and more spiritual means of grace specially sustain and invigorate the new life in the people of God, while the preaching of the word is directed to the healing of those, that are without. And since the life eternal is universally the basis, end, and motive-power, the tree, which bears the various means of grace, is a tree of life, just as the river, which gives to it its vitality, vigour, and fructifying energy, is a river of life.

The following are abstracts of some passages in coeval works, which may be thought to confirm statements, that have been made, and which will at any rate show what views were entertained by the author’s contemporaries.—Enoch, C. 24: The prophet is transported to a place, where he sees seven splendid mountains, adorned with brilliant stones. The seventh mountain was in the midst, and as a whole they resembled the seat of a throne. Odoriferous trees surrounded them. Among these there was a tree of an unceasing odour, superior to all the trees of Eden. Its leaf, its flower, and its bark never withered; and its fruit was beautiful. Michael informs the prophet, that the mountain will be the seat, on which the Lord of glory will sit, when he descends to the earth; and the tree will be given to the righteous after the great judgment, who shall live a long
life on the earth, and suffer no sorrow, distress, or trouble.—4 Extra 2; 10 sq.; The Lord instructs the prophet to tell his people, that he will give them the kingdom of Jerusalem, the everlasting tabernacles, and the tree of life; that the kingdom is prepared for them; also twelve trees laden with divers fruits; and as many fountains, flowing with milk and honey; and seven great mountains.—G. of Nicodemus 19; 1; 'Then Jesus said: Come to me, all ye my saints, who were condemned by the tree of the forbidden fruit. Live now by the wood of my cross.'

DIV. 7. THE PRIVILEGES AND BLESSINGS OF THE CITY.

XXII; 3-5. 1549-57. And there shall no more be any curse. And the throne of God and of the lamb shall be in her. And his servants shall serve him; and they shall look upon his face; and his name shall be upon their foreheads. And there shall no more be night: and no need of lamp-light nor of sun-light; because the Lord God will give them light. And they shall reign unto the ages of ages.

In the account of the state and privileges of the citizens, which occupies these three verses, symbolism is necessarily dropped, and figurative description adopted.—Hengstenberg says: 'The future in vv. 3-5, serve to show, as Bengel has justly remarked, that “there shall be an everlasting continuance in the glorious things here described.” Up to this the Seer wrote what he had seen: here writing in such a manner could no longer suffice, and the description must take the form of prophecy.'

1549. No curse. None, such as was incurred in the paradise, in which the tree of life was first placed, nor yet such as was entailed by the Law, shall have place in the evangelical Jerusalem. To the same effect spake Zechariah (14; 11) long before; “There shall be no more curse in it, and Jerusalem is securely enthroned.” Some, however, prefer the reading, which may be rendered an accursed thing.

1550. And the throne, etc. The throne, which under the former Dispensation was seen in the heaven above (4; 2), descends with the new Jerusalem to the symbolic earth beneath, in order to denote that God will not only dwell spiritually with her citizens and be their God, but also their immediate though unseen Governor, Lawgiver, Protector, and King. Here Hengstenberg remarks: "Because there is no more curse, that is, no more an object of cursing, the gracious presence of God and of Christ shall no longer be liable to such a withdrawal as of old, when it was said to the Jews, as the curse began to alight on them, "Behold your house is left unto you desolate; ye shall not henceforth see me, till ye shall say; Blessed is he, that cometh in the name of the Lord" (Mt. 23; 38, 39); and so does he virtually speak from time to time to his Church."
1551. And his servants shall serve him, that is, without let or hindrance. They shall not have to endure persecution, as those who lived in the old Jerusalem had.—Note from the words his and him, that one person only is spoken of, showing, that we should read (as I have remarked above) God, even the lamb.

XXII; 4. 1552. They shall look upon his face. Actually to look upon the face of God would be the greatest honour, that could be conferred on created beings. Moses and Elijah could endure but a small part of his gloriousness; and no man could look upon his face and live. Hence this statement is to be taken figuratively, as denoting the enjoyment of the Divine favour in the highest degree. Op. Ps. 17; 15.

1553. And his name shall be upon their foreheads,—as it was on those of the conquerors of the beast (3; 13), and of both the twelve times twelve chiliads of the redeemed (7; 3: 14; 1). This,—the being stamped with the Divine image, and renewed after the likeness of the Creator, is the sure and indelible mark of God's servants, and the certain passport to heaven.

XXII; 5. 1554. There shall be night no more. Some prefer the reading, no night there.—The same declaration was made in C. 21; 25; but there it was introduced only incidentally in assigning a reason; whereas here it is made as a direct statement.—Throughout my exposition of the new Jerusalem tableaux I have shown, that a running contrast with the old Jerusalem is implied. This may be carried on here; for certainly the two Dispensations, in respect of the degrees of spiritual light possessed under them respectively, might be fitly compared to the day and the night. And with this view S. Paul's sayings agree well; 'The night is far spent: the day is at hand.' 'Ye are all the children of the day: we are not of the night.' 'Now is the day of salvation.' 'Ye are sealed unto the day of redemption.' By S. John, however, day and night appear to be sometimes used to denote respectively seasons of prosperity and adversity: see Jo. 9; 4: 11; 9: 13; 30.

1555–56. And no need of . . . sun-light, &c. The inhabitants of the city of God may possess and use the ordinary means of spiritual enlightenment; but the time will come, that they will not stand in actual need of them. They will be able to dispense with them; because the Lord will 'guide them by his ever-present eye,' and by the special influences of his Spirit (see on 1531).—A statement substantially the same as this was made in C. 21; 23; but there the city was the subject, here the inhabitants are spoken of,—there the past tense, here the future is used. Different stages in the progress of the holy city must be referred to.

1557. And they shall reign unto the aëons of aëons. As to the aëons
see on 25.—As it was said (11:15) of the Lord, when he took the kingdom, that he should 'reign unto the sons of sons,' so here the same is said of his servants.—Those who were made 'kings and priests unto God' during the millennium were to reign for the definite and limited period of 1000 years; but the citizens of the new Jerusalem shall reign throughout endless ages. This difference ought alone to suffice to show, that the same state and epoch cannot be spoken of in the two places.—The new Jerusalem, or true Church of Christ, has been held to consist of two divisions, the Church militant on earth, and the Church triumphant in heaven. If this view be adopted, it will follow, that the elect people of God, when they have served their allotted time, and been 'delivered from the burden of the flesh,' will be removed to the state of 'joy and felicity,' there to dwell in the presence of God for evermore. But there are some who think, that the earth will be the final abode of the righteous. And this is an opinion, with which the statement before us will accord well. Still, it by no means constrains us to adopt this view, and the other is decidedly the more probable one. The new Jerusalem represents the Church in its corporate capacity. And hence, when it is said; They shall reign, we must understand, that the inhabitants as a corporate body are meant. And this body may exist for ever and ever, while the generations that compose it are successively removed from a state, fitted for mortal bodies only, to one adapted to immortal and 'spiritual bodies.' Still, it will be seen, when the limited application of the phrase for ever in such passages as Ge. 17:8; 49; 26: Ex. 12:14; 13:21; 6:27; 21: Lc. 25; 30: 1 Sa. 2; 35: 2 Sa. 7; 16: 2 Kgs. 5; 27: Ps. 21:4; 23; 6: Is. 34; 10: Je. 17:25: Jo. 8:35: Ph. 15: Re. 14; 11, is taken into account, that eternal duration, in the strict literal sense, cannot with certainty be predicated in reference to the new Jerusalem, as an earthly state, in any point of view. —Bengel asks; "If the inhabitants of the city shall be all regents, where then shall be the subjects?" and he answers; "Outside the city." Hengstenberg cannot accept this answer; because it rests on what he considers to be the untenable supposition of a place, intermediate between the new Jerusalem and the lake of fire. He thinks, that 'a hint for the right answer is furnished by Ps. 49:14, and that the wicked, notwithstanding their destruction, are the objects of the ruling.' To me it seems, that the question assumes two points, which are not necessarily involved in the statement: first, that the place of reigning must needs be this earth; secondly, that the word reign necessarily implies persons, who are reigned over. With regard to the former:—this sentence might be taken to contain an independent statement, in which the eternal duration of the reigning is simply affirmed, without any reference being made to the locality of it. As
to the latter, I have already had occasion to notice (see on 368, 1079, 1087, 1122, 1157, 1392), that the word king and its related terms are always used in the Apocalypse in a loose or figurative sense. As the priests of the millennium cannot rightly be supposed to be priests in the strict sense, that is, persons offering animals in sacrifice, so neither is it necessary, that the kings should be understood to have subjects. Royal honour and glory may be all that is intended.—On the whole, I think, that the statement before us is adapted to a two-fold application, and may be understood to affirm a long duration of the Church as a corporate body on earth, and a glorious and never-ending existence of its members individually in heaven.

At this place it is evident, as well from the mode of conclusion of this verse, as from the change of subject in the next, that the account of the new Jerusalem (forming the Supplement to the two Mysteries) terminates. With it the Vision, which had now occupied the 24 hours of ‘the Lord’s day’ (see the Guide, p. 184 ss.) came to an end.

But, before concluding my exposition of the details, I would call the reader’s attention to some curious correspondencies between several of the principal particulars of this symbolization, and views entertained in heathen nations, or by contemporaneous writers.—1st. In respect of the future situation of the new Jerusalem, namely, on a high mountain. The paradise of the Hindoos is placed on the high mountain, called Meru, and is arched by four mountains. That of the Thibetans is on the peak of M. Rivou. That of the Chinese is on M. Kouantun, the heavenly mountain. That of the Persians is on M. Abbord. Symbolic mountains are continually being brought to view in Enoch. For example. One in the West, and six in the South, making seven (Ca. 17, 18). In another place, seven shining mountains, adorned with precious stones, form the ground-plot of paradise (C. 24). Again, a mountain [Zion] in the middle of the earth, with one on the east, and another on the south (C. 25). On the north seven other mountains (C. 31). Westwards six mountains, in contradiction from the seventh of the Messiah (C. 51). Seven high mountains are the storehouses of frost (C. 76). In like manner, in 4 Ezra God has provided seven mountains for the enjoyment of the inhabitants of the heavenly Jerusalem.—2dly. In reference to the shape of the new Jerusalem,—that it was a cube. The statue of Hermes, the inventor of all the sciences, and of language and writing, was a simple cubiform stone or pillar. The statues of the gods generally in ancient times were cubiform pillars. The ancient Arabians worshipped cubiform statues, and amulets of this form were common among them. Cybele, the Phrygian mother of the gods, was represented in this way; and the Arabian black stone, Hagiar Al Hassoud,
was of this form. Down to this day, the Parsees consider the cube to be the perfect image of the world.—3dly. With regard to the square, which each side of the new Jerusalem presented. The throne of God in Eze. C. 1 is square. The mystical square, which the Hindoos used to represent the world, has been noticed in Vol. I: p. 32. Buddha, or reason personified, in which the Godhead reveals itself, holds a square in its hands, and wears another on its breast. The Brahmin, in sacred meditation, sits upon a square form. Hermes, the Logos of the Egyptians, was called τετράγωνος by the Greeks. The statues of some of the Grecian deities were square in form.

With the Chinese a square is the figure of the universe: and they symbolize the celestial empire by two squares. Among the Sabaeans and Chaldeans, a square was the symbol of the sun, as the light of lights in which Godhead is revealed. The paradise of the Thibetans is square.—4thly. With regard to the river. Four rivulets of silver water (cp. Gen. 2; 10) proceed from the mountain, on which the paradise of the Hindoos is placed. Brahma's palace has four doors, out of which flow four rivers towards the four quarters of the world. Also, from the paradise-mountain of the Thibetans flow four rivers. The Chinese paradise, too, is watered by a golden river, which divides into four branches. So also is the Persian paradise: and the rivers contain the waters of salvation.—5thly. With regard to the numbers, generally, and the number twelve in particular, see Vol. I: pp. 37 ss.

Before proceeding to take a synoptical view of the new Jerusalem tableau, I will lay before the reader two summaries,—one showing briefly the points of contrast, not already noticed, between the holy city Jerusalem and the great city Babylon,—the other exhibiting the indications, that the new Jerusalem is neither a celestial, nor a millennial or perfect state of existence on earth.

The following tabular comparison will serve the former purpose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. is exhibited as a whore,</td>
<td>1. is brought to view as a virgin bride,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. with whom kings and people fornicate:</td>
<td>2. adorned for a husband: 'kings and peoples bring their glory to her.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. is seen in a wilderness,</td>
<td>3. is beheld from a mountain,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. sitting on many waters,</td>
<td>4. descending from heaven,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. adorned with meretricious ornaments,</td>
<td>5. illuminated by the glory of God,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. with purple and scarlet, 6. as with the brilliancy of the
diamond,
7. with gilding and tinsel: 7. and all manner of precious
stones:
8. seated on the horns of a wild
beast, which will ultimately
make her desolate: ve. 6:
8. built on a foundation of pre-
cious stones:
9. notable for bestial confusion
and strife:
9. characterized by symmetry,
order, and beauty:
10. the abode of those not written
in the book of life: ve. 8:
10. the abode of 'those written in
the book of life:' ve. 27:
11. illuminated by her own burn-
ing: ve. 17.
11. — by God and the lamb: ve. 23.
12. In her was found the blood of
all saints: 18: 54.
12. The saints, her inhabitants,
will reign for ever: 22: 5.
13. The apostles are called on to
rejoice over her destruction:
18: 20.
13. The apostles form her founda-
14. Her inhabitants make war with
the lamb and his servants:
14. Her inhabitants are the ser-
vants of the lamb: 22: 3.
ve. 14.

That the new Jerusalem does not represent, either a state in
heaven, or a state of unmixed purity, happiness, and perfection on
earth, appears from the following considerations. 1. That the city is
seen descending from the heaven to the earth (vv. 2, 10) shows, even
more strongly than if she had been seen located on the earth, that a
terrestrial state is symbolized. 2. The declaration (3), 'the tabern-
cacle of God is with men,' shows the same. 3. That there are those,
who may thirst (6) after spiritual and eternal life, implies a state, in
which unconverted persons may exist. 4. And 'those who overcome'
(7) implies a militant state. 5. That there may be those guilty of the
vilest crimes (8) shows, that no extent of sin is necessarily excluded.
6. The contrast with Babylon (9 ss.) indicates an imperfect condition;
since there would be no propriety in, nor basis for making a contrast
between things, so diverse in their nature as an earthly and a heavenly
(i.e., a necessarily imperfect, and an absolutely perfect) state of ex-
istence. 7. 'The lamb's wife' (9) must unquestionably denote the
Church of Christ, as the parallelism with C. 19; 7 shows. 8. What
need could there be for a wall, for gates to close, and guardians to
keep them (12), if there were no enemies, and none to be excluded?
9. What occasion for gates on every side (13), if there were none to
be admitted? 9. How could a city in the heavens be otherwise than
built on sure foundations, or how could it have the apostles as such
SUPPLEMENT TO THE TWO MYSTERIES.

(14)? 10. Much more pertinency and propriety is seen in the highly coloured picture of the order, symmetry, and excellence of the city, when a terrestrial state of the Church is supposed to be symbolized, than when a celestial (15 ss.). To state, that in heaven there was no need of the light of the sun (23), whatever may be signified, would seem to be a jejune truism. 12. The mention of 'the nations' or 'heathen,' and of the kings and the nations giving honour to the city, and walking by her light (24–26), necessarily implies the existence of such outside; and intimates, that the many, while deriving more or less of spiritual light from the Church, would still be in an unconverted state. 13. So also, the declaration (27), that all gross sinners should be excluded, implies the contemporaneous existence of such. 14. What occasion, again, for the river of life and the tree of life (22; 1), unless there were those, who needed to be nourished continually by means of grace? 15. Or, what for leaves to heal the heathen (2), if there were none to be healed? 16. All the statements in vv. 3–5 are appropriate to a purified condition of the Church on earth, but would be mere truisms in reference to a state of glory in heaven. 17. The details generally, and especially those which most exalt the new Jerusalem, indicate by their utter unworthiness of, and unsuitability to a celestial condition (see the summary view infra), that that holy city symbolizes an earthly state.

Synoptical interpretation of the new Jerusalem tableau. This,—the last of the 24 heptads seen during the 24 hours of the Lord's day, is divided into two principal parts, vv. 1–8 being introductory to the description of the new Jerusalem. But vv. 1–2 connect immediately with ve. 9; and hence the intermediate portion is in some sort parenthetical.

The prelude. Having been brought down in regular chronological order to the epoch of the Reformation, we must suppose, that the opening portion of the Introduction to the new Jerusalem scene refers to that era; and, by the reconstituting of the relations between heaven and earth, with the absence of the sea, symbolizes the re-formation of the Church, and the absence henceforth of an antagonistic world-power capable of persecuting the people of God. As the renovated Church of God comes into view, commencing its descent from the heaven of divine Providence under the appearance of a glorious city, formed of gold and precious stones and pearls, a heavenly voice proclaims, that the tabernacle of God is about to be set up among men, fraught with blessings, and with remedies for all the ills, to which flesh is heir. 'The former things' of the Legal Dispensation, and the practical re-establishment of them, even in Christ's Church (which is the very opposite of the Law), having passed away, sinners, who
mourn for their sins, shall be for ever delivered from spiritual death, and all its horrid train of evils; and, being adopted as the sons of God, they shall be admitted into the most intimate communion and union with Him.—This making new of all things is again solemnly affirmed, as from the very throne of God; and the command is given to place this decree, and that which is about to be given in continuation of it, on record to all future generations, with the view to show their high importance, bearing, and results. The proclamation, which at the first Jesus and his apostles began to make; 'Ho, every one that thirsteth, &c.,' shall now again be heralded in all lands; and the gratuitous character of the redemption, that is in Christ Jesus, shall be specially insisted on. To him in particular, who shall endure persecution, 'striving unto blood,' is the promise of adoption and of the heavenly inheritance given. But to those, who are swayed by the fear of man, or are destitute of a saving faith, or are guilty of abominable crimes, of murders legal or illegal, of lustful vices, of superstitious heathenish practices, of idolatries, or of laying snares to entrap the faithful,—all these shall go into everlasting punishment.

The tableau-proper. The prelude, which adverts to the state of things at the commencement of the period introductory to the new Jerusalem, having thus been brought to an end, the description of the tableau itself is entered upon. And, in order to intimate a connexion, in the way of contrast, between this and that of the great whore, the angelic interpreter, who had exhibited the latter, is again introduced as the hierophant of this. This appears to symbolize the Church of God in that state of perfection, to which it will ultimately attain, and on its progress towards which it entered at the Reformation. If so, it will necessarily be implied, that the interval between the states depicted in the prelude and the tableau will be one of progress towards perfection.—I think it will be most convenient to present my summary view of this symbolization in the following tabular form.

1. Introductory: (vs. 10).

The bride, new Jerusalem = the purified Church of Christ.


(1). Her brilliancy as = the special presence of God and the Lamb, manifested in sanctification by the Spirit.

(2). Her walls, 'great = the protection of a system of sound doctrines and discipline.

(3). Her gates, the 12 = the Law, excluding self-righteous sinners, and admitting those to whom Christ opens.

(4). The gatekeepers, = Christ, who alone can open the gates, which the Law shuts.
(5). Equal distribution = equal admission to all from every quarter of the gates (13).

(6). Foundations, the = the Gospel, i.e., the fundamental doctrines of the faith, as taught by the apostles.

(7). The measuring = an exhibition of the symmetry, immensity, and admeasurement of the city and her wall (15–17).

3. DETAILS OF THE STRUCTURE, WITHIN AND WITHOUT (18–23).

(1). The superstructure = excellence of the Church’s doctrine and discipline in their entirety.

(2). The interior of = excellence of internal arrangements, or of the character of her members.

(3). The 12 foundation-stones = excellence of the fundamental truths, on which the Church is built, as well when viewed separately, as when regarded in their combined effect.

(4). The 12 gates, 12 = inasmuch as they are all alike, uniformity of admission: inasmuch as they are all pearls, the want of ‘glory’ in the Law as compared with the Gospel.

(5). The street, gold = the way of the saints is ‘the way of uprightness.’

(6). The temple, none = communion and oneness with the Father save God (22) through the Son, without mediating priests.

(7). Her light, God = Divine guidance by providence and grace, and the Lamb (23).


(1). To heathen nations = “A light to lighten the Gentiles,” like her Lord.

(2). Kings render their glory = “Kings shall be thy nursing fathers.”

(3). Gates never locked = free admission always to all, whom Christ, by day (25).

(4). No night there = no time when any will be excluded, or no time when enemies can covertly assail.

(5). Her tribute, the = the Church is a ‘praise upon earth.’

honour of the nations (26).

(6). What may not = anything unholy.

enter (27).

(7). Who may enter = the elect.

(27)
Synoptical interpretation.

5. Her supply of water = eternal life in Christ, open to all.

6. Her supply of food = various and neverfailing means of grace, appropriate to the converted and the unconverted, and made efficacious by the Spirit.

7. Her inhabitants = Free from curse; enjoy the perpetual presence of God: intimate communion with Him; no dark cloud of doubt or alienation intercepts the light of His countenance; they will reign in glory for ever.

It will be seen, that three of the divisions of the heptad are severally divisible into seven parts.

As a last word, before taking leave of the final scene in the Apocalyptic Vision, let me quote two passages from Stuart’s concluding remarks in reference to Cs. XX–XXII; 5. “I cannot therefore doubt,” he says, “that the setting sun of the Church on earth is to be in a heaven of unclouded splendour. Peaceful and triumphant will be her latest age. The number of the redeemed will be augmented beyond all computation; and the promise made from the beginning, that “the Seed of the woman should bruise the Serpent’s head,” will be fulfilled in all its extent, and with a divine plenitude of meaning. Is there not in every breast a kind of necessary anticipation, that such will be the triumphs of redeeming love and mercy?” . . . “No Eden can present any more than a faint resemblance of the picture, which the writer has drawn. The understanding and pious reader closes the book with admiration, with wonder, with delight, with lofty anticipations of the future, and with undaunted resolution to follow on in the steps of those, who, through faith and patience, have inherited the promises, and entered into everlasting rest.”

Interpretations of the new Jerusalem.—State of the Church under Constantine [Eusebius]. The Christian Church [Hilary]. From the birth of Christ to the end [Joachim]. The true Church from the passion [Tichonius]. A renovated world [Primasius]. The heavenly state [Augustine, and others; see p. 478]. Earthly and heavenly states [Fleming]. Abode of saints and angels after the first resurrection [Arethas]. The Church of Rome [Bibeira]. The Church of Rome in heaven [Alcassar]. A prosperous state of the Church on earth [Brightman, and others]. The Church reformed and triumphant [Pyle]. The state on earth after a future millennium and judgment [Bp. Newton, Fuller, Burgh]. The Church as established after Constantine [Lee]. Contemporaneous with the millennium [Cuninghame and others]. The earth purified for the everlasting habitation of the saints under Christ their king [Gell]. The visible
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Church enthroned for 1000 years after a.d. 476 [W. H. Scott]. "The mother-church of a christianized universe" [Elliott].

---

EPISODE to the REVELATION.

PART VII. Ch. XXII; 6–21.

HEPTAD XXVII. SPECIAL CONCLUSION TO THE NEW JERUSALEM (vv. 6–13), AND GENERAL CONCLUSION TO THE VISION (vv. 14–21).

Introductory remarks. I have shown in the Guide, pp. 127–140, that the description of the new Jerusalem (and with it the 24 horns' Vision, in which the Revelation-proper was seen) terminates with v. 5 of this chapter. The nature of the details of the epilogue now to be examined, and their parallelisms with the general prologue in C. 1; 1–10, will be seen to confirm this fully. Of course, the epilogue does not stand connected in chronological order with the Vision, any more than the prologue does. Both are primarily addressed to the author's contemporaries, and have immediately in view the events current at the time of writing.

DIV. 1. THE ANGELIC HIEROPHANT SHOWS THE OBJECT OF THE REVELATION.

XXII; 6. 1558–83. And he said to me; 'These words [are] faithful and true. And the Lord God of the spirits of the prophets hath sent his angel to show to his servants things, which must come to pass with speed.'

1558. And. I have deemed it expedient, more than once already, to remind the reader, that no inference can be drawn from the use of this copulative as to the closeness of connexion with the preceding context; since this conjunction is used throughout the book, in the widest transitions, as a formula of commencement (or perhaps to contribute to the stichodial arrangement), without any intention existing to draw closer the connexion between the parts. It is important, that this should be constantly borne in mind.—He said, or (according to another reading) saith. Who said? Unquestionably the hierophant of the new Jerusalem, namely, "one of the seven angels who had the seven vials" (21; 9). Yet, in the next verse the speaker assumes the character of Jesus; and, throughout the epilogue, he takes alternately the angelic and the Messianic characters. This is one of the many conclusive proofs, that the angels are to be regarded as symbols of the Messenger of the covenant. The hierophant of the new Jerusalem is continued as the speaker, for the purpose apparently of indicating,
that this portion of the epilogue is to be regarded, as being specially connected with the new Jerusalem scene.

1559. These words are faithful and true. This is the third repetition of an affirmation, which has a precedent in Dan. 8; 26: see on 1318–20, 1445, and cp. 15; 3: 16; 7: 19; 2. Its use, as a formula, is (as I have shown on pp. 457 ss.) to mark a connexion between the places, in which it occurs. Thus, its insertion here marks out, first, in relation to C. 21; 5, the portion, which has reference to the new Jerusalem (that is, the Christian Church) from the date of the renewed espousals of the bride of Christ at the Reformation; and again, in relation to C. 19; 9, that, which refers to the same from her first espousals at the epoch of the annulling of the union with the Jewish Church. But the relation, with which we are now more immediately concerned, is that with C. 1; 1–3,—"the revelation of things shortly to come to pass,"—"the word of God and testifying of Jesus Christ," —"the prophecy of this book" (cp. C. 19; 10); and which connexion will more clearly appear, as we proceed with the clauses, which follow the one before us. I cannot doubt, that the object of the parallelisms in the passage before us with C. 1; 1–3 has been, by connecting the beginning of the Conclusion with that of the Introduction, to indicate the point of commencement of the former, and at the same time to intimate what 'the words' here referred to are, namely; in general the whole portion lying between the Introduction and the Conclusion, and constituting what is variously designated 'the Vision,' 'the revelation,' 'the testifying of Jesus Christ,' 'the words of this prophecy;' and in particular that part of it, which relates to 'the things shortly to come to pass.'—Hengstenberg says; "The expression, what must shortly come to pass (which was already explained at C. 1; 1) shows, that this verse does not primarily refer to what immediately precedes,—to what lies beyond the thousand years' reign, but that it applies to the whole of the book. In unison with that is the fact of the coincidence with the Introduction of the book, which has the effect of emphatically stamping this as the Conclusion of it." To the same effect writes Stuart; "The angel-guide reassures the seer, that all which has been disclosed is certain." Cp. Guide, p. 126.

1560. And the Lord God, etc. The remainder of this verse, conjointly with the next, are substantially identical with C. 1; 1–3, thus confirming what was said on 1559.—Of the spirits of the prophets, that is, who governs their spirits, or inspires those, who write by inspiration.—The emended reading (in place of the holy prophets), sanctioned by A, B, and most cursive, may look to the expression, the spirit of the prophecy, in the parallel place in C. 19; 10.—The word spirit appears to be used, when the intention is to bring to view the immaterial principle in contradistinction from the corporeal: and the
word soul, when it is desired to bring specially forward the life or living quality of the spirit. Thus, we have spirits made a symbol in C. 13: 15; 16: 13: and again, souls, in two places (8: 9: 16: 3) in respect of the animal life, and in two others (6: 9: 20: 4) in respect of the spiritual life. Cp. pp. 428–432.—As to prophets see on 698. 1055.

1561. Hath sent His angel. Jesus, the High Priest, is manifestly exhibited in the Frontispiece (1; 10 sa.), and again in C. 4: 1, as the revealing angel throughout. Hence, there is here another proof, that the angels are representative of Jesus. See on No. 4.

1562–63. To show, &c. Cp. and see on No. 3.

DIV. 2. JESUS DECLARES HIS SPEEDY ADVENT.

XXII; 7. 1564–66. ‘And lo! I am coming speedily. (Blessed be, who is keeping the words of the prophecy of this roll.)’

Cp. and see on C. 1; 3, 7: 2; 5. Here, and again in vv. 12, 20, the last book of the new Testament is brought to a close in a similar way to the last book of the old Testament. For Malachi concludes thus; “The Lord shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the Covenant: behold, he shall come.”

DIV. 3. JOHN OFFERS WORSHIP TO THE ANGEL.

XXII; 8–11. 1567–83. And I John [am] he, who heard and saw these [things]. And when I heard and saw, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel, who showed me these [things]. And he saith to me; ‘See [thou do it] not. I am a fellow servant of thee, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of those who keep the words of this roll. Worship God.’ And he saith to me; ‘Seal not the words of the prophecy of this roll; because the [appointed] time is near. He who doeth unrighteously, let him do unrighteously still; and he who is polluted, let him be polluted still: and he who is righteous, let him do righteousness still; and he who is holy, let him be holy still.’

1567. I John. The seer’s name is introduced five times: and it may be thought, that it was not without an object, that the name has been inserted only in the Introduction to the Vision, in the Introduction to the new Jerusalem, and nearly at the commencement of the Conclusion (Ct. 5; 4: 7; 13: 10; 8: 17: 3). The object may have been to assist in marking the commencements of principal portions. Doubtless, too, as Hengstenberg says, there has been an intention to indicate the high importance of the book.—“Who,” asks Vitringa, “could he be, excepting John the apostle, known by this name to the churches?”—The pronoun is, here as elsewhere, inserted to mark emphatically the person, to whom it relates.—Am he who heard and saw. As the seer is represented throughout the Vision as seeing and
hearing, so in congruity therewith he is here said to have seen and heard. But this does not imply here, more than in the previous instances, that the seeing and hearing was actual, or more than imaginative and as it were ecstatic: see on 35, 66.

1568. And when I heard and saw, that is, no sooner were the seeing and hearing concluded than, &c.

XXII; 9. 1569–76. I fell, &c. Here our thoughts are at once led to revert to the parallel passage in C. 19; 9–10; and I doubt not, that the parallelism has been made with the intention of marking out the intermediate portion as that, which relates to the history of the Christian Church from its full establishment, until the time that it merges in 'the ages of ages.' During this period Christ would receive Divine worship, yet not under the character of a fellow servant of John, but as God.—All the details of this passage have been fully considered under C. 19; 9–10, and in pp. 457 ss. So that there will only be occasion here to notice some differences between the two passages, which have not already been adverted to. 1. The clause, These words, &c., which in C. 19; 9 immediately precedes I fell, in C. 22 stands at the commencement of the Conclusion, and is separated from I fell by several sentences. I suppose the principal object of the separation to have been to mark the beginning of the Conclusion; and at the same time to draw as close as possible the connexion between vv. 6 and 8, so as to intimate, that there is no distinction in respect of time or precedence between the two passages commencing with these verses, but that they stand on an equal footing, as a goal to both C. 1; 1, and C. 19; 10. Another object may have been to indicate, that 'the words,' which are declared in vs. 6 to be 'faithful and true,' are identical with 'the things,' which the angels had showed to the seer (vs. 8); and consequently with those, which 'God had given to Jesus to show, and which he symbolized by his angel to his servant John' (1; 1), and which are none other than the words of the prophecy of this book (1; 1: 22; 7, 9, 10, 18, 19), and in particular 'the things, which must come to pass shortly' (1; 1: 22; 8).

2. C. 19; 10 runs; 'I fell down before his feet to worship him:' C. 22; 8; 'I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel, who showed me these things.' By 'these things' must be intended (as just shown) all the things, contained in the Revelation. And if so, there could have been but one angel throughout, and he 'the angel of the Covenant.' 3. The word for, before I am thy fellow servant (which is not found in C. 19; 10), has been admitted into the R. T., but it is rejected in critical editions. The difference is not material; but its omission causes the clause to be put less decidedly in the form of a reason for not offering the worship.

4. In C. 19; 10 we read of thy brethren, who hold the testifying of Jesus: in C. 22; 9 of thy
brothers the prophets (i.e., the inspired teachers), and of those, who keep the words of this roll. The difference between the two places is appropriate to the circumstances of each; inasmuch as in the former there is an immediate reference to the persecuted saints of the time, and in the latter the reference is quite general, and comprehensive of all inspired teachers, and obedient followers of true religion from first to last. An aspect of the latter clause to that in C. 1; 3; "they who hear and keep the words of the prophecy," may be perceived. 6. A clause, appropriate to the circumstances, is appended in C. 19; 10, which is not found in C. 22; 9, because the latter passage is designed to be less specific. "In C. 19; 10," says Hengstenberg, "the offered worship had respect to the marriage of the lamb, &c.: here, on the other hand, it is done in respect to the whole subject-matter of the book."

XXII; 10. 1577-78. Seal not, &c. In C. 10; 4, in connexion with the little opened roll, an instruction was given; 'Seal what the seven thunders spake, and write not these things:' and this instruction manifestly imported, that the things were not to be then made known (see on 671). On the other hand, the great roll was brought to view sealed, in order that the opening of the seals might symbolize the revelation of the contents (see on 330-31). See also Da. 9; 24: 12; 4, 9: Is. 8; 16: 29; 11, and cp. Job 9; 7: 14; 17. These precedents, negative and positive, would suffice to show (if any elucidation were needed, which it scarcely can be), that the instruction now before us is tantamount to a declaration, that the contents of the Apocalyptic roll were meant to be, and therefore (if inspired by God) must have been, made generally intelligible to competent and unprejudiced readers. The facts too, that the book is declared in its title to be 'a revelation or unveiling of Jesus Christ,' and that it was communicated to the seven churches for their comfort and guidance (1; 1, 4), confirm this. With this declaration before us, then, we must either deny the inspiration of the book, or admit its intelligibility. But, if we take the latter alternative, how are we to account for the undeniable fact, that the book has not been generally understood? Only by concluding, that readers have not brought unprejudiced and duly qualified minds to the perusal of it. And, in truth, there can be no reasonable doubt, that the great bulk of readers either have not used due diligence in the investigation, or have not come to the study of the work with an unbiased desire to ascertain, what events were had in view by the writer. The many have sought rather to discover in it, and (by any means, no matter how tortuous) to make it conform to, their own preconceived schemes, or those advocated by some favourite expositor, or in vogue with their particular party. Great guilt, then, must lie upon those, who, while they
recognize the inspiration of the book, either directly or indirectly deny the truth of the statement before us,—directly, by neglecting to study the book on the ground of its being unintelligible,—indirectly, by the lie, which their perversions of the meaning are calculated to give practically to this declaration, made by Jesus himself. Such persons certainly cannot expect to be partakers in the blessing promised in C. 1; 3 to readers and hearers (and which the next clause shows to have been had in view here): and it will be well, if, through their erroneous expositions, they do not incur the curse denounced in vv. 18–19 against those, who 'add to, or take from the words of the prophecy of this book.'—Perhaps, however, I have not, in the light, in which I have now put the matter, done full justice to the inferences I have drawn from this statement. The precise point of the figurative instruction not to seal the words doubtless has reference, not to their intelligibility, but to their publication. The right literal rendering would be (as the reason appended shows); 'Publish the things without a day’s delay.' And this rendering of it places my argument in a much stronger light; for the intelligibility of the things is necessarily assumed in the instruction to publish them, and is on this view manifestly regarded as being so much a matter of course, as not to need to be mentioned.

1579. *For the time is near,* sc., of the advent of Christ (spoken of in ve. 7, and symbolized in C. 19; 11 ss.: see on 13, 26), at which would commence the overthrow of the persecuting powers, and the institution of the Church of the new Covenant in place of that of the old.—The same clause is found in C. 1; 3; but there it assigns the reason, why the readers of the prophecy are blessed; while here it is appended as a reason, why ‘the words of the prophecy’ should be made intelligible to all (John’s contemporaries being doubtless had primarily in view). Two questions suggest themselves here: 1st. How could the prophecy possibly be made intelligible to John’s contemporaries, if it entered into the details of the history of distant ages? 2dly. What cause is there for surprize, that the prophecy has not been understood, when, although the direction given was to make it intelligible to all, because the time was near, men have constantly persisted in maintaining, that the greater part of it relates to periods more or less remote, and even to a time yet future, and none can say how distant?—If it be asked, why was the nearness of the time a reason for enjoining the immediate publication of ‘the words,’ the answer is, that otherwise Christ’s coming would have forestalled the publication; and thus have rendered useless the revelation of the words,—at least in respect of the primary object had in view, namely, the comfort and encouragement of Christ’s then suffering servants.—

The for of some copies, and the because of others, are alike rejected
by Scholz. No material difference is made, whichever reading be adopted.

XXII; 11. 1580–83. He who doeth unrighteously, &c. Cp. Eze. 3; 27.—These four stichs contain a remarkable quartet, which, as such, carries with it the idea of completeness or universality, and hence of finality or termination; since, when a thing is complete or all-comprehensive, it has reached its utmost limit. And this may guide us to the general idea, meant to be conveyed by this alliterative formula, as a whole. The mention in the clause, which we have just considered, of the nearness of 'the time of the end' of the old Dispensation led to the solemn declaration, that, in whatsoever state a man should be found, when the Lord should summon him hence, in the same he should permanently remain. The general purport is well expressed in the proverbial saying; 'As a tree falls, so it must lie.' And the above construction is placed beyond doubt by the next verse, in which substantially the same declaration is made by a different mode of expression. To understand the statement in any other way, than as having reference to the immutability of the condition in a future state of existence, were inconsistent with the spirit and tenor of the Gospel, which forbids to give any one over to a course of unrighteousness. Both the preceding and the succeeding context show, that the coming of Christ is had in view; and C. 1; 7, with which a partial similarity of sentiment may be discerned, tends to confirm this.—In appropriateness to the thought, which suggested this declaration,—in order to make the latter as emphatic as possible, —and with the view to indicate its universal applicability, it is thrown into the fourfold form, which denotes universality. It may also be observed, that the statement is subdivided into two contrasted or antithetical pairs of stichs.—The several clauses do not appear to need any elucidation.

DIV. 4. JESUS REPEATS THE ASSURANCE OF HIS SPEEDY COMING.

XXII; 12–13. 1584–89. 'Lo! I am coming speedily (and my reward is with me) to render to every one as his work is. I [am] the Alpha and the Omega, the First and the Last, the Beginning and the End.'

1584. Lo! I come, &c. By the general rule when a clause is repeated, I am led to suppose, that this verse is to be regarded, as a resumption and continuation of what was being said in ve. 7; and consequently, that the intermediate portion is to be looked upon, as being in some sort parenthetical, or otherwise parallel to the portion, which the catch word or phrase introduces. Hence I infer, that the angel at this point again takes up his discourse in the character of Jesus, having intermediately spoken in his ostensible character as an
angel. The quasi-parenthetical symbolization was introduced very naturally. The words, 'I am coming,' must have led John more immediately to recognize his Lord in the angelic hierophant. Hence he fell down to worship him. But, inasmuch as Jesus was now manifested under the form of a Fellow servant of the seer, worship offered as to a Divine person was rejected. It must not, however, be forgotten, that all this (as in the previous instance) was not a real, but a symbolical transaction,—a mode of representation, introduced (in part) for the purpose of reminding the reader, that Jesus is the revealing angel throughout, and (more expressly still) in order to show, that not even he, albeit his true character be recognized under 'the form of a servant,' is to be worshipped, when thus manifesting himself. It may have been designed, too, to be an anticipative rebuke, a fortiori, of that worshipping of angelic and spiritual beings, which was afterwards introduced into the Church.

1585. My reward, &c.: The conception is of a person coming with rewards in his hands ready for bestowal. Cp. Is. 40; 10: 62; 11. Similarly it was said in the syllabus of the seventh trumpet (11; 18); "To give the reward (or hire) to thy servants."

1586. To render, &c.: sc. to those, whose work is "unrighteous" and "polluted," fellowship with the unrighteous and polluted in perpetual pollution: to those, whose work is "righteous" and "holy," communion with all the righteous and holy ones in never-ending holiness. Thus this text is virtually (by implication) an exposition of the preceding verse. It looks back, also, to C. 1; 7; "Lo, he cometh with clouds, . . . and all the tribes of the earth shall wait." Cp. Ro. 2; 6; "who will render to every one according to his works, to those, &c."

XXII; 13. 1587–89. I am the A. and . . . end. This is the last of six repetitions of this formula, which make on the whole a stichoiical series of seven items: see the Guide, p. 193. It doubtless has a more especial aspect to the precedents in the Introduction, 1; 8, 11, 17, and to that in the new Jerusalem scene, 21; 6. Apparently it serves as a technical break, while forming a basis for an important sequel. Its frequent repetition,—so emphatically enforcing at the beginning and end of the book, that Jesus is 'the beginning and end,'—seems designed to impress strongly on the mind, that to him respect is to be had from 'first to last.' See on 30.

DIV. 5. THE ANGEL SHOWS, WHO ARE WITHIN, AND WHO WITHOUT THE CITY.

XXII; 14–15. 1590–96. ('Blessed they, who wash their robes, that they may have authority over the wood of life, and may enter by the gates into the city: without [will be] the dogs, and the sorcerers, and the for-
1590. Blessed. This catch-word recalls C. 1; 3; “Blessed he, who readeth, &c.;” and again, at the epoch of the great catastrophe, C. 14; 13; “Blessed the dead, &c.;” and C. 16; 15; “Blessed he, who keepeth his garments, &c.;” and C. 19; 9; “Blessed the called, &c.;” and previously in this Conclusion (vs. 7); “Blessed he, who keepeth the words, &c.” In all there are seven of these beatitudes, marking as many interludes (Guide, 196). Here, the eye had to the Introduction, and to the beginning of this Conclusion, should be especially noted. And the identity of sentiment between this clause, and that in C. 16; 15, may well lead to the opinion (nothing appearing to the contrary), that the two have respect to the same time and parties. And if so, as C. 16; 15 has been shown to refer to the Christians of the period immediately preceding the second destruction of Jerusalem, this clause must have been immediately addressed to the same parties.—The alternation of speakers apparently intended, and the reading of the R. T. (‘his commandments’), as contrasted with the first person in vs. 13 (‘I am’), have led me to conclude, that the angelic interpreter is to be conceived of, as taking up the word in his apparent character.—They who wash their robes. This is the reading adopted by Tregelles. And since his work was published, it has received the high sanction of the newly discovered and very ancient Codex Sinaiticus. Griesbach and Scholz adhere to the reading of the R. T., who keep his commandments: and they do so on the authority of B, the great majority of cursive manuscripts, and many versions. The meaning comes to much the same on either reading. For the one is the figurative expression for the cause, and the other the literal expression for the effect of that cause. Certainly the former is more in evangelical congruity with giving a right to the tree of life than the latter. The latter occurs only twice elsewhere (12; 17; 14; 12), and both times in reference to Christians of the epoch, to which we refer the present instance, viz. circa A.D. 69.—The clause before us (as we have just seen reason for thinking, and as the entire context, and especially the present tense shows) has in view primarily Christians of the mystico-Babylonian or Roman crisis. And in C. 7; 14 there is a similar one, spoken in reference to those, who had ‘come out of the great tribulation’ of the literal Babylonian crisis.

1591. That they may have authority or power. The word power directs our thoughts to what was said in reference to those, who have part in the first resurrection,—“over such the second death hath no power;” and thus indicates, that the same blessed state is implied in both modes of expression. Again, the second death turns our thoughts to the parallel passage in C. 21; 7–8 relating to the abominable and
others, in respect of whom it is said; 'They shall have their part in the lake of fire, which is the second death.'—This clause may denote, not only a right to partake of the fruit themselves, but also authority to dispense its leaves for the healing of the nations.—*Over the wood*, etc. See on 1546.

1592. *And they may enter by the gates.* The salient point here will be best illustrated from John 10; 1 (see on 1477); "He that entereth not by the door is a thief." This text shows, that the emphasis is to be thrown on *by the gates,*—the gates of the Law. A ticket from the tree of life must first be obtained by washing in the blood of the lamb, and then the narrow path of God's commandments be followed into the heavenly city. There must, at any rate, be a willingness to do the commandments of the Law of God, before the Lord Jesus will admit any into the number of his 'called, elect, and faithful' ones.—The connexion between 'the doing of the commandments' (R. T.: cp. ve. 11), and entering by the gates, affords a confirmation of my exposition, that the gates stand for the Law.—*Into the city.* The new Jerusalem is of course referred to. But, as the parties primarily contemplated here were the Christians, who were living at the time that the Revelation was written (*circa A.D. 69*), and at that epoch the new Jerusalem had not entered upon its descent to the earth (cp. 3; 12), the heavenly division of the city,—"the city of the living God,—the *heavenly* Jerusalem" (He. 12; 22), must immediately, though not of necessity exclusively, be meant.

XXII; 15. 1593. *Without* or *outside,* sc. of the symbolic city. That such grievous sinners as those mentioned should exist contemporaneously, and in connexion with the city, is a plain proof, that heaven cannot exclusively be its site,—cannot be contemplated, in so far as reference is now made to it, as being its site at all. And we shall see, that there is here another link, making the new Jerusalem one with Christ's Church on earth.—Op. C. 14; 20, where the vineyard is said to be trodden 'without the city.'—*Without* and *within,* in contradistinction to one another, were the terms commonly used in reference to the heathen and the Lord's people respectively; see Deut. 25; 5: 1 Co. 5; 12: Co. 4; 5: 1 Th. 4; 12.—*[Will be].* The future tense, and not the present, ought to be supplied from the preceding verse. The difference is not unimportant, as may be seen by comparing 1592. This verse looks forward to a time subsequent to the date of the work; and its terms are even sufficiently comprehensive to include the whole period of the new Jerusalem's existence on earth.

The similarity between the four verses, 12, 13, 14, 15, and the four, 5, 6, 7, 8, in C. 21, is so great (especially in sentiment) and the inference arising from the points of agreement and diversity is so important, that it will be worth while to place the passages in juncta-position.
CONCLUSION TO THE REVELATION. [H. XXVII. D. 5.

From xxii; 5–8.

5. Lo, I make all things new,

6. To him who thirsteth, to him will I give out of the fountain of the water of life gratuitously.

I am the A and the Ω, the beginning and the end.

7. He who conquereth shall inherit these things, and I will be to him a God, and he shall be to me a son.

8. But to the fainthearted, and faithless, and abominable, and murderers, and fornicators, and wizards, and idolaters, and all liars,—their part shall be, &c.

These passages may be taken to be mutually explanatory. The former is part of the Introduction to the new Jerusalem tableau; the latter of the Conclusion special to the same. And hence it may with certainty be inferred, that both have a general reference to the thing thereby symbolized. Their substantial identity shows this; while their circumstantial diversity indicates, that their reference is to different epochs. But we have seen (pp. 353–56, 456–59, 494), that both these passages stand connected with that in C. 19; 6–10. And thus it appears, that the three mark out the space, in which, in the Apocalyptic symbolization, the Church of Christ, has existence on the earth as 'the bride, the lamb's wife,' the period being divided into two parts at the epoch, at which the Church assumes, strictly speaking, its new Jerusalem aspect and constitution. The passage before us, however, relates primarily to the same epoch as the first of the three, namely, to the commencement of the Church's existence as the fully espoused bride, who was about to take the place of the repudiated matron: that is, the first and the last passages relate primarily to circa A.D. 70. But the second relates to the re-formation or Reformation epoch, circa A.D. 1500. And hence, together with a generic resemblance, appropriate circumstantial differences are to be expected. It will be my object now to point out these differences; and I have chosen to do so here, because they chiefly come to view in the verse before us.

For the specialty of reference generally of C. 21; 6–8 to the period of the Reformation, I refer the reader to my remarks on that passage, and proceed to compare the terms used in C. 22; 15 with those in C.
21 ; 8, in so far as I have not already done so in considering the latter text.—(1). In C. 21 ; 8 are found eight terms in four pairs, while in C. 22 ; 15 there may be reckoned seven, which are probably intended to be divided as usual into a triad and a quartad. (And here I may notice in passing, that four similar terms are found in C. 9 ; 21, while three are introduced in C. 21 ; 27. A precedent for seven occurs in Is. 1 ; 4.) —(2). In C. 22 ; 15 it is observable, that the article is inserted before each term, while in C. 21 ; 8 it is introduced only before the first and last, though not before the former in the R. T. (cp. 6 ; 15–16: 13 ; 16). The difference may be accounted for in a grammatical way, and fully explained by supposing, that the sins were more rife and characteristic of the period, in respect of the parties alluded to, at the earlier than they would be at the later epoch. At the earlier those "without" were had in view, but at the later those (nominally) 'within' the Church.—(3). The first two terms in C. 21 ; 8 ("the faint-hearted," and "the faithless") are omitted in C. 22 ; 15 ; because (it may be supposed) those failings were not so prominent in the Church in the times of the early persecutions, as at the epoch of the Reformation; and also because the heathen were mainly had in view in the one case, but those ostensibly within the Church in the other. —(4). The dogs. This term is not found in C. 21 ; 8, but (as I have shown on that text) it is probably an equivalent, or nearly such, for the abominable. And this will further appear from the use of the term dog among the Jews. The strongest mode of expression, that they could use to testify a sense of the insignificance of any one, or the contempt with which a person deserved to be treated, was to compare him to a dog. Hence it was, that David said to Saul; "Dost thou pursue after a dead dog?" (2 Sa. 9 ; 8 : 16 ; 9). See also Ex. 11 ; 7; "Against Israel shall not a dog move his tongue:" 1 Sa. 17 ; 43; "Am I a dog?" 2 Kgs. 8 ; 13; "Is thy servant a dog?" Ps. 22 ; 16, 20; "Dogs have compassed me." St Paul applies the term to false teachers; "Beware of dogs, beware of evil workers." And Isaiah had done the same long before: "They are dumb dogs, . . . greedy dogs." In Mt. 15 ; 26 the designation is used in reference to heathens; "It is not meet to cast the children's bread to the dogs" or curs. And in the Rabbinical writings the answer to the question, 'What does a dog mean?' is, 'One who is uncircumcised.' Solomon (and after him Paul) compares grievous sinners, who are continually relapsing into heinous sins, to 'dogs, returning to their own vomit.' But, more especially, dog is given as a name of opprobrium to one, who has lost all modesty,—to one, who prostitutes himself by committing abominable crimes, such as the Sodomites committed. In this sense Wemyss takes the term; and he says, that Herbelot quotes a passage from a Persian poet, in which Sodomites are compared to
dogs. And so the term is used in De. 23; 18; "Thou shalt not bring the hire of a whore, or the price of a dog, into the house of the Lord." Applications of the term, similar to the foregoing, are found in most languages. For example, in the common English use of the word (as in "cut-throat dog," "most impenetrable cur," "inexorable dog;" Shakespeare), and in the French canaille. The word cynocephali is pregnant with meaning. We may readily see, then, that this term may have been used to designate the same description of sinners, as 'the abominable' of C. 21; 8; and, at the same time, that it would be even more appropriate than the latter to the heathen of this epoch, on account of their being so notoriously addicted to vices, which 'it is a shame even to speak of' (Ep. 5; 12: Ro. 1; 24–27). So that the Roman heathen of the times of the empire might well be styled by the seer "the dogs" par excellence,—"obsceni canes" (Georg. I. 470).

1594. (5). And the sorcerers. With no less propriety might this term be similarly applied to the heathen, and to the unbelieving Jews. Witness, e.g., in respect of the latter,—Simon Magnus (that is, the magician), 'who of long time had used sorceries, and bewitched the people of Samaria,'—Elymas the sorcerer,—the damsel at Thyatira, who had a spirit 'of divination' or 'of Python,' and 'brought her masters much gain by soothsaying,'—'the vagabond Jews, exorcists,'—and 'the many at Ephesus, who used curious arts, whose books were valued at 50,000 pieces of silver.' In reference to the heathen, it is needless to adduce proofs. But I may remind the reader, that, in the Apocalypse itself, sorcery is charged upon them, as one of their crying sins. At the commencement of the beast's existence, sorcery is one of the sins, from which, it is said, they would not repent (9; 21); and again, towards its extinction, the climax of the damnable charge against the Roman whore, who, during the whole of her career, carries 'a cup of divination' in her hand (17; 4), is, that 'by her sorceries all the heathen were deceived' (18; 23).—There is a slight difference between the word used here, and that in C. 21; 8, that is, if the received reading of the latter be adopted (for it is a doubtful one, though Griesbach gives it the preference). The meaning of the word in C. 21; 8 is given by Liddell as "one who deals in drugs, spells, or charms;" of that in C. 22; 15 (the termination only of which differs from the other) as "one, who is sacrificed as a purification for others: hence an arrant rascal, a polluted wretch." There can be no doubt, that the two words have generically the same meaning, which is best expressed by our word toward or sorcerer: but that in C. 22; 15 is the stronger of the two. And hence we may perhaps discern an appropriateness of use, in reference to professing Christians in the former place, and to Jews and heathens in that before us.—(6). And the fornicators. This, again, is one of the salient vices
charged upon the heathen in C. 9; 21; and with how much pro-
piety they might be designated "the whoremongers" it needs not to 
show. Every page of Paul's epistles would furnish a proof. The 
symbol of Rome is a whore; and, throughout the whole Vision, for-
nication is the head and front of her offending. Spiritual fornication,
it is true, is immediately intended; but the statements would be no 
less true in their literal sense.

1595. (7). And the murderers, and the idolaters. These need no 
illustration.

1596. (8). And every one, who loveth and acteth [or practiseth] a lie.
The verb, which different translators render here by acteth, practiseth, 
makest, and doeth, has a very varied sense in the Apocalypse (see on 868).
' Doing a lie' here stands contrasted with 'doing righteousness' in ve. 
12, and also with, 'doing his commandments' in the R. T. of ve. 14.
Similarly, in 1 Jo. 1; 6 we have 'doing the truth.'—In C. 21; 8 the 
expression is "all liars." Here these appear to be divided into two 
classes,—an hypothesis, which receives support from C. 21; 27, where 
only one of the classes,—those who 'act a lie,' is mentioned. The 
two classes may be, either those who delight and glory in deceiving, 
and those who play a false part in any respect; or those who at heart 
or in principle are liars or deceivers (i.e., those who will not scruple 
to deceive, when they can do so safely), and those who will carry a 
lie into practice to any extent, or at any risk. In the class of those, 
who are in principle liars, would be included the 'false apostles' of 
John's time mentioned in C. 2; 2: 3; 9; and they may probably 
have been specially had in view here. So also may the antichrists 
of John's epistles, in speaking of whom he says; "Who is the liar, but 
his who denieth, that Jesus is the Christ? The same is the antichrist" 
(1 Jo. 2; 22, cp. ve. 4; 5; 10). Again, heathenism was one great 
lie (Ro. 1; 25)—in principle and in practice,—in the abstract and in 
the concrete. It was, in the highest sense, the lie: and, what it was 
in itself, such were its professors: cp. Co. 3; 9: 1 Ti. 1; 10. The 
coadjutor and chief instrument of the beast, and hence of the dragon 
or Satan, was 'the false prophet' or 'prophet of a lie' (19; 20).
Satan, the dragon, is himself 'a liar and the father of it.' 'He abode 
not in the truth;' and, 'when he speaketh the lie, he speaketh of his 
own' (Jo. 8; 44), i.e., according to the things, which are peculiarly in 
his province. Hence, the trio in their unity may be deemed the liar of 
liars, the antichrist of antichrists. In contrast to the Judaizing and 
heathen liars, the army of the Lord's elect, which stood opposed to 
them, was described as consisting of those, 'in whose mouth was found 
no lie' (14; 5).

We have now arrived at the end of that portion of the Conclusion,
which seems to be more immediately connected with the new Jerusalem scene.

DIV. 6. FINAL DECLARATIONS BY JESUS.

XXII; 16-19. 1597-1615. "I Jesus have sent my angel to testify to you these [things] concerning the churches. (I am the root and the offspring of David, the bright [and] the morning Star. And the Spirit and the bride say; Come. And he who heareth, let him say; Come. And he who is athirst, let him come: he who willeth, let him take water of life gratuitously.) I testify to every one, who heareth the words of the prophecy of this roll:—If any one shall add unto these [things], God shall add unto him the plagues, that have been written in this roll: and if any one shall take away from the words of the roll of this prophecy, God shall take away his part from the wood of life, and out of the holy city,—which have been written in this roll.'

1597. I Jesus. That the angel now speaks in his Messianic character is not only stated, but stress is laid on the circumstance by the insertion of the pronoun.—Have sent. The tense used is that, which imports, that a thing is begun, but not ended. Hence we may conclude, that the mission is that spoken of in C. 1; 1 (which was begun to be executed in C. 1; 10), and that it has been carried on up to the present verse; and, consequently, that the angelic hierophant is to be regarded as being one and the same throughout, though assuming from time to time the appearance and character of different angels for greater effect in the pictorial representation. And as the voice in C. 1; 10 proceeded from Jesus the Mediator, and the angel who speaks here designates himself as 'Jesus,' it will follow, that he (as indeed is explicitly declared in C. 1; 1) is the Revealer of himself and his actions from first to last, and that all the angels are only symbolic manifestations of him. See on 4, 43.—My angel. This expression refers us back to C. 1; 1, and more immediately to C. 1; 11 ss., as the portion, to which allusion is here made.

1598. To testify. The whole book is a testifying,—a witness-bearing of; for, and by Jesus, from first to last: see on 6, 7. It began by exhibiting Jesus as 'the faithful testifier,' and the seer as 'he who testified of . . . the testifying of Jesus Christ' (1; 4, 2). It was occupied throughout with such a testifying. And now it concludes with a threefold declaration (vv. 16, 18, 20) respecting testifying.—To you. To whom? Not to John; for the pronoun is in the plural (cp. 21; 9 Gk.). Nor to 'his servants, the prophets' (as Hengstenberg says); for there is no such limitation. But to those, to whom 'the book' was directed to be sent (1; 11), i.e., to the seven churches, as representative of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, or (as the expression is in ve. 21) "to all the saints." The testifying, then, is of
interest and concernment to all, even to the end of time. And the declaration in this sentence is, as far as it goes, equivalent to that in C. 1; 1; "A revelation of Jesus Christ, . . . to show to his servants what must shortly happen: and he sent by his angel, and symbolized it," &c.—*These things* are all the things contained in the book, as Hengstenberg has rightly said. They include the 'things shortly to come to pass' of C. 1; 1,—the 'prophecy' or 'the things written in this prophecy' of C. 1; 2: 19; 10: 22; 7, 9, 10,—the 'things seen' of C. 1; 11,—the 'things which thou hast seen, and those which are, and those which are about to happen after these' of C. 1; 19,—the 'things (viz. those contained in the seven epistles), and those which must happen after these' (viz. the chief subject-matter of the seven-seal book) of C. 4; 1,—and the 'all things new' in the new Jerusalem of C. 21; 5. And this is placed beyond doubt by what follows in vv. 18–20.—*Concerning*. *Codex A* and some versions have εἰς in; and some cursives omit the preposition altogether, which has the effect of giving to the churches. The reading which I have followed, viz. that of the R. T., is authorized by B and most cursives. The first has been adopted by Lachmann, Tregelles, and Kelly: the last by Ewald and Tischendorf. When the former is received the meaning is; 'I have sent to testify to you the saints in your several churches or assemblies.' This is in accordance with what was the fact (see 1; 4, 11). But it seems to me to be scarcely the full meaning of what was here intended: at any rate, it was equally the fact, that the subject-matter of the communication was of concernment and deep interest to the churches. I have therefore adopted the other preposition. Stuart, who also received it, has rendered it by *on account of or for the sake of*. But this rendering is, I think, scarcely admissible; and, though either phrase states a truth, it is not the truth here expressed, though necessarily implied. The *upon* of Fairbairn's translation of Hengstenberg (or perhaps *about* would better express the meaning of the latter) is strictly literal, and gives a good sense. But I think, that it scarcely comes up to the fulness of what is intended; for we find included in the subject-matter, not only what immediately related to, but also what was, indirectly, of interest or concernment to "all saints." Hence I have given the preference to the word *concerning*, as being the most comprehensive, and the word which I have elsewhere used in similar doubtful cases (see on 699).—The churches. If what has now been said be well-founded, it will follow, that, while the seven churches, to which in C. 1; 11 the Revelation was directed to be sent, are primarily contemplated as forming the symbol, and while churches in existence in the apostle's time were immediately spoken of and to, the body corporate ultimately had in view is the Church universal in respect both of time and place,—God's elect from 'the beginning'...
to 'the end' (cp. vv. 12, 13),—from the Creation to the Consummation, and wherever dispersed throughout all the world.—The remarks now made on this verse will make it apparent, that this portion has been rightly described, as being a General Conclusion to the whole book.

1599. (x am. From the beginning of this sentence to the end of ve. 17 I have placed in parenthesis; because the difference of the subject-matter, and the recurrence to 'testifying' in ve. 18 appear to indicate, that this portion is to be regarded as being spoken aside as it were, or digressively.—Again we have an emphatic & introduced, which is as though it were said; 'I, and I alone, am, &c.'—The root, &c. Jesus, 'of the seed of David' (2 Ti. 2; 8), was "the root and the root-shoot [offspring, or race] of David" par excellence, and in a sense, in which none other ever was or could be. Hengstenberg renders the second of the two Greek substantives by a word equivalent to race, and says; "The race of David is more than his offspring: it indicates, that the race of David should, save for Christ, have ceased to exist. The race of David is here brought into view, in respect to the unconquerable strength and everlasting dominion, promised to it by God. What he testifies, in whom the glorious race of David culminates, will assuredly go into fulfilment." And in reference to the first he remarks; "The root of David, as in C. 5; 5, is the product of the root, the sprout from the root, that in which the family of David, that had sunk into the lowest depression, again bloomed forth." To the same effect Stuart says; "Root-shoot, not root, as our version has it." The result is to make the two terms in reality synonymous, the former being the figurative expression for that, of which the latter is the literal equivalent. I have already (on 347) stated my reasons for rather thinking, that the terms are meant to present a contrast; and I may add here, that such a collocation of terms, as Hengstenberg's and Stuart's construction would make out,—the one used figuratively and the other literally, is incongruous, and not in accordance with the author's manner. I think, that the following is the view, we ought to take of this clause. As by the next preceding clause our thoughts were carried back to the scene introductory to the new Mystery (cp. 1; 1 ss.), so by this they are directed to that, which introduced the old Mystery (cp. 5; 5). In the passage first referred to, Jesus appears as the High Priest giving his instructions to the universal Church, specially that called after his name: in the other, he is introduced as "the lion of Judah, the root of David, who has conquered to open the roll," that is, to reveal his own mysterious settings under the older Dispensation. What is in the latter specialized, so as to refer to that Dispensation, is in the clause before us, by the twofold phrase, made comprehensive of both Mysteries. And the
apparent contradiction, in making Jesus to be at once 'the root' and 'the race,' does but present a difficulty similar to that, which Jesus himself propounded to the scribes for solution, when he asked them; 'If David himself called the Messiah Lord, how is he then his son?' And this may guide us to the solution of the present difficulty. The Christ was David's 'root' and 'Lord,' as the Mediator and Lord of the Dispensation, under which David lived: and (besides his descent after the flesh, which is of secondary importance) he was spiritually David's 'son' and his 'race' (extending to the remotest ages), as "the son" of the woman (12; 5), that is, of the Church of God, which David served, loved, and honoured,—the son, who founded (and hence is regarded as the representative, comprehending in his own person the thing founded)—who founded, I say, a spiritual race, over which he, "the son of the Highest," "the horn of salvation raised up in the house of his servant David," "should reign as on the throne of his father David for ever, and of whose kingdom there should be no end" (Lu. 1; 32, 69). Cp. Is. 11; 1: Jer. 23; 5. Thus, by the two passages in question, both taken separately, and as mutually explanatory, Jesus is virtually set forth as the Lord and Originator of both Dispensations, and as He who is the Mediator of the Church of God of all time.

1600. The bright, the morning star. Some copies read 'And (=both) the bright, and.' while others omit one or both copulatives.—By this particular, again, we are referred back to the beginning; where (see on 195) the promise is made; "To him that conquers I will give the morning star," that is (as we learn from our present text), "I will give to him myself"—give myself both for him, and (by my Spirit) to him. —We should not look for the precedent, as Commentators direct us, to Is. 14; 12; "How art thou fallen, O Lucifer (the king of Babylon), son of the morning." For, to connect in any way the Lord of the Covenant with the ungodly ambition of the ruler of the hostile world-power,—he who 'said in his heart; I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God,' were almost blasphemous. But we must rather look to Nu. 24; 17; "There shall come a star out of Jacob" (which expositors refer first to David, and then to the Messiah); and more especially in this connexion to 2 Sa. 21; 17, where David is called "the light of Israel."—I agree with Stuart, that "the splendour and beauty of the morning star make it a fitting emblem of the King of Zion." But this only satisfies the epithet 'bright.' That of 'morning,'—early-rising or first visible, must also have its appropriate signification. And this it will be seen to have, if we consider, that Jesus was the harbinger of a brighter day to the Church, as compared with the afflicting circumstances, under which she was placed at the time, when this was written,—yes, of an abso-
luteLY 'bright' and 'perfect day,' even that of her new Jerusalem state, when there will be 'no night,' and 'no need of sun, or moon, or lamp; for God and the lamb will be her light.' Cp. 2 Pe. 1; 19; 'Until the daystar (lit., the light-bringer, Lucifer) arise in your hearts;' and Lu. 1; 78, where Christ is called "a dayspring (or sunrising) from on high."—The remarks now made have shown, that, when Jesus, the messenger of the Covenant, has arrived at the last words of his communication to the churches, he stops short in what he is saying, in order to throw in a farewell word of comfort and encouragement. This he does by exhibiting himself in his relations to David, and to his own Church. Under the former head he gives, as by a single stroke of the pen, a bird's eye view of the main features of the whole Revelation, exhibiting himself as the Mediator of the two Covenants, and Lord of the Church, 'from the foundation of the world' unto 'the ages of ages.' This is the basis of the latter head; for, as the one Mediator and Lord of all, he is qualified to be a harbinger of 'bright' and blessed things to his now afflicted people. When thus regarded, how gracious a Conclusion is this! How fitted to call forth such a response, as that which follows! And hence how naturally is that response appended, which would otherwise seem to be not pertinent!

XXII; 17. 1601. And the Spirit, etc. It may be doubted who is the speaker,—who are the parties addressing or addressed,—and with what object the invitations are given in the four clauses of this verse: and therefore these points must be considered: but we will first ascertain the purport of the several terms.—And. The first copulative might properly in this instance, as in so many other places (cp. 6; 11: 17; 11: 18; 15, 16: 20; 10), be translated both.—The Spirit. Hengstenberg says; "The Spirit is not the Spirit, that dwells in all believers (Ro. 8; 16), but the Spirit of prophecy (19; 10),—the Spirit of the prophets (22; 6),—that in which John was on the Lord's day (1; 10: 4; 2),—which also speaks through John in C. 14; 18, and which utters the promises in the seven epistles." In this statement there is a lamentable commlingling of things, which differ in their nature as widely as God and man. Doubtless the same Spirit, namely, the Holy Spirit, is spoken of here and in C. 2; 7: 14; 3, and (inasmuch as it is 'the same Spirit, that worketh all in all') also in Rom. 8; 16. But the Holy Spirit is not immediately spoken of in C. 1; 10: 4; 2: 19; 10: 22; 6, as either the absence of the article or the compound phrase shows. The bride being the Church, which is 'the temple of the Holy Spirit,' the Spirit here must be that Holy Being, who dwells in the Church, thereby giving to her the life and holiness, which make her fit to be the wife of the lamb.—The bride. See on 1312.—Come. This invitation, given in answer to the preceding words of Jesus, implies, that the announcement of himself, as 'the
bright and morning star,' carried with it the idea of an early rising, having in view that immediate advent, which he had just before thrice announced (vv. 7, 10, 12). *Come* is here equivalent to the *Come quickly* of ve. 20. The Greek word is not the same, that is translated *Come* in the call to the birds of prey (19; 17); and this advent has, in reference to the saints, a very different object in view to that of the birds.

1602. *He who hears.* As the series is a descending one, I should not (as some do) understand this phrase in its widest sense; but would rather (recalling the formula; "He who hath an ear to hear, let him hear:" 13; 9) limit the application to those earnest *Christian* hearers, who were prepared to entertain the sentiment with fervour.—But, 'hears' what?—"the words of the prophecy of this book" (vv. 7, 9, 10), as Stuart says? or,—the 'Come' of the Spirit and the bride, as Hengstenberg asserts? I think the former, on account of the connexion (the immediate reference being to 'the things' of ve. 16), and still more because the utterance of the Spirit and the bride must be a spiritual or figurative, and not an audible one.

1603. *He who is athirst let him come.* This is from Is. 55; 1; "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters." 'Let him who thirsts after the water of life, which flows from the throne of God and of the lamb' (22; 1), 'come unto me and drink' (Jo. 7; 37); and 'I will give to him out of the fountain of life gratuitously' (21; 6). From the invitation being given to John's contemporaries to partake of that water of life, which was the peculiar privilege of the new Jerusalem, we perceive, that, although the new Jerusalem was as yet formally, or in respect of its chief and proper locality, "above" (Gal. 4; 26), yet it was at this epoch virtually, or as good as, come down to earth. Hence we have here again a proof, that the new Jerusalem is a symbol of a terrestrial state of Christ's Church.—Strictly speaking, we should not understand primarily, 'Let him come to me,' but (as in the precedent) 'Let him come to the living water, which I have to give.'

1604. *He who willeth let him take,* &c.) 'To will' is something more than 'to be willing,' or even than 'to wish.' There was required, especially at the time when John wrote, a strong effort of the will, a steadfast purpose, a stern unalterable determination.—Of course, we are not to understand the two clauses, as if they ran thus; 'He who thirsteth, let him come to the water;' and, 'He who willeth, let him take the water:' though the meaning intended might be more clearly expressed thus; 'Let him who thirsteth for, and him who is steadfastly purposed to obtain the living water, come and take it as my free gift.' The condition of obtaining being one and the same, but the clauses twofold, the mode of expression has doubtless been thrown
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into the existing form, in order to make a quartet in ve. 17, and thus to intimate, that this is a universal invitation, comprehensive of all, who are themselves willing to be comprehended in it.—Water of life. The best Codices omit the article.—Cp. and see on C. 7; 17: 21; 6: 22; 1.

We are now in a position to deduce answers to the questions suggested above (see on 1601). 1st. Who is the speaker here? 2dly. Of or to whom does he speak? 3dly. To or by whom does he state, that an invitation or exhortation is or ought to be addressed? 4thly. For what purpose, how, and when are the several parties invited called upon to come? It is important to distinguish between the first two questions; because, owing to the distinction not having been observed in putting the questions, confusion and error have arisen. For example, the questions have been proposed thus. (1). Who are the parties addressing? and (2). Who are the parties addressed? And then such answers as the following have been given. (1). In the first member the Holy Spirit and the Church, and in the second weak believers, address Christ: in the third and fourth Christians address sinners. (2). In the two first the Church addresses Christ: in the two last she addresses the world. (3). In the two first the parties addressing are the Church and individuals: in the two last the parties addressed are he, who has an earnest desire, and he, who will listen.

In order to clear away this confusion, the most ready way will be to observe, in the first place, that the text naturally divides itself in two ways:—1st, into those, who have come to the living water (as shown by their being qualified to say, Come), and those, who have not; 2dly, into those who do, and those who do not say, Come. On the former division the four members are divided into two pairs: on the latter into one and three. But it may be observed, that the first member (as it is commonly regarded) is capable of division into two members, inasmuch as it includes two parties; and, on the other hand, the last two may (as I have shown) be taken together, so as to form one member. This capability of double arrangement has not, I think, happened without design. I believe, that there has been an intention to admit of a distribution into pairs on both modes of division. At any rate, the reader can choose between the two, if he thinks that both are not admissible. On the former, we shall have, as those who have come to the living water (and who consequently must be true Christians); 1st, the Spirit and the Bride (i.e., the spiritual Church, in which the Holy Spirit dwells); and 2dly, the well-disposed Christian 'hearer' (but one not yet so fully converted; as to be in the face of persecution an open 'doer of the word,' and in consequence to be constrained to cry from his inmost soul; 'Come, Lord Jesus (ve. 20):
come quickly, as the bright and morning star, the harbinger of a better day'): and we shall have, as those who have not come to the living water (and who must, therefore, be heathen unbelievers); 1st, 'he who thirsteth' with all his soul to know the way of life,—to be assured of, and to attain unto the blessedness of a future state of bliss; and 2dly, 'he who is willing, and steadfastly purposeth' to choose the way of life rather that that of death, if the two are made known to him. Those, who constitute the former of these two pairs, are in a position to be able to say to Jesus, Come; and in consequence they are either said to do so, or are called upon to do so. Those, who constitute the latter, are not in a position to say to him, Come; and they are, therefore, not exhortcd to do so. On the second of the two divisions, we shall have, as those who do say to Christ, Come; 1st, the Holy Spirit (who, as the Sanctifier, is properly placed first); and 2dly, the sanctified, or those in a state of salvation: and we shall have, as those who do not give him this invitation, such as are not yet converted unto life, including (1). those who will not, and (2). those who can not invite Christ (i.e., convinced but not fully converted,—sincere but not spiritual Christians), and earnest-minded and well-disposed heathens (and none but such are worthy of being brought into consideration).

This analysis will enable us readily to arrive at right answers to the questions, proposed at the outset. 1st, The speaker must be Jesus in his Divine character. Not John; because in such a case as this, in which the statement itself does not indicate the speaker, his name would have been introduced, if any change had been intended. Not Jesus, as the angelic hierophant (and à fortiori not the seer); because Divine knowledge was required to know the mind of the Spirit, and to search hearts; and because none, but the Divine Mediator, has the water of life at his disposal. Jesus then, as God, must be the speaker: and this the relation to the preceding context likewise requires. 2dly, He speaks of parties in the first member only, namely, of the Holy Spirit and the spiritual Church. In the three last members he speaks to parties, namely,—to convinced Christians,—to heathens thirsting after life,—and to heathens willing and wishing to obtain it. The first he exhorts to let their zeal and affections be enflamed to the point of earnest longing for his coming; and the two last to 'arise from the dead, and he will give them life.' 3dly, In the first member an invitation is not directly given; but a statement is made, to the effect that one is being given by the Church to the speaker, Jehovah-Jesus. In the second also no invitation is given; but a call is made on convinced Christians to give one to the speaker. In the two last an exhortation is given by the speaker to two classes of heathens to come and receive the water of life gratuitously. 4thly,
By the party spoken of in the first member Jesus is, and by the party contemplated in the second it is required that he should be, earnestly implored to come to the rescue of his persecuted Church. This is no ordinary 'Come:' it does not invite to come into the believer's heart. It is one manifestly called forth by the perils of the time (A.D. 66–70), and by the afflicted circumstances of those, to whom the Revelation was immediately addressed: and it is based on the unveiling of Jesus by himself as 'the bright and morning star,' that holds forth the prospect of a day, in which the Sun of righteousness will shine in unclouded splendour. It is, therefore, a pressing call on Jesus to hasten his coming,—to fulfil the promises he had just made, and 'come quickly,'—to come at once to execute the threatened judgment on his enemies (14; 6: 15; 4: 16; 5–7), to deliver and give the promised reward to his servants (11; 18), and to set up his kingly or millennial kingdom (14; 6: 20; 4). While thus the Church urgently calls upon her Lord, who in his goodness delayeth his coming, until the number of the 144000 'elect' ones (14; 1–5: 19; 14), who are to form his train shall have been made complete, he, in the two last members, no less urgently calls upon his heathen enemies and persecutors (upon those at least, whose state of mind affords the smallest hope, that they will listen to the call) to come without a moment's delay, and partake of the water of life by reception of the saving truths of his Gospel; and he will give unto them eternal life, and none shall pluck them out of his hand.

The dependence of the statement in ve. 17 on that in the last sentence of ve. 16 will be more clearly perceived, when the two are regarded (as they ought to be), as forming together a digression, which has been introduced parenthetically as it were.

XXII; 18. 1605. I testify. The connexion of subject, which is indicated by the For of the R. T., does not exist with ve. 17, though it may be considered to do so with the first sentence in ve. 16, that is, with the context preceding the digression. The omission of the particle may, therefore, be thought to be sanctioned by the sense, as it is by the great majority of MSS.—On the same grounds the reading of the R. T., which would properly be rendered (though it is not so in the A. V.), I testify together with every one, etc., is rightly rejected. —The verb testify occurs only four times, viz., in the Introduction in ve. 2, and in this Conclusion in the three alternate verses, 16; 18, 20. By this circumstance, again, the parallelism of the Conclusion with the Introduction is made more obvious; and, the limits of each being marked out, the portion intermediate between them is shown to be the testimony that is testified.—The close connexion between the first clauses in the three verses just mentioned, and more especially that between the one under consideration and the first of the three, will
be apparent on comparing them with one another. Jesus, having in ve. 16, by the words "I Jesus," emphatically avouched himself to be the testifier of 'the things' contained in the book (and which concern the Church of all time), in ve. 18 returns from his digression; and, in order to connect closely with his first declaration that, which he is about to make as a safeguard against corrupting the testimony, he takes up again the thread of his discourse by repeating the word I. testify', which he had used as the emphatic word of the sentence in ve. 16. It was because the testimony proceeded from him, and concerned the Church of all time, that such a protective statement as that which follows, was rendered proper and necessary. Besides, in the case of a book numerically and stichically arranged in the way that this is, a special reason would exist for such a conservative declaration; inasmuch as the smallest addition or omission might suffice to throw out the whole arrangement. These reasons will better and more naturally account for the insertion of the warning, which the word before us introduces, than the hypothesis of Stuart (which, by the bye, has nothing to rest upon), that there was a special proneness 'to tamper with such books in the region, where the Apocalypse was published.' And it must be admitted, that a declaration, so solemnly appended as a parting word, needs to be accounted for; since, as Stuart says, 'there is something not perfectly natural in the severity of the interdict before us.' Precedents, however, for such a caution may be found in De. 4; 2: 12; 32: Pr. 30; 5: 6.—Hengstenberg asserts, that 'no one, who has discerned the spirit of this book, will for a moment doubt, that such additions and omissions as belong to the proper kernel of the book, and to which a clew may be found by comparing C. 2; 10, 20: Is. 5; 19: 2 Pe. 3; 4: 2 Ti. 2; 17, are here referred to.' For my part I must submit to be reckoned by him among the number of those, who have not discerned the spirit of the book; for I can see no grounds for entertaining such an opinion.—To every one who heareth. In C. 1; 3 two terms, hear and read, are used. In this place the preference is given to the former, in consequence of the hearers being necessarily far more numerous than the readers, owing to the paucity of manuscript copies, and the comparatively small number of persons, that could read. Of course, no contrast between hearers and readers is intended; but we are to understand the latter, as being included in the latter. In the use of the term hear, we may see another indication of immediate reference to the time then current.

1606. The words of the prophecy of this roll. This phrase and the similar one (the words of the roll of this prophecy) in 1611, the these things in 1607, and this roll in 1609 and 1615, may be supposed, at first sight, to have all the same meaning. But a closer inspection
will show, that there are indications to the contrary. Thus, the arrangement of the words in the two first is not identical. In the genuine text of the third the pronoun, which expresses these things, is not (as might have been expected) put in the gender, that would have made it refer to the words in the preceding clause, but in that, which refers it to the things spoken of in ve. 16. Again, the roll cannot be precisely identical with the prophecy contained in it. What, then, do the several terms and phrases mean? 1. The roll is that, which John sent to the seven churches in obedience to the command given to him in C. 1; 11, and which contained the epistle (1; 4, cp. 22; 21), in which the revelation-proper was sent. In short, it was the Apocalyptic roll. And strange it is, in so self-evident a case, that the interdict before us should be commonly cited as referring to the whole Bible, as though it were the book intended, or could possibly have been at a time, when the Scriptures contained in it were not collected into a volume. 2. The prophecy is, properly, the inspired matter contained in the roll. Hence the roll and the prophecy are not strictly identical; though they are so closely connected, that, when strict accuracy was not required, the terms might be used interchangeably. 3. The words of the prophecy of this roll (22; 7, 10, 18) may be taken to be equivalent to the words of this prophetic roll. So that this phrase, the roll (1; 11: 22; 18, 19), the prophecy (19; 10), the words of this roll (22; 9), and the words of this prophecy (1; 3), may be considered to be in the main identical in meaning, all virtually denoting the Apocalypse. The two remaining phrases, while they may have the same general meaning, seem to have a specialty of signification assigned to them. 4. These things (cp. ve. 16) appears to have specially in view 'the things about to happen, after those now occurring,' of C. 1; 19 and 4; 1. 5. Again, the phrase in ve. 19, corresponding to the one before us, may be thought to have had the arrangement of its terms varied expressly for the purpose of signifying, that it is 'the roll of the prophecy,' that is to say, the predictive portion of the Apocalyptic roll, that is specially meant. If so, this phrase will be substantially identical with that last noticed. The chief result I will hereafter exhibit in a collation of the two parts of this interdict. At present, I will only further call attention to the additional instance of parallelism between the Introduction and the Conclusion, which appears in the distribution between them of the four examples of the clause before us.

1607-8. God shall add ... God shall take away. Jesus alone could be justified in speaking thus.

1609. The plagues, sc. 'those, in which the wrath of God attains its end' in the due punishment of the offending party. — Codex B, seven cursives, and some versions have 'the seven plagues.'
XXII; 19. 1610-13. And if any one . . . his part, &c. Far from having "part in the first resurrection," his portion shall be with "the liars (this being a species of lie), who have their part in the lake of fire." "God shall appoint him a portion with the unbelievers." "This shall be the portion of his cup."—From the wood of life. This reading is better accredited than that of the R. T.; and the circumstance of the wood and the city having been mentioned together just before (ve. 14) gives additional probability to it. As "the plagues," by which the great city Babylon was desolated and destroyed were doubtless had in view in ve. 18, so the blessings, which are to be found in, and which form the crowning glory of the holy city, new Jerusalem, are implied in the wood of life.

1614. And from the holy city. The wood of life and the holy city were blessings promised (2; 7: 3; 12) to the conquerors of the beast in the seven churches (i.e., in the Catholic Church of John's time primarily). And they are finally exhibited in Cs. 21-22, as being the consummating privileges and blessings of earth. Whence it may be inferred, that the things signified in Cs. 2-3 and in Cs. 21-22; 6 are substantially the same, the Church of Christ on earth being represented in both places, only under different aspects, and at different stages and epochs.

1615. The things written in this roll. In consequence of the unauthorized insertion of the copulative in the R. T., the things here spoken of are made in the A. V. to be distinct from, and additional to the roll and the city; whereas these are in point of fact the things spoken of. The view to be taken is this. To 'the plagues' (ve. 18) would have corresponded naturally in ve. 19 'the blessings written;' but, instead of the indefinite term 'blessings,' a symbolical specification of them has been substituted. And the reason for this seems to be obvious. The term 'plagues' would in itself be sufficient to indicate, that such plagues as the seven last plagues, by which the great city Babylon was to be destroyed, were intended. But in order to bring out the parallelism of reference to the holy city, new Jerusalem, something more definite than the term 'blessings' was required.

The threat contained in the two verses last considered has been deemed to be 'severe,' and disproportioned to the offence. But this can appear to be the case, only when a too literalizing principle of interpretation is adopted. The principle followed throughout the book ought, in a degree proportioned to the character of the passage as a whole, to be adhered to here. This will require, that we take the terms used in the same wide and quasi figurative sense here as in similar places, and that we look rather at the gist of the passage as a whole, than interpret it in its several details. The passage itself, by
the alliterative form into which it is thrown, indicates, that this is the right view to take of it. Construing it on this principle, we shall merely gather the following, as being its general purport in literal terms:—God will assign a due measure of punishment to any one, who in any way wilfully corrupts this book.

Vv. 18–19 contain the last words of the Mediator Jesus; and it must be superfluous to point out how appropriate they are, as a termination (excepting John's final prayer) of the Conclusion.

DIV. 7. JOHN'S FINAL COMMUNICATION AND PRAYER.

XXIII; 20. 1616–18. He who testifieth these things saith; 'Yea, I am coming speedily: Amen.' Come, Lord Jesus!

1616. He who testifieth. The change to the third person indicates a change in the person, from whom this verse proceeds; and I think there can be little doubt, that John (by inspiration) adds one more word of his own, in order, by a fourth repetition in this Conclusion of the Lord's own assurance of his speedy coming, to inspire those, who were suffering for the truth's sake, with hope and consolation. He who testifieth is, of course, Christ. And what he testifieth is the 'Revelation of Jesus Christ,' but with so especial a view to 'the things, which must shortly come to pass,' that these may be, and occasionally are put for the whole (1; 1). Whence we see, what we must understand by the these things; and, that we must not refer the expression to the sayings just uttered.

1617. 'Yea, I am coming speedily: Amen.' That I have done right in not following commentators in connecting the Amen with the clause that follows it, and in attaching it to this, may, I think, be satisfactorily shown. 1. Yea: Amen is the most emphatic Hebrew expression for affirming, that a thing is unalterably fixed, and will inevitably happen. See 2 Co. 1; 17–20; 'When I was thus minded, did I use lightness, . . . that with me there should be the yea yea, and the nay nay? . . . For the Son of God . . . was not made yea and nay, but hath been made yea in him. For all the promises of God have in him the yea [which seals their truth], and in him the amen' [which seals their unchangeableness]; that is, they have the highest possible attestation given to them; and they may, therefore, in the fullest manner be relied upon. See also Mt. 5; 37, where the command is given, that a Christian man must not go beyond a double yea or nay. Now, as the intention here manifestly is to give the strongest possible attestation to the declaration made, the connexion which I have indicated must be adopted. 2. This is confirmed by C. 1; 7, which contains a declaration, to which the one under consideration is doubtless intended to form a parallel; and in which, moreover, the two terms appear together:—'Lo, he cometh,
&c. Yea: Amen." Thus we have at the end of the general Introduction, and at the end of the Conclusion, statements precisely parallel (the one presenting the Lord's coming in the aspect, in which it will be regarded by his enemies, and the other in that, in which it will be viewed by his saints); and both are avouched by 'the two immutable words, after which it is impossible for God to lie.' If there be any difference arising from the varied allocation of the words in the two texts, it would seem, that the placing one before, and the other after the declaration to be attested by them, gives additional force to the attestation. The affirmation of his coming is then as it were encircled by the immutability of Jehovah. The kernel of the statement,—that in which his elect are supremely interested, is defended on every side by an impenetrable and indestructible shell. The assurance of his speedy coming is made to appear so infallible, that the Sun of righteousness may be said to be seen as it were to be actually making his appearance in the heavens, the rays which encircle him leaving no doubt as to either the fact or the person. 3. We have, in like manner, found the Amen placed at the beginning and the end of a statement for double attestation (7; 12). Moreover, in four places the single Amen of immutability, and in three the single yea of truth occurs. But it is only at the beginning and the end of the book, and in reference to the advent, that the yea: Amen is introduced; and then it is uttered by him, who is designated "the Amen, the faithful and true testifier" (3; 14), "the God of truth" (Hab., the amen God: Is. 65; 16). What more could be said? Or could it have been made more clearly evident, that the grand and primary object of the revelation was to comfort and sustain Christians of the time then present, under their sufferings for his name's sake?—Here let me take occasion to remark generally, in reference to the word Amen, that it invariably affirms the truth, certainty, or unchangeableness of that, to which it is prefixed or affixed, and never signifies "So be it," so as to constitute a prayer. It is remarkable, that, except as a concluding term of confirmation, it is found in the N. T. only in the words of our Lord; "Amen I say unto you." And still more singular is it, that, while he is reported by the first three Evangelists to have always used the word singly, he is represented by S. John as invariably doubling it. It is further worthy of notice, that the above phrase is reported in four times seven places of S. Matthew, in twice seven of S. Mark, in seven of S. Luke; and it may be reckoned to occur seven times seven in S. John's Gospel; for the phrase is found in twenty-five places, and, the term being doubled in each, gives the Jubilee-number, which was so reckoned. In Romans, again, it is inserted seven times, as a concluding word of attestation, thus dividing the epistle into seven parts.
And in the Apocalypse, according to the best critical editions, it ought to be read only seven times: though in the R. T. it occurs ten times.

1618. *Come, Lord Jesus.* The R. T. has *yea: come Lord Jesus.*—The seer appends his *Come, as a fourth* invitation or prayer (cp. vs. 17), in response to Jesus's *fourth* declaration of his speedy coming. And thus this verse is seen immediately to connect itself with vv. 16-17; and it would be well to read it in immediate sequence to them.—John should be regarded as acting, here as elsewhere, in the character of a representative of the universal Church. Then, this response will appear as hers. And, most appropriately, with this fervent wish and prayer for her Lord's coming does the apostolic Communication terminate.

**VALEDICTORY SALUTATION OF THE APOCALYPTIC EPISTLE.**

XXII; 21. 1619-20. *The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ [be] with all [the saints. Amen].*

With the usual benediction John concludes his work in the epistolary form.—Some copies have our before Lord.—*Christ* is omitted in A, and in two cursives.—There are three readings of the concluding words, viz., *be with all (A), be with you all. Amen (R. T.)*, and *be with all the saints* (B). The first is perhaps the best accredited. That of the R. T. is almost identical with S. Paul's valediction in Ro. 16; 20: 1 Co. 16; 23: Ph. 4; 23: 1 Th. 5; 23: 2 Th. 3; 18.—The limitation to 'the Lord Jesus Christ' is most appropriate to a revelation of Jesus Christ.'—"The saints" must of course mean Christian saints.

*Recapitulatory interpretation.*—The Conclusion does not form part of the Vision, and consequently does not connect in chronological sequence with the preceding context. Chronologically it must have immediate reference, like the Introduction, to the time and circumstances of the writer, and of those whom he addresses.—The first six of the seven parts, into which it naturally resolves itself, consist of declarations, made by the interpreting angel alternately in his angelic and in his Messianic character, the seventh being a statement, which the seer is inspired to add as the last word of the Revealer, in order to afford him an opportunity of making a response on the part of the Church, expressive of her longing aspirations for the advent of her Lord. All these parts exhibit parallelisms to the statements of the Introduction, the Introduction and the Conclusion being thus marked out as corresponding to one another, and as being distinct from the Vision or Revelation-Proper.

1. In the first division (ve. 6) the angel, as the Revealer, solemnly affirms the truth of all the things, that have now been revealed, and the trustworthiness of the expectations, that have been held out; and
he repeats the declaration made at the beginning, that the principal object of the Lord in giving the revelation was to show to his persecuted saints what things were about to happen, in reference to their persecutors and themselves. He had made the same affirmation at the commencement of the new Jerusalem scene; and thus that state of the Church is as it were marked out, and distinguished from the rest.

2. In the second division (ve. 7) the angel-Mediator renews the assurance, which he had given at the outset, that he would come speedily to avenge and deliver his people; and he adds parenthetically a declaration of the blessedness of him, who should so observe the sayings of this inspired book as to govern his conduct by them.

3. The third division (vv. 8–11) consists of a colloquy between the angelic hierophant and the seer. First of all, the scene is repeated, which had been exhibited at the epoch of the marriage of the lamb (Jesus’s espousing his Church); and thus the strictly Christian period is marked out. In it the seer offers worship to the angel, in order to give occasion to a stern rebuke and rejection of the worship by the angel: and thus is symbolically represented, that in the Christian Church no worship must be given to angels, no, not even to the Lord of the Church, when appearing in an angelic character; because then, inasmuch as he acts as ‘a ministering spirit sent forth to minister to them, who shall be heirs of salvation,’ he appears only as a fellow-servant of all those, who minister in like manner. Divine worship must exclusively be rendered to the Godhead as such. [Cp. p. 379]. Next, the angel directs John to lay the things, which had been revealed to him, before the Church forthwith, and in so plain a manner that they might readily be understood; since, if this were not done, the chief purpose of the revelation would be frustrated, inasmuch as the accomplishment of the things, in which his contemporaries were specially interested, was near at hand. The final sentence of the Lord would decree, that every one should for ever remain in the condition, in which he was found at the Lord’s coming, the holy should be for ever holy, and the vile for ever vile.

4. Whereupon, as a fourth division (vv. 12, 13), and in order to give the highest attestation to the speediness of his coming, Jesus in his character of Mediator takes up the word, and again declares, that he is coming speedily, bringing recompenses in his hand. He states, further, what is the object of his coming, namely, to give to every one his wages according to his work,—to the persecutors ‘confusion of face,’—to his servants deliverance. And this he avouches on his word as the thrice eternal One.

5. The angel then, in the fifth part (vv. 14, 15), resumes, as the hierophant, his discourse with reference to the two classes of which he had spoken, declaring, that those, who washed the filthiness from their robes by the blood of the lamb, should be blessed
CONCLUSION TO THE REVELATION.

indeed (for they should be permitted to enter by the strait gate into the holy city, and should be made partakers of all the privileges of the city); while the heathen workers of iniquity of every description should be kept 'outside,' and be consigned to 'the darkness that is without, where there is weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth.'

6. The sixth division (vv. 16–19) contains the parting words of Jesus, spoken in his own person. First, he repeats the assurance which he had vouchsafed at the beginning, that the testifying now given through the symbolic hierophant, touching matters of deepest interest and concernment to his Church, especially the then existing Church, proceeded from himself.—And here in his great love to his people, he cannot refrain from pausing to throw in (as it were parenthetically) yet one word more of comfort, encouragement, and exhortation. He therefore describes himself as being, at once 'the root,'—the Divine Creator of David and David's throne,—He who called him from the sheepfolds to make him King of Israel, and also the long-promised "seed of Judah,"—"that son of David," "to whom God would give the throne of his father David." Moreover, with special regard to the present distressed circumstances of his people, he designates himself 'the morning star,' which is about to appear as the harbinger of a brighter day. He then shows the sentiments, with which different classes were prepared to receive him as thus announced, and the way in which they should be severally addressed. His own true people, under the guidance of his Holy Spirit, were earnestly calling and praying to him to hasten his bright and blessed coming, and to establish 'the kingdom which should never be moved.' The hearers of his word,—the convinced but not converted followers of him, were halting between two opinions, and needed to be exhorted to make up their minds to say; Come. The heathen man, who, weary of 'living without hope in the world,' was thirsting after a better state; and he, who was not only willing but stedfastly purposed to 'choose life,' if 'the way of life' were made known to him,—these could not indeed be expected as yet to say to Jesus, Come; but to each of them the gracious invitation might still be given to come and take the water of life, which Jesus had at his disposal, and which he was willing to bestow without money and without price. And thus there was a final word of comfort and encouragement from Jesus to all, who might be disposed to receive him.—After this 'comfortable' digression, Jesus resumes his discourse relating to the testifying. He has only now to add a sanction, which may serve as a safe-guard against the corruption of it. This sanction he appends in two parallel lines, the paronomasia in which will more clearly appear by a parallelistic arrangement of them.

If any one shall add unto
these things [sc. the things of the prophecy, specially those in the near future],

God shall add unto him the declarations of the book of this prophecy [those of the prophetic part, relating to the near future],

God shall take away his share of [the blessings, to wit,] the wood which destroyed the great city of life, and the holy city, new Babylon,—which have been written in this Jerusalem,—book.'

7. Thus end the alternate declarations of the "angel" Jesus, as made in his angelic and his Messianic characters. But, that the last word may be one of promise, and not of threat, the seer is inspired to add, in a seventh and last portion (ve. 20) a fourth and final declaration of the fixed purpose of the Mediator to come quickly. And this declaration is 'set' in a Yes, Amen, whereby it is certified to be the immutable declaration of the Almighty God. To it the seer, as the representative of the Church, responds with a devout and fervent 'Come, Lord Jesus.'

The Apocalyptic Communication having been thus brought to an end, it only remains for the writer to conclude his epistle to the seven churches with the usual apostolical benediction; and appropriately he invokes for all Christ's saints the favour of him, who has been pleased thus graciously to unveil himself and his actings for their edification and comfort.

FINIS: S. ANDREW'S DAY, 1860.

The author of this Exposition of the Apocalypse, having brought his labours to a close at the end of the Christian year, may appropriately conclude with a prayer for his readers and for himself, that each, 'at the end of the days' allotted to him, may find, that his name has been written in the lamb's book of life, and that 'an entrance will thus be ministered unto him into the everlasting kingdom of his God and Saviour.' Amen.

CORRIGENDA: VOLS. I. & II.


" 288, l. 39: for A.D. read A.C.

" 308, l. 32: for 30-1 read 31-30.

Vol. II. p. 89, l. 17: for draconic read draconic.

" 363, l. 21: for 9-11 read 9-10.
NOTANDA.

Since the greater part of the present work was printed, Scrivener's edition of the Greek Testament, and Kelly's 'Revelation edited in Greek,' have come into my hands. The following are the only Various Readings in them, which appear to deserve notice in this place.—In C. 7: 5–8, A, C, with many cursives, have the numbers in words, but B, and very many MSS. in numeral letters.—In Vol. II: p. 199, I stated, on the authority of the editions to which I had access, that the reading adopted by Heneganberg in C. 16; 8 was not 'well supported.' I now find, that it is authorized by A and C.—The very ancient Uncial, recently discovered, and designated Codex Sinaiticus, has the following readings.—C. 2: 18; τ. ε. μεν ει ν. ά. το τους τ. λ. Μαινατος.—In C. 2: 20 the second ην is omitted.—In C. 5: 9–10 reads ἔνθα, and ἀκοντος της θ. η. βασιλεί. η. ἱερατείας η. βασιλεύοντος.—C. 6: 11; φθορεῖν.—C. 10: 8, 10; βιβλιοθήκης.—C. 12: 18; λογαριασμός.

C. viii; 1. The half-hour's silence. In connexion with the view enunciated in Vol. I: p. 802 it seems to be very significant, that Scripture should be wholly silent (that is, the prophetic spirit was intermittent) during the period indicated: and it is a curious coincidence, that the duration of the period between the date of the last book of the Old Testament and the era of the trumpet, under which Rome takes the place of the Grecian kingdom as the world-power, is the same as that of the latter kingdom.

C. xiii; 10: p. 76. There are so many variations of reading in the former part of this verse, that it is difficult to form an accurate opinion as to the true meaning; but the following may be given as an expository paraphrase, which will probably for substance exhibit it, in so far as it has Nero in view. 'If any one seek to carry into captivity (as Nero has done), into captivity he shall be carried (as some think that Nero has been). If any one killeth with the sword (like Nero), with the sword he shall be killed (as some say, that Nero has been).' Cp. Jer. xv; 2.

Having a spare page or two, I will subjoin abstracts of some passages in Enoch, to which references have been made as presenting points of resemblance to parts of Rev. xx–xxxii.—C. xxxviii. Parable the first. 'When the righteous shall be manifested, who will be elected for their works, weighed by the Lord of spirits, where will be the place of rest for those, who have rejected the Lord of spirits? It would have been better for them, if they had never been born. When, too, the secrets of the righteous shall be revealed, then shall sinners be judged. [So that the apostle's contemporaries believed, that the godly, and not 'the ungodly dead only,' would appear in the judgment.] From that period those who possess the earth shall cease to be powerful and exalted ['there shall be no more a sea']. Neither shall they be capable of beholding the countenances of the holy; for the light of the countenances of the elect has been seen by the Lord. Yet shall not the mighty kings of that period be destroyed; but be delivered into the hands of the righteous and the holy.—C. xxxix. In those days shall the holy and elect race descend from the upper heavens [Re. 21; 2]; and their seed shall then be with the sons of men. . . . At that time my eyes beheld the dwelling of the elect, of truth, faith, and righteousness. Countless shall be the number of the elect, in the presence of God for ever.'—In C. xl. "the four angels of the most high God and their four voices" are described, and their names are given as Michael, Raphael, Gabriel, and Phanuel. These evidently correspond to the four zōa of Re. 4; 6.—C. xlv. Parable the second.
In that day shall the Elect one [the Messiah] sit upon a throne of glory [Re. 21:5]; and shall appoint their conditions and countless habitations for those, who have fled for protection to my holy name. In that day I will cause my Elect one to dwell in the midst of them [Re. 21:8]; will change the heaven will bless it, and illuminate it for ever. I will also change the earth; will bless it, and cause those whom I have elected to dwell upon it [Re. 21:1]. But those who have committed sin shall not inhabit it [Re. 21:7].—C.xlv. There I beheld the Ancient of days, whose head was like wool; and with him another, whose countenance resembled that of man. Then I enquired of one of the angels, who showed me every secret thing, concerning this Son of man; who he was; whence he was; and why he accompanied the Ancient of days. He answered me; This Son of man will raise up kings from their couches, and the powerful from their thrones, and will break in pieces the teeth of sinners.—C.xlvii. In that day the prayer of the holy and the blood of the righteous shall ascend from the earth into the presence of the Lord of spirits. At that time I beheld the Ancient of days, while He sat upon the throne of His glory, and the book of the living was opened in His presence [Re. 20:12]. Then were the hearts of the saints full of joy, because the consummation of righteousness was arrived.—C.xlviii. In that place I beheld a fountain of righteousness, which never failed, encircled by many springs of wisdom. Of these all the thirsty drank [Re. 21:8:22:1], having their habitation with the righteous. In that hour was this Son of man invoked before the Lord of spirits, and his name in the presence of the Ancient of days. The Elect and the Concealed one [the Spirit] existed in His presence before the world was created, and for ever.—C.xlix. Others shall be made to see, that they must repent, and forsake the works of their hands [Re. 9:20].—C.i. In those days shall the earth deliver up from her womb, and hades deliver up from hers that which she has received; and destruction shall restore that which it owes. He shall select the righteous from among them; for the day of their salvation has approached. And in those days shall the Elect one sit upon his throne [Rev. 20:11 ss.]. The earth shall rejoice; the righteous shall inhabit it, and the elect possess it.—C.lii. After the powerful ones of the earth perish, the righteous and chosen house of his congregation shall appear, thenceforward unchangeable. And the righteous shall be relieved from the vexation of sinners.—C.liii. I beheld a deep valley burning with fire. To this they brought the mighty, the host of Azasyel, that they may be delivered over to the lowest condemnation; because they seduced those that dwell on the earth. All shall be destroyed who dwell upon earth, and under the extremities of heaven. [Re. 20:8, 9].—C.liv. Then shall princes combine together. They shall go up, and tread upon the land of their elect. The threshing floor and the city of my righteous ones shall stop their horses. They shall rise up to destroy each other, until the number of the dead bodies shall be completed by their death. Hades shall swallow up sinners from the face of the elect. [Re. 20:9].—C.lvi. The third parable: concerning the elect. The saints shall exist in the light of the sun, and the elect in the light of everlasting life. There shall be light interminable: nor shall they enter upon the enumeration of time. [Re. 21:11, 28:22:5].—C.lx. In those days I beheld long ropes given to those angels. And the angel who proceeded with me said; They are gone forth to measure. These are the measures of the righteous; and cords shall the righteous bring, that they may trust in the name of the Lord of spirits for ever. And these are the measures, which shall be
given to faith, and which shall strengthen the word of righteousness. [Re. 21: 15.]—Previously in C. x, Enoch appears to have had in view the recognized scheme of the ages, and to have contemplated it in its whole duration. As I have omitted to notice this passage in my Introduction to the seven-seal roll, I will introduce an abstract of it here. "The Lord said to Raphael: Bind Azazyel [Satan] hand and foot; cast him into darkness; and, opening the desert which is in Dudaæl, cast him in there [Re. 20; 2]. There shall he remain for ever: cover his face, that he may not see the light. And in the great day of judgment, let him be cast into the fire [Re. 20; 10]. Restore the earth, which the angels have corrupted; and announce life to it, that I may revive it [Re. 21; 1]. All the sons of men shall not perish in consequence of every secret, by which the Watchers have destroyed, and which they have taught, their offspring. All the earth has been corrupted by the effects of the teaching of Azazyel. To him therefore ascribe the whole crime. To Michael likewise the Lord said: Go and announce their punishment to those associated with Samyaza, the teacher of sorcery, and the leader of the 200 angels, the sons of heaven, who chose themselves wives from the progeny of men, and begat children, which became giants [cp. Gen. 6; 1-4]. When all their sons shall be destroyed, bind them for seventy generations underneath the earth, even to the day of final judgment. Then shall they be taken away into the lowest depths of the fire in everlasting torments. Immediately after this shall he, together with them, burn and perish: they shall be bound until the consummation of many generations [i.e., "unto the sons of sons"].

Let every oppressor perish. Let every evil work be destroyed. Let the plant of righteousness and of rectitude [i.e., the new Jerusalem] appear, and its produce become a blessing. In those days all the earth shall be cultivated in righteousness: it shall be wholly planted with trees, and filled with benediction: every tree of delight shall be planted in it: and the vine which shall be planted in it shall yield fruit to satisy [Re. 22; 2]. Purify the earth from all oppression, from all injustice, from all crime, from all impiety, and from all the pollution which is committed upon it. Then shall all the children of men be righteous; and all nations shall pay me divine honours [Re. 21; 26]. The earth shall be cleansed from all corruption, and from all suffering: neither will I again send a deluge upon it from generation to generation for ever. In those days I will open the treasuries of blessing which are in heaven, that I may cause them to descend upon earth. Peace and equity shall associate with the sons of men all the days of the world, in every generation of it.—I think there can be no doubt, that the new Jerusalem state is had in view in the last seven sentences: and if so, it is manifest, that the apostle’s contemporaries must have expected the new Jerusalem to be a terrestrial, and not a celestial state.—Considering that the author, when speaking of ‘70 generations,’ had immediately in view the antediluvian period, it is probable, that he intended to allow 100 years to a generation; and the fact, that in one scheme his computations would give on the average 100 years to a mystical ‘day’ (see Vol. i: p. 224), tends to confirm this. If so, the “70 generations” will give 7000 years.

The following is the text in 4 Ezra 7; 32, to which reference is made under Rev. 20; 12. “The earth shall restore those that are asleep in her, and so shall the dust those that dwell in silence; and the secret places [of hades] shall deliver those souls, that were committed unto them. And the Most High shall appear on the seat of judgment.”