

A  
TREATISE  
ON  
THE 1260 DAYS  
OF  
DANIEL AND SAINT JOHN :  
BEING AN ATTEMPT  
TO ESTABLISH THE CONCLUSION  
THAT THEY ARE  
YEARS ;  
AND ALSO  
TO FIX THE DATE OF THEIR COMMENCEMENT  
AND TERMINATION.

BY THE  
REV. WILLIAM DIGBY; A. M.

DUBLIN :  
PUBLISHED BY R. M. TIMS, 85, GRAFTON-ST.  
LONDON, HATCHARD AND SON, PICADILLY,  
AND J. NISBETT, BERNERS-ST.

MDCCCXXI.



## ADVERTISEMENT.

The Author of the following Treatise intended that it should have appeared in the pages of the *Christian Examiner*, in two successive numbers. It proves, however, to be too long for the Editors of that Periodical to be able to give it insertion. He therefore takes the liberty of sending it to the press himself, without going to the *useless* trouble of altering its original form, or address. He is not without hope, that he may thus be found to have contributed something, towards the settling of some questions still remaining at issue among the expositors of prophecy, which are evidently of growing importance, as time advances towards THE END.

# ERRATA.

*Page 19, line 15, dele " by."*

~~—~~ 46, — 1, for " typical," read " antitypical."

~~—~~ 47, — 21, for " was," read " was not."



## ON THE 1260 DAYS.

*To the Editor of the Christian Examiner.*

SIR,

I believe that truth, upon all subjects, shall assuredly prevail at last, and therefore the mean while it can bear to be freely, or even roughly handled. And among the subjects which can thus bear without any eventual injury to be passed even through the severest ordeal of examination, that of prophecy stands pre-eminent as a witness unto the children of men—"more sure" even than that of signs and wonders, for Him who seeth the end from the beginning, and calleth things that are not as though they were. 2 Peter i. 19.

Under these sober and composing convictions, I am unable to feel *over much* grieved, when interpreta-

tions of parts of the prophetic word, which seem to me to be satisfactorily established, and in which most, if not all, of our *Protestant* commentators at least, from the days of Mede and Newton, appear to have acquiesced, as though they stood impregably fixed upon the basis of inductive demonstration, are now all to be overhauled again—and that, too, by men of deep piety, and considerable ability and learning, such as your respected correspondent, R. D. and Mr. Maitland, (from whom R. D. has, I believe, derived his present sentiments,) and some others. Now as I still think that those gentlemen are wrong, and they themselves will not go so far as to say that they are right, I trust that they will not take it amiss, if, in a spirit of brotherly love, I honestly make the attempt (whether with success or no, let the public judge) to show, First, the *groundlessness* of their objection to the postulate, that the term of 1260 days of Daniel and St. John is to be understood of a period not of natural days, but of years; and Secondly, the *inconvenience* of the conclusion, which would follow in the shape of a corollary from their objection, if they could succeed in establishing the validity of it. Far be all asperity from christian brethren, when speaking or writing against each other upon any point in which they may not yet see eye to eye, and be therefore like minded: and this doing to another as we would not be done by, ought for an additional reason to be the farther avoided, when we deem our opponents (as I do mine, in the present case) to be sufficiently punished already by sustaining

the loss—through their *defect* of information, or *excess* of scrupulousness (whichever it may be) of the comfort of knowing as much of truth as we, (though at the expense of being regarded by them as over credulous folk) venture to believe ourselves to be in the possession and enjoyment of.

Without further preface then, I consider that the objection, made by those who think with Mr. Maitland, to the sentiment, which, with almost the highest consent has, obtained among Protestant commentators and students of prophecy for the last 200 years, that the 1260 days of Daniel and St. John cannot mean natural days, and must therefore be taken in the only remaining sense, of so many natural years “a day for a year”—is groundless in itself, and untenable by any believer in the Prophets (Acts xxvi. 27,) who will only allow that the history of the world is, as far as the Scriptures of the Prophets are already fulfilled, the best and safest clearer up of any ambiguities, which are to be found in the language employed by those men who spake not “by any private interpretation,” or impulse, but “as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.”

That objection, as far as I am aware, is based upon these two assertions—First, “that nothing has yet occurred in the history of the fourth wild beast of Daniel, or of the Roman Empire,” (which *without any interruption of time* was to succeed to that of the Greeks, if I may be allowed so far, at present, to assume as a postulate what I do not know to have been by any opposed) “which bears a sufficient re-

semblance to its being partitioned into ten separate sovereignties, and then to the rise of a new power of a different character—an ecclesiastical character—among, or behind, these, which should soon succeed in swallowing up the temporalities of some of them, (and among these, that of the great city of Rome itself) and should afterwards succeed in obtaining an evil ascendant over the whole; which evil ascendant was to stand, against all the gentler means that should be used to destroy it, even until the time, when the ancient of days should come, and the judgment should sit, and the books be opened!" The second difficulty, which is started against the idea of the 1260 days, which measure out the duration of the tyranny of this little horn, which has eyes like a seer, and a mouth speaking great things—whose look is more stout than his fellows—being not natural days, but years, is, that the objectors, and also perhaps ourselves, are, or may be, "unable to state precisely, to our own satisfaction or that of others, when that long period exactly commenced, and whether or no it has already terminated." Hence, they infer, that they have a right to impute to us, as a begging of the question, the position, which we took for a 'sequitur—*quod erat demonstrandum*,' and which history, if candidly consulted, establishes as fully as any other event which had been literally foretold, and is now literally fulfilled.

Now, really, the first of these objections seems only necessary to be stated, (begging the pardon of my learned opponents, to whom I would be sorry to



give any offence) in order to its being confuted. What?—the fourth kingdom upon the earth not yet divided!—and that, into ten kingdoms, which, making due allowance for the mutations of all terrene things, have ever, and even unto the present day, continued to make about that number, as writers of the most opposite parties, and with the most different views and objects—papal, as Machiavel, and infidel as Gibbon, as well as Protestant, such as Mede, Newton, &c. &c. have all substantially agreed, independently, to declare! And, the little horn upon the SEVENTH head of that beast, the DEMI-CESAR of the west, soon, like the occidental star in the heavens, to set, and leave the throne of his predecessors in darkness, not yet grown up! the mystery of iniquity that was even working in the Apostles days, still a *hidden* mystery, the letting power at Rome being still untaken away, which was there in St. Paul's lifetime! and the antitypical Jeroboam, the man of sin, who causes the surrogated Israel of the Gentile church to sin "with his idols" and his laws in favour of the worship of them—this wicked one, who in the womanish attire of a Jezebel acts the part of a Judas, sets up a house of merchandize in the very temple of God, and betrays Christ into the hands of the sworn foes to His name—this one who opposes and exalts himself above all that is called God or that is worshipped, not yet revealed! Antichrist—in pretence the vicar and deputy of Christ, and in reality the vicar and deputy of the dragon—not yet come; when, even in the time of St. John, there

were many Antichrists—many heretical and hypocritical professors of the religion of Jesus! He, whose coming was to be after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all the deceivableness of unrighteousness (or Jesuitism, as we might say) in them that perish, not yet come, but to be still looked for!!! Art thou indeed, O Pope, he that should come, or look we for another? What are thy works? or from whence do they proclaim thee to have come? and who do they tell us is thy father?—Really, Sir, when in the face of the Apostasy of the *latter* times, whereof this “fallen star,” in frolicksome and blasphemous parody upon the three-fold offices of the great head of his own church, has made himself, and caused himself to be acknowledged as, the Prophet, the priest, and the king—when, in the face of this glaring papal usurpation of all power in heaven and in earth and under the earth—and by Protestants too, who profess to protest against popery as that very apostasy which the spirit has so expressly spoken of that was to be revealed in times BEFORE the last—when in the face of all this, and *by Protestants too*, as I have said, the question is after all asked, “Has the seven headed and ten horned wild beast of the sea yet made his appearance, or has the two horned and lamb-like wild beast of the earth, who speaks as a dragon, and exercises all the power of the first, or civil beast in his very presence, come up after him?”—really, Sir, when such questions as these are asked, and when those who hesitate not to give to them an AFFIRMA-

TIVE reply are, by sage men and PROTESTANT divines written against, as though they were “over-credulous and fond interpreters of prophecy, following their own foolish imaginations, by the help of which they have distorted the sober truth of history, and accommodated it to their own pre-conceived *quidlibet ex quolibet* scheme,” I am tempted in reply to ask *them*, “Is there any such thing as sober truth in history? or can it furnish us with any such thing as the verification by its accomplishment of prophecy at all?”

Now, let it be remembered, that if ever the two wild beasts connected with the city of Rome, which are so particularly described in Rev. xiii. have yet made their appearance in the world, their subsequent duration, in a state of dominance, is determined for a period of 1260 “days.” The sequel of the argument then may be contained in a nutshell:—if these days were *natural* days, they must have *long since* expired; and the results to follow their expiration—after which the judgment was to *begin*—must have *long since* been accomplished: but no such results as these—the going to destruction together of the whole fabric of civil and ecclesiastical polity in the Roman Empire—have *long since* been accomplished: on the contrary, this great image though now evidently tottering to its fall is still standing: *therefore* the “days” of the duration of the Gothic kings, and of their contemporary, the Roman Seer, are not natural days, but *may be* years, and, if we may be allowed to argue from the analogy of Scripture language employed

elsewhere, *are so*.—(See Ezek. iv. 5, 6. Rev. ii. 10—ix. 5, 15, and Dan. ix. 24.)

R. D. conceives that he has found a confirmation to his objection against the received opinion, respecting the 1260 days as being to be understood for years, in the Eighth Chapter of Daniel where a similar phraseology is employed respecting another period of time there designated as “2300 days.” But what, if your respected correspondent is here found running into that very error in argument, which he appears elsewhere so studious to avoid, and to caution his brethren, and the public to beware of? What proof can he adduce, that this vision, which was for many days, was to take the date of its commencement from the precise time when Daniel is supposed to have seen it? And yet the whole strength of the *confirmation* to his objection, which he imagines that he has found in this passage, rests upon that assumption, which is perfectly gratuitous. Is the chronology of all other predictions respecting things to come thus to be dated from the time of their revelation?—Why then necessarily of this one?—The vision relates to the sanctuary, its pollution, and its eventual cleansing. Is it not then more reasonable to date its commencement from the commencement of the restoration of that sanctuary in the days of Ezra, which will make it to commence **SYNCHRONICALLY** with another vision of the same Daniel, respecting the same sanctuary; I mean the vision of the seventy weeks, which I suppose that R. D. will allow to have commenced with the seventh

year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, and to have terminated (making an allowance for the error of four years which has crept into the common reckoning of the Christian era) Anno Domini 33.

Upon this supposition then, understanding the 2300 days to mean YEARS, the time for the cleansing of the sanctuary at Jerusalem has not yet arrived—nor will it for sixteen years yet to come, (making the same allowance again for the error of four years in the chronology;) therefore this buttress of the objection of R. D. is insufficient for the purpose for which he adduces it, and makes rather against him than for him.

Let the vision in Daniel viii. be viewed as connected with that “lesser calendar of prophecy,” the seventy weeks, which is furnished in the following chapter (ix.) relating to the same sanctuary at Jerusalem which was restored after the captivity, in the days of Ezra, and was to be desolated and trodden under foot again, when His authority to cleanse it was blasphemously called in question, who, IN THE FOUR HUNDRED AND NINETIETH YEAR FROM THAT PERIOD, entered it with a scourge of small cords in his hand, with which he drove out the buyers and sellers who polluted it: and it will seem to tell us, if we will not be unreasonably sceptical and slow of heart to believe, that, after the expiration of 2300 years from the same memorable period of the restoration of the Jewish establishment under Ezra, (see Ezra. vii.) the fulfilment of the promise to that nation, may be expected, of another, and a

better restoration, when "the Redeemer shall come to Zion, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob,—(Rom. xi. 26.) when He, whose prerogative it is to baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire, shall thoroughly purge his floor, and consume his enemies with the rod of his mouth—and the children, upon whom the curse of their fathers had descended, seeing Him coming with the clouds of heaven, and with all the angels of God as his worshipping attendants, shall say, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord!"—Then, as Daniel says, shall the sanctuary, after its long continued desolation and treading down beneath the horses' hoofs of the robbers of the wilderness, be cleansed—and cleansed, to be polluted no more for ever!

And when we consider the present state of Europe and of Turkey, and observe how the circumstances of the times are, as it were, forcing the Jews to move homewards into their place, which the complete exhaustion of the Ottoman power is leaving vacant for them to re-occupy when their time is fully come; when we see these things coming, and already so far come, to pass, we shall regard the event predicted to take place at the expiration of Daniel's 2300 "days," as, even humanly speaking, one of no improbable occurrence within about a dozen years, or a little more, from the present period. For who almost is so bold as to think that things can continue as they are upon the platform of the Roman territory (which is the *Theatrum Apocalypticum*) much longer; or that the "times of the Gentiles," when

JERUSALEM SHALL BE TRODDEN DOWN NO LONGER;  
are almost ended?

The second ground of objection made by the interpreters, or *non*-interpreters rather of prophecy, of the school of Mr. Maitland, to the idea of the 1260 days being years, is, that "they, and possibly we too are ignorant of the precise period, when that reckoning is to commence," or when this great almanack, (or *half* almanack rather) of prophecy began to serve for a calendar of the times and seasons.

But I will ask, is this a valid or sufficient ground whereon to rest such an objection? May not that event, which possesses the marked character of formally and effectually consigning the saints into the hands of the little horn of the fourth, or Roman wild beast, have really taken place already at its appointed time, *shortly after the ten Gothic horns had sprouted forth from its seventh (or Demi-Cesarean) and last, short lived head:* and yet, we, or some of us, from want of a more particular acquaintance with the history of that period, or from some other cause, may not know, or be able to see it? Is nothing knowable in the history of the part, except what we may happen to know already? And does no real *connexion* subsist between events past, which separately and independently are known and allowed to have occurred, except what certain individuals may see, or choose to admit? Besides, may it not be necessary for the ends for which prophecy came, and does it not harmonize with God's general design in affording but "partial manifestations" to creatures who

are "not worthy to know Him, (See Pascal's thoughts, chap. xviii.) that even after the prediction has been fulfilled, as well as before, there should *sometimes* be such a veil of obscurity spread over the language, or mode of discovery, which the Holy Ghost has seen fit to employ, as shall not only serve to blind the wicked for ever, in this world, from being able to see at all before them, (See Dan. xii. 10.) but shall even hide altogether from the wise, for a certain time, its true meaning, in order to keep them continually watching for a consummation, which, for aught they can yet know to the contrary, may be very near them, and waiting continually at the posts of the heavenly oracle, for wisdom to see farther than any hitherto have done into the deep and hidden things of God, according to the encouraging promise given in the last of Daniel, "Many shall run to and fro, (*διδαχθῶσι*, lxx.) and knowledge shall be increased?" And are not, in fact, all the prophecies relating to the intermediate events that were to happen to the church since the Christian era, and to the signs that should go before the second coming of the Lord and the end of the present world, or age, (*αἰών*) remarkably conveyed in language of obscure, and for a time doubtful meaning of this kind, so as to keep each successive generation of Christians, like the first, (and as even the inspired Apostles themselves seem personally to have been always left) ignorant of the length of the delay that should really (as the event has proved) take place, before the kingdom of reward, both in body and soul, which they were



taught to expect, should be revealed ;—so that they should each and all be still and ever looking up, and praying, ‘Thy Kingdom come,’ as though that rending of the heavens, and revelation of the Lord Jesus coming with all his saints, might *possibly* take place even before their natural life had terminated?—Hence St. Paul, as well as St. John, is moved by the Holy Ghost to speak upon this subject in the language of *enigma*, which time alone would serve more fully to unfold. How soon the letting power, (*το κατεχον*) in those days of violence and of quick revolution, when the Prætorian guards of Rome made and deposed emperors as they pleased, might be “taken out of the way,” so that the throne of the Pagan dragon might be vacated for his “anti-christian vicar” to occupy, who could then, or for some centuries afterwards, tell? And *after the papal millennium began*, and the minds of real Christians began to be disabused of the error into which they had fallen, when “BEATA TRANQUILLITAS” was echoed through the Roman empire on a Constantine coming to the throne in the place of a Dioclesian and a Galerius—when Arianism first, which looked so like the spirit of Antichrist, began to raise its head, and to diffuse its poison, under both episcopal, and imperial countenance—and afterwards the fond worship of images began to restore the pantheon at Rome, under misused christian names, to its old proprietors, the “Gods many, and Lords many” of the Gentiles—and when, keeping pace with these evils, the ungodly strifes of the bishops of the two im-

perial cities about pre-eminence seemed to tell all good men that Gregory the First, like Caiaphas, was a *true* prophet, when he declared that Antichrist was now about to be revealed, and that the prelate who aspired to the title and authority of UNIVERSAL BISHOP was "the man," (2 Sam. xii. 7.)—when time and the lapse of events had thrown so much light upon prophecy as this, who, still, and for some time, (except the Waldenses,) was able to see, that this Antichrist was no other than the bishop of Rome himself, or, with the boldness and energy of a Wickliff in the fourteenth century, and a Martin Luther in the sixteenth, could tell it out, and make it plain to the men of understanding of their times?—And as long as this remained untold, so long it remained necessarily a secret, which no man could know—a secret, the seal upon which was not yet broken so that any man could read it, whether "the 1260 days" meant natural days only, or days of years. But it was not very long after Luther's treatises on the Babylonish captivity, and on Christian liberty, with his prefatory letter to Leo X. had seen the light, nor was it very long after our immortal Hall and Jewell, and a host of other worthies, who are the glory of our country, and were confessed at the synod of Dort to be "*stupor mundi*," had arisen and with one accord proclaimed, *and proved*, (however a man *bred to the law* may now make the attempt to call in question, or to impeach, their powerful testimony,) that the city of Rome that now is, is the foredoomed Babylon of the New Testament,

and that the bishop of that metropolis is the anti-christ—the in pretence *pro*, and in reality *contra* Christ of St. John,—it was not very long after these thrilling Protestant sentiments had been put forth from the burning lips and burning pens of men who were Protestants in power as well as in earnest—whose testimony unto these points, however it may be impugned among us Protestants of a feebler spirit and of a later date, can, I am persuaded, never be, for any time, invalidated, much less subverted—it was, I say, not long after the era of the blessed reformation, which dragged this mystery of iniquity into the light of noon day, and exposed the grovelling worshippers, in those chambers of imagery among the gentiles, to the abhorrence of all who from the fountains of pure truth, now translated into their several tongues, had learned what pure and undefiled religion, in its principles and in its practice, really is—it was, I say, but a very few years (about half a century) after this, when the spirit of God raised up and qualified the illustrious author of the “*Clavis Apocalyptica*,” and of the magnificent prefatory “*Synchronisms*,” to tell his church *at once* THAT THE 1260 DAYS WERE YEARS —“a day for a year, a day for a year,” Ezek. iv. 6.—and THAT THOSE YEARS of lamentation and mourning and woe” WERE NOW ABOUT TO BE ENDED. Thus, I first object to the *principle* of the objection advanced against Mede’s demonstration of the 1260 days being years, which is grounded on the assumption “that the commencement of this long period is still not certainly known;” for even if this were the

case, as for a long time indeed it was, still it might have had its beginning long ago, though we may not certainly yet know it; and it may be necessary for God's purposes of mercy and of judgment, for aught we can tell *a priori* to the contrary, that it should remain, although a fact in itself, an undiscoverable secret to us even still. Yea, and though it may have since become to us as *barely discoverable*, as it is proper that the meaning of *some* of the prophecies, until the end, should be, (for which reason they are given in symbolical language, which must always remain in itself *in some degree* obscure, as well after the event, as before it,) still that discovery is possible, if not likely, to be shrouded in a good deal of difficulty, and may require the exercise of qualities of head and heart, as well as accurate historical and biblical information, which will have the effect of admitting *some* with a firm step to walk through, and with a clear and delighted eye to survey, the length and breath of the whole "valley of vision;" while to *others* the same outward exhibition, unfolded before the eyes of all with an attendant voice as of thunder, saying, "Come and see," may present nothing more orderly or luminous than it did to the mind of the "brilliant Frenchman," when he pronounced the author of the "Principia" to be in a state of dotage, because believing the God of nature to be the God of the Bible also, he had in his advanced years addicted himself to the study of the "Revelation of St. John," and was not ashamed to publish his lucubrations upon that ancient and *inspired* docu-

ment (as poor Sir Isaac took it to be!) also the world!!!

But may I now be permitted to advance one hypothesis against another; and, when I promise some circumstances in history, that look like confirmations of *my* opinion—if they do not indeed amount to an inductive proof of its justness—proceed to question the ground *in fact* of the objection I am combating, as I have already done *in its principle*? I have already said that our ignorance of the precise date of the 1260 “days,” even supposing that it still necessarily continued, would not serve to overturn the idea that years were, or might be, nevertheless intended; or to establish the opposite opinion in favour of natural days. I now proceed, cautiously and modestly, I hope, to question the *fact* itself,—“Are we, or must we necessarily any longer remain, in that ignorance, which is here first assumed, and then employed as a premise whereupon the objector would build his conclusion?”—I decidedly think NOT.

The hypothesis to which I am opposing mine, is, “that Antichrist, or the little horn of Daniel’s fourth beast, or the man of sin of St. Paul, or the two horned beast or false prophet of St. John”—all of which we are, I believe, commonly agreed to consider as different symbolical descriptions of the *same* ENEMY OF CHRIST, whosoever or whatsoever that may be, that should appear in the *latter* times—“that this blasphemer and persecutor is to be understood to be not a moral body, or succession of men, animated by such a spirit as this: but that it is to be understood

of *some individual character* who has not yet made his appearance, who when he comes, *in the very LAST time*, shall almost extinguish the Christian name, and put down, in all the countries of his dominion *orbis terrarum*, the very profession of the true religion, and prevent the assemblies of Christians for worship every where. And that this awful blasphemy and tyranny shall continue in the world just for 1260 *natural days*—or three natural lunar years and six months.” This conjecture, borrowed, I admit, from the ancient fathers of the church, who lived *before* the time when events had at all cleared up that obscurity that hung over the prophecies in question, to which I have already sufficiently adverted, differs but little from that which is still in vogue among those who profess to take those fathers for their guides, in the interpretation of Scripture, to a much greater degree than we Protestants can consent to do:—only, the Roman Catholic expositors of prophecy add to the above hypothesis, (that it may appear more properly in a *Roman* and *Catholic* dress,) that the aforesaid Antichrist will prevent the holy *unbloody* sacrifice for sins to be offered any where, for the said period of three years and an half; nor shall a single mass be said for the benefit either of the living or of the dead during the same period—in short, the whole world shall then be laid under an interdict, affecting even the papal court itself, like unto that which the papal court, in times past—in the days of its meridian splendour—used, as often as it was offended or disobeyed, to inflict upon other

countries—so that none shall be any more, during those *days*, “baptised for the dead; even the baptised bells of churches shall be unhung, and Christians must be buried in the high ways, like dogs: and further, they add, this Antichrist is to be a JEW of the tribe of DAN, who, during his short day, is to do many wonderful things in diverse parts of the earth, which the curious may find detailed at length in such works as that of Signor Pastorini, and those authors from whom he draws his information, as Cornelius a Lapide, &c. &c. to which, therefore, I need not advert more particularly here. But I will only say, that it is evident that all these are pure conjectures, not an atom of which has yet come to pass; therefore, when advanced, as they are, by their respective maintainers, as hypotheses, such they must remain, until we see *at least* the beginning of their accomplishment: and no *proof* can be offered in sustentation of their hypotheses by these conjectural expositors of prophecy, the meanwhile.

It is time that I should now advance my hypothesis: and then proceed to adduce my proofs of its sufficiency to solve the phenomenon of the 1260 DAYS OF YEARS: *οπερ εδει δεῖξαι*.

I will begin by expressing my dissatisfaction with the dates that some, who think with me that the 1260 days are years, have assigned for the commencement of that remarkable period. Among these I would first specify that of Anno Domini 727, which is fixed upon by Joseph Milner, in his History of the Christian church, because that date seems to me

much too late ; the Papal power, which was then so effectively employed in the behalf of idolatrous worship, having necessarily begun to exist, and to be generally acknowledged and submitted to, before it could thus hurtfully be actually exercised in the churches. Neither can I adopt the precise period, when the Pope first became a temporal prince among the sovereigns of the Gothico-Roman Empire, by the conferring upon him of the Exarchate of Ravenna by his allies the kings of the Franks, who so soon after were exalted to the rank and dignity of Demi-Cesars of the West, (or the healed seventh head of the beast,) through his as much interested, as grateful, interference ; because in fact that temporal power, augmented as it was afterwards by the addition of the dukedom of Rome itself and the kingdom of Lombardy to the “patrimony of the church,” never put such resources into the hands of this *spiritual* potentate, as to enable him to prevail by the force of it alone—or even it *at all*—against the saints of the most high, or to exercise his tyranny over them for the appointed period. No ; the power that was wielded for that effect was not of a temporal character ; it was a spiritual power which aimed at, and succeeded in enslaving the whole man, by first enslaving his conscience to the obedience, in spirituals, of a Lord paramount upon earth.

We must, therefore, as others also have clearly seen, seek an *earlier* period than either of these two, for the commencement of the reign of the man of sin—the Jeroboam of the New Testament dispensation,



when the dragon, in his Pagan form, being able to persecute the church no longer, should surrender unto his Antichristian vicar, "his power, and seat, and great authority." The time usually fixed, until lately, for this event, is A. D. 606, or thereabouts, when it is stated, that Phocas, who now reigned in the East, in the room of his master Mauritius, whom he had murdered, conferred the title of universal bishop upon the aspiring successor of the first Gregory. But to this I object, that, even admitting the fact, which I believe is questioned, of there being any certain and authentic record of such a transaction, and even if the original of the instrument, with that tyrant's signature appended to it, could be produced, still it must and would have proved a nugatory title that rested upon no other or more efficient authority than this: for what real power either to make or administer laws for Rome, or for the West, did this Eastern emperor ever possess? Again, if I be right in supposing (which I will here assume) that the fallen star of the fifth trumpet in the Apocalypse, is the now Apostate Roman Episcopate—the Apocalyptic "stars" being, in the first chapter, determined to be "the angels of the churches,"—then, if that star now opens the door of the abyss, and, as from an oracular cave like that at Delphos, spreads the "smoke" of a *cloud of others mediators besides Jesus*, over the heads of the inhabitants of Christendom, so as to obscure the light of the Sun of righteousness from the view of most men then bearing the Christian name; and if during the prevalence of that sore plague of a darkness that

might be felt, the Mohamedan locusts issue forth from their native Arabia, at once to conquer and to *convert* these apostates from their polytheism to the acknowledgement of the *Unitarian's* god,—then these scorpion prophets actually began to ascend out of the same cave of darkness, from whence the demons of Popery had ascended before, in the very year 606, or almost immediately after, as is sufficiently well known. Now this latter plague of the Saracenic horsemen came upon both the East and West as an *αντιμισθια*, or recompense of their error, which they deserved who would not take Jesus Christ **ALONE** for their mediator—the “one mediator between God and men;” and therefore an enemy is sent, for “five months”—or 150 *years*—to torment them, by compelling them, at the point of the sword, to separate themselves from all mediators—the false ones of their own choosing, as well as the true **ONE** of their rejecting—and to say that God is *μονοπροσωπος* as well as *μονοφυσης*—that “*God is ONE, and Mahomet is his prophet.*”

Now if the scourge for this sin, of introducing these *διδασκαλιαι Δαιμονιων* into the Christian church, came in the year 606, or between that and 612, the sin itself, which a God of long suffering would thus severely punish, must have been conceived in the hearts of his professed worshippers, and brought forth in their outward made of worshipping, and in their receiving and submitting to laws promulgated in its favour, and using liturgies absolutely idolatrous, or tending to idolatry, some time

before.\* In other words, if the western Antichrist opened the door for the eastern, and Popery prepared the way for Mohamedan *Unitarianism*, (as men will be always running into opposite extremes,) then Popery must be somewhat, though not very much, older than Islamism—its “doctrines of devils,” older than the Koran: just, as the darkness of the night must already, and for some little time, have set in before the eye is attracted to the brightness of the CRESCENT which is to be seen in the heavens eastward. Here then again, we are compelled to ascend higher than to the year of the Christian era, 606, for the commencement of the great calendar of the times, after which we are inquiring.

Is there then any event upon record, of a public and well known character, antecedent to the commencement of the seventh century, which may with probability be considered as marking the epoch, or era, when the 1260 *years* commenced?

It has been shrewdly, and I think justly observed, by the author of “the Sacred Calendar of Prophecy,” quoting a well known passage in the works of Joseph Mede, in his treatise on the Apostacy of the latter times, chap. xii.—that the above mentioned period is an incomplete one, and forms but the half, or bisection of a perfect week of seven times 360 “days,” or years—which ever it may be. The passage in Mede, to which the learned author of the

---

\* “The use, and even worship of images was firmly established before the end of the sixth century.”—GIBBON.

above modern work alludes, is as follows, "For the account therefore of *times* in Scripture, we must have recourse to that SACRED KALENDAR and GREAT ALMANACK OF PROPHECIE, *the four kingdoms of Daniel* which are a *Prophetical Chronology of times measured by the succession of four principal kingdoms, from the beginning of the captivity of Israel, until the mysterie of God should be finished.* A course of time during which the church and nation of the Jews, together with those, whom by occasion of their unbelief in Christ, God should surrogate in their rooms, was to remain under the bondage of the Gentiles, and oppression of Gentilisme. But these times once finished, all the *kingdoms* of this world should become the *kingdoms of our Lord and his CHRIST.* And to this *great kalendar of times*, together with that other, but *lesser, kalendar of seventy weeks*, all mention of *times* in Scripture, seems to have reference."

Now I am to propose such a period for the commencement of these three years and an half, or latter half-week of prophecy, during the entire septenary of which the church and people of God should be left under the dominion and oppression of "the kings of the Gentiles," (who are compared to beasts, being *beside themselves*, Dan. iv. 16.) as shall serve to solve the prophetic phenomenon, first, of a public act, delivering the true worshippers of God into the hands of THE ANTICHRISTIAN VICAR OF THE DRAGON, to persecute and "overcome them," even until the expiration of that *latter half-week* which has been

specified: and secondly, I am by reckoning backwards to show that the church, or chosen nation of God, (or "the saints,") began then to fall under the dominion and oppression of the **ETHNICAL REIGN OF THE DRAGON**, or "*four* horns of the Gentiles," (Zech. i. 18-19.) when the first half week, according to the proposed chronological application of history to prophecy, commenced; (which if I can do, it will wonderfully check and confirm my hypothesis;) and thirdly, and lastly, if I can also show, that, at the expiration of this whole week of 2520 "days," or years—and of the latter *ἡμίον* or bisection of it, when the latter 1260 "days" or years ended, such an event has actually taken place, as historically serves to mark the ending of the power of the VICAR of the dragon to prevail against, and overcome the servants of Jesus Christ, and to compel all them to receive his mark who will buy and sell in his dominions, any longer,—if I can produce this second check, in confirmation of the designation of the middle period of the great prophetical week above proposed, I think that then all reasonable men, who have applied their minds to these studies, will agree with me, that there is at least a very high degree of probability that my hypothesis may be the true one; if indeed it be not demonstrated to be so.

And here I pretend to little or no originality of opinion, having found the most of what we are inquiring after at present in the exposition of Bishop Newton.—His words are (in a note upon his dissertation on Rev. xiii.) "*The Papal Roman Empire*

*seems to have arisen when Justinian called him the head of all churches; see his Codex, book I. title I. YEAR 533, and this he did not in word only, but by sending bishops to him as ambassadors. Gregory I. at the end of the sixth century, abused this concession, by treating in a very insolent manner the bishops of Spain, France, &c. but was much exceeded herein by his successors in the seventh century. In both these centuries, by the countenance of the Popes, the worshipping of images and the invocation of saints much prevailed. For this very Gregory inserted the name of the blessed Virgin Mary in the litany. Behold then the blasphemies in the eighth century. Gregory II. in the year 727, seized the civil government and dutchy of Rome, having excommunicated and expelled the Greek emperor. In the mean time the orthodox, (that is they who resisted the popes in their pretensions,) were declared out-laws, infamous, aliens, and incapable of appearing as witnesses. The canons of the church were put upon an equal footing with the laws of the empire. *Do not all these things sufficiently show that the beast had arisen who received his great power from the Dragon.*"*

. Now this date, 533, is not liable to any of the objections which I have already showed to be applicable to later ones. It marks not a period when *temporal* sovereignty, over a limited district in Italy, was conferred upon the bishops of Rome, (which here is unimportant;) neither does it mark the period when they began to exercise their *spiritual* authority

in the support of that worst of heresies which is image and demon worship: but it does mark the time when that *spiritual* authority was first given—not from Christ the personator of God, but from Justinian the personator of the dragon—to be afterwards employed, as we know it was, in the cause of false religion foisted into the place of the true, and of religious persecution. And let it not be said that this act of an emperor who reigned both in the East and West, and who was the promulgator of those laws called, from their universal reception, the *PAN-DICTS*, which still are recognized, and made the foundation of the civil and canon law, throughout European Christendom—let it not be said that this act, (the document confirmatory of which still palpably remains) of a Justinian, was in effect as nugatory, as the superfluous iteration of it, (real or supposed) of his successor in the East only, Phocas, in the year 606, was, afterwards. For, as all historians well know, the substantial power and authority of the emperors in Italy, which had been reduced to a mere shadow under the reign of those feeble princes who came after the elder Theodosius, was recovered under this vigorous ruler, for a time longer, by the arms of his victorious generals, Belisarius and Narses. And when the elder Justinian thus had the power, he used it, as the document above adverted to records, in formally and actually surrendering, on the Dragon's behalf, the power and seat and great authority of the latter, into the hands of this “wicked one,” HIS VICAR, who thenceforward appears, in his place at

Rome, usurping the three offices of Christ—the prophetic, the priestly, and the royal; and representing himself as the visible **HEAD OF THE CHURCH**, and centre of unity to the Christian world!

Lastly, this date is sufficiently prior to that of the first, or Saracenic woe, to allow of our considering that woe, as it evidently was, God's sore visitation upon the men, who had not His seal upon their forehead, for a crime which they had previously committed, and of which they were not repenting. That crime was the darkening of the throne of God by the cloud of Demons, whom these apostates acknowledged and worshipped as mediators along with Christ; to punish which sin, God brought these flights of locusts from Arabia that darkened the air, and tormented those men as with the stroke of a scorpion for a period of five months, *or 150 years*, to come, afterwards.

And now I would desire to be informed, if any reasonable or solid objection can be advanced against the epoch I am proposing for the commencement of the latter three days and an half of this great week, measuring out the whole of “the times of the Gentiles,” whereof the “*Vicariatus Draconis Antichristianus*” forms the latter division, or half? If there be, let me hear it. The question is one of naked fact—did a code of laws made, and *universally received* in the Roman Empire, (as its name implies,) in the days of Justinian and ever since, confer a primacy not merely of order but of jurisdiction, in things spiritual, upon the bishops of the ancient



metropolis of the Roman world, or did it not?—If it did, then we have the naked fact in history, in correspondence with the sure word of prophecy, presented to our view, of the “*Regnum Draconis Ethnicum*,” at this critical period of time, merging into, and succeeded by that of a deadlier and more dangerous foe to the church of God still—the “*Vicariatus Draconis Antichristianus*,” after which we have been inquiring.

But I am, in the second place, to show that reckoning backwards from the year 533 of the Christian era, and putting back the commencement of that era four years, as it should be, (for our Lord was born A. M. 4000, instead of 4004) we are brought to the very commencement of that full week of years, whereof each day is a year consisting of 360 days, when “the times of the Gentiles” began to be “fulfilled,” and the Israel, or church of God began to be in bondage to them. Mr. Faber, who sees the propriety of adopting Mr. Mede’s idea respecting this palmary number of years, proposes that they should take their commencement from the birth of Nebuchadnezzar, grounding his position upon the text in Daniel, “Thou art that head of gold.” But what have we here to do with the natural birth or childhood of Nebuchadnezzar? It is not as a man that he was *that head of gold*, but as a king—as then sitting upon the throne of the ancient kings of Assyria, which, whether its capital city, for the time, happened to be Babel, or Nineveh, or Babel (Babylon) again, was one country, and the peo-

ple one, and the empire one—being the first of those which the mighty ones in the earth, or mighty hunters before the Lord, established after the flood. (See Gen. x. 8—12.) And if “thou,” in Dan. ii. 38, must, as Mr. Faber conceives, mean Nebuchadnezzar personally and individually, then another “inferior to thee” must in like manner mean another individual man, and so on. But the Scripture, methinks, settles this point at once, where, in the continuation of the interpretation of his dream to the then “King of kings,” Daniel adds, “And after thee shall arise another KINGDOM (מַלְכוּת מִלְּךְ both *feminine*) inferior to thee, &c.” Now Nebuchadnezzar was not himself a KINGDOM; neither did that other which was inferior to him, succeed to him immediately or individually, but to his grandson Belshazzar. “Thee,” then, in verse 39, means not the individual *monarch* then reigning, but the *Corporation Sole* (as Blackstone expresses it) of the Assyrian or Babylonish MONARCHY. And therefore “thou,” in the preceding verse, must have the same meaning,—“Thou, O Assyrian, or king of Babel the ancient and the great, art that head of gold.” Besides, Mr. Faber, when he took from the father of apocalyptic interpretation his idea of “the sacred calendar of prophecy,” might (I speak it with all due respect and gratitude to a man who has rendered some important services to our blessed Master’s cause) have remarked, and recollected, that that great modern expositor of Daniel’s almanack of times and seasons, proposes to have that considered as the *first* year of this alma-

nack, "when the captivity of *Israel* should begin"—to extend from thence "until the mystery of God should be finished." Now, when did this *captivity of Israel* begin?—or, when was it that their sin, in going after other gods, of the gods of the nations, provoked the Lord their God to begin to bring to pass his terrible sentence against them, which was written before by Moses for their warning, in the xxviii<sup>th</sup> chapter of Deuteronomy—to the 52<sup>d</sup> verse of which I would particularly now refer? Here is a plain question asked, to which a plain and *full* reply is furnished from the inspired history of the kings of Israel and Judah, in 2 Kings, xvii. 1—6. Let us mark the year, when the king of Assyria, having previously captivated its monarch Jeroboam's successor, as is here recorded, went up through the land, and laid siege to the royal city of Samaria; which he took after three years, and then *finally* carried its inhabitants away captive "out of their own land to Assyria unto this day." The year when Samaria was thus *invested* by its all conquering enemy—after which Israel's liberty never since has been recovered—was before Christ, according to the common chronology, 723.\* Now 1260, *minus* 723, is 537.

\* It will not be judged strange that this important chronological epoch—the commencement of the great calendar of the *times of the Gentiles*—should take its date from the *besieging* of Samaria by Shalmanezzer, in the year B. C. 723, rather than in 721, when the city was taken and Israel carried away captive into Assyria, if it be recollected that afterwards, (as we learn from Jeremiah, xxv. 11, 12,) the seventy years

But four years have been lost in the common computation of the Christian era; as has been already observed. Therefore deducting these from *Daniel's almanack*, (which is correct,) in order to make the prophetic and inspired chronology to correspond with the erroneous and common one, we are thus brought down to the exact year of the Christian reckoning, in which the Papacy was, by the Dragon's representative, and by a formal judicial act of his, invested with authority to "change times and laws," and to punish with death all those whom the "Antichristian vicar of the Dragon" might now, in the plenitude of his power and of his insolence, choose *ex cathedra* to denounce as heretics, and, as the anti-typical Balaam, and the Nicolaus of the Apocalypse, (which both are one and the same) to "curse."

Now I cannot think that this coincidence of dates, which I have noted, is accidental: and if it be not accidental, then we have both the beginning and the ending of the first half, or bisection, of this great prophetic period of seven times, clearly, and (to many as well as myself, I hope) satisfactorily, defined.

And now, if we be actually, on the stream of

---

captivity of the two remaining tribes of Judah and Benjamin is to be reckoned, not from the final taking of Jerusalem, and the burning of the house of the Lord, in the eleventh year of Zedekiah; but from the fourth year of Jehoiakim, B. C. 606, when Nebuchadnezzar first *invaded* the land: which was sixteen years before that final catastrophe.

time, carried below the expiration of the *latter* half—and of course of the entire—of this palmary period; and if I can produce, as a further check and confirmation, at the *end* as well as the *beginning* of the whole, unto the date which I have assigned for the *termination* of the first half week of 1260 “days,” and the *commencement* of the latter half week of the same length, some event of modern occurrence, which seems so like the passing away of the power of this “wicked one” into the hands of another *who is to be* HIS executioner, as not to be discerned by plain men, for whose sakes prophecy was written, to be any thing else than the *literal* fulfilment of the text, in Daniel, “They shall take away his dominion, to consume and destroy it (a gradual work) *unto the end*,” and that in St. John, “The ten horns which thou sawest upon the beast, these shall hate the whore, and make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and burn her with fire: for God hath put in their hearts to fulfil his will, and to agree, and give their kingdom unto the beast (which the whore rides) *until the words of God shall be fulfilled* :”—if I can do this, and show that there has come a most marked and momentous period, within the memory of many of us, when these words of God were actually fulfilled, and when, therefore, these kings would consent to be priest-ridden and Pope-ridden no longer :—if I can name a time, when, at the first blast of the trumpet of judgment—the seventh, which is still sounding, and its sound waxing louder and louder in our ears every year—as

upon a signal given, the power of Popery fell prostrate before that of its own *natural* child—the fruit of its *monstrous* teaching, and of its *monstrous* tyranny over the consciences and bodies of men—INFIDELITY:—if this be a result, which wise and good men, who had been studying prophecy, and were watching the signs of the times and the progress of events, surely anticipated, and the reality of which is now forcing itself even upon the most careless and indifferent observers:—if we are now actually living, not in an age of abject superstition, which has past away for ever, but in an age of profane and scoffing infidelity, and if the latter 1260 “days,” from A. D. 533, actually expired on that very year when this “noisome and grievous sore” broke out, like the blains of Egypt, “upon the men which had the mark of the beast, and them which worshipped his image,” (the Papacy,) and soon after, under the succeeding vials of judgment, began to *run blood*:—if these things be so, may I not triumphantly demand, have I not produced the *second* check, in *double confirmation* of my theory respecting the 1260 days, *as not being days, but years*; and what sober or just reason is there, why I may not, with humble and adoring confidence exclaim, “*ευρηκα*”?

And I hope it will not be deemed dogmatism, which I deprecate in such matters, if I venture to assert that the French revolution, in 1793, furnishes us with the last epoch after which we are at present enquiring, which measures precisely, *onwards*, 1260 YEARS from the arising of the Roman *Papal* empire

in 533, (according to Bishop Newton ;) just as, from that same middle period *upwards*, as has been already made to appear from Scripture history, the same number of 1260 YEARS is to be reckoned again, reaching unto the very year, when the children of Israel and Judah, and the Gentiles whom, because of their unbelief, God would afterwards for a season surrogate in their room, began to fall, from the happy THEOCRATIC state in which they had before been placed, into the power of the worst of the heathen—the lions, bears, leopards, and non-descript monsters of the deep and of the dry land, in this evil world, whose inhabitants, and their rulers, are ever growing “worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived;”—under whose stern and oppressing dominion, until this great calendar, of the “times of the Gentiles” shall be expired, the people of God must remain at school, as it were, that they may learn how “the waters of Siloah that flow gently, are to be preferred before any Rezin,” or “son of Remaliah, whom they, in their desire “to be as the heathen,” should choose unto themselves for a head, (1 Sam. viii. 5, 9, and Isaiah viii. 6.)—that they may prove the difference between His service, whose they are, and that of the Lords of the countries in which they are sojourning, from thenceforward and for ever.—See 2 Chron. xii. 8.)

And in proof of my last point, it will surely not be necessary to add much to this article, already too long:—It might be almost enough to ask, who, that has either eyes or ears, can doubt it? Behold then

the man, who made Europe ONCE to tremble at his power, shortly after this great revolution in human affairs, when the seventh and last trumpet began its sevenfold blast, conducted out of his dominions, and across the Alps, under the arrest of *a corporal's guard* of French dragoons, to the place that was chosen by the Atheist despot, for his long confinement. Behold him again submitting to the humiliation of recognising the right to empire of his military oppressor: and, for his interest's sake, and at his *master's* bidding, (who once himself had *emperors* for his *equerries*) cancelling a marriage, good according to the laws of God, and joining the unlawfully divorced husband to another wife. But why need I go to any distance from home, for proof that this "Lucifer son of the morning" is indeed "fallen from heaven," and that he is "cut down already to the ground who did weaken the nations?" (Isaiah xiv. 12.) Do not we see it here at home? do not our very peasantry know it, and in their unceremonious treatment of their own clergy give us a plain and palpable proof that it is so? Who now, even among them, regards a priest's curse? or what influence have the Papal clergy remaining, for good or for evil, among them, except by throwing themselves into the rising tide of *infidel republicanism*—which they cannot, even if they now would, counteract or keep down—and by leaguering themselves, for political purposes, with the creatures, whom their absurd teaching, or no teaching at all, in times past, and their keeping the light of truth, that others would show them, wholly from



them, has brought into their present appalling moral condition, who, in the recklessness and cruelty of their conduct, are making it so manifest, that they are a people who neither fear God nor regard man? And as to the better sort of Roman Catholics, though they may, for political or other purposes, for a while pretend to show some *public* respect for the character and functions of "their clergy," or even on occasions, in their speeches or letters, laud them to the skies, still, it is well known, that in private they pay them little or no regard:—the parties are too well mutually acquainted already, to respect each other, except from the teeth outwards; and by the profane levity with which they treat all those subjects, which it was his business, as a priest of the holy Catholic (*Roman*) church, to teach them to hold as sacred, they tell Father \* \* \* but too plainly, that "the times are changed, and they also are changed in them,"\* and they are now, in fact, as it regards *obsolete opinions of*

---

\* *Tempora mutantur, et nos mutamur in illis.*—It is a striking fact, that at the present moment, the two most effective supporters of the Pope, as a temporal sovereign, against the attacks of his *insurgent* Italian subjects, are the cabinets of infidel France, and protestant (*qu?*) England!!! Provided that he and his College of Cardinals consent to accept of the mediation of these two powers, and to take their joint *liberal* advice, he may remain (the shadow of his former self in the days of a Hildebrand) wielding the two swords, and wearing the triple crown, for a little longer! "How are the mighty fallen, and the weapons of war perished!"

*this sort*, more the disciples of Voltaire, or of the Edinburgh Review, than of his; and however they may endure for a while longer, for example's sake, to go to Mass, or even to confession, he must not presume to be the instructor of those consciences which he is still permitted *generously* to absolve; and that to thwart them in any of their pleasures, or favourite pursuits, is a piece of priestly impertinence which will not be borne, and as he loves himself he had better abstain from it.

Oh! Babylon the Great is spiritually fallen already: her merchants know it full well; and that the hour is come, when, "no man buyeth their merchandize any more." And the short-lived influence, which these unhappy and abandoned men still possess in some countries only, and over a small part only of their former slaves there, is wholly owing to extrinsic circumstances, which cannot be of much longer continuance. "*The schoolmaster is abroad*;" as is also the Atheistical reformer, to receive and perfect the disciples of the schoolmaster, as soon as they are ready for such an advancement. When that day (which is not far off) arrives, the priest will no more be wanted: and if he be suspended merely *from* his function, and not *to* the lamp-post, or to the next tree, he may deem himself a fortunate person.

I say then, that the 1260 latter "days" are years, and not days; as the event has proved: and that they have been preceded by 1260 years, equally clearly defined, which went before, beginning in the year B.C. 723; and that the whole round number of

$7 \times 360 = 2 \times 1260 = 2520$ : which again, *minus* by four years, is bisected, A. D. 533, and terminates with the breaking out of the French revolution, A. D. 1793.

I wish to know, what can be advanced against these things, so as to constitute a valid, or even plausible ground of objection to the above scheme of interpretation being admitted. As I would not knowingly or willingly entertain any opinion upon any subject—and especially such a subject as this—which was untenable, I hope that my friends and respected brethren, from whom I have differed, will correct me, if they really are able to do so. Are they, or are they not, substantial and well known FACTS, which I have adduced?—and, are they, or are they not, sufficient to solve all the phenomena of the visions which we have been considering?

I must defer for another number, (having exceeded so much my intended bounds in this) what I proposed to lay before my differing brethren and the public, upon the *inconveniencies* attendant on *their* scheme of *shortening* the prophetic calendar, and making it to be of no use for learning the times and seasons as yet—or, until bye and bye. I shall also reserve until the same opportunity, if you will again favour me upon this subject with a place in your pages, some observations which I wish to make, and which I deem solid and satisfactory, in reply to the objection of R. D. and some others, upon the score of the ten kingdoms not being always reckoned up exactly alike, and not continuing always from their

commencement, to be distinguished by the same precise names, and defined according to the same precise geographical boundaries. And I hope to show, that this, which seems to be made the very head and front of their objection to the system of interpretation of these chronological prophecies, in which the great bulk of Protestant commentators, and writers upon the subject, have for so long a time, in the main, acquiesced, is in reality wholly unsubstantial, and what no person who is skilled in the mode of using numbers, round and fractional, by the inspired writers, needs at all to be stumbled at. In the mean time

I remain, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

D.

*To the Editor of The Christian Examiner.*

SIR,



Having already offered for insertion in the pages of your Magazine, my observations, in reply to the objections of R. D. and a few others, to the taking the 1260 days of Daniel and St. John for any thing more than so many *natural* days—all of which, according to these gentlemen, are to be considered as *yet future*: and having shown, as I humbly trust, that those objections rest upon no

sufficient foundation ; but that, on the contrary, there is every solid ground, which reason in such things can, or ought to require, and may fully acquiesce in, for our continuing to hold, with the illustrious author of the Apocalyptic synchronisms and clavis, that the days in question are YEARS, during the course of which, as history has proved, the Gentiles have been stabling in the outer court of the temple, or visible church of God,—the witnesses, or witnessing churches in these apostatical times, have been prophesying in deep mourning,—the woman, or true spouse of Christ, has been hiding in the wilderness,—and the beast having ten horns upon his seventh head, or the secular Roman empire broken up, under its seventh or Demi-Cesarean form of government, into *ten* Gothico-Roman kingdoms, has, as directed by the woman's great rival and enemy, the harlot of Babylon *drunken with blood*, been persecuting the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ ;"—all which events in history do, '*singula singulis*,' synchronize :—having shown, in this striking coincidence of history with prophecy in so many particular points of view, the weakness of the ground whereon R. D. rests his objections to *our whole scheme of interpretation* of the prophecies of Daniel and of the Apocalypse, I am now, in the next place, to fulfil my pledge, (which I feel to be almost a work of supererogation,) by pointing out the several *inconveniencies* which would result, in the face of this body of evidence, from the adoption of the purely hypotheti-

cal or conjectural scheme of interpretation, which R. D. and Mr. Maitland, *in company with the whole host of Romish Divines*, would propose gratuitously to substitute in its room.

I. The *first* of these inconveniencies is, that the very inchoation of the fulfilment of a main part of the Revelation of things "*shortly* to come to pass," which God gave unto Jesus Christ "to show unto his servants," is, *at this late period of the Christian era*, suspended upon an uncertain and most improbable conjecture, which the proposers themselves must acknowledge, *may never be realized*. The fourth kingdom upon earth, then, must either not yet have appeared—or come up out of the tumultuating abyss, at all; or else if it has—contrary to the testimony of history and all present appearances, it must still be one and an unbroken whole!—there never has been a Demi-Cesar of the west, or a line of *Augustuli*, instead of an Augustus reigning over "the whole world!" (Luke ii. 1.) neither has any such calamity as yet even befallen the Western Emperor, as to have those horns planted on his brow, which bespeak the imbecility of his government, and the consequent contempt of his authority, which it is said in some *romances*, (not histories) has been manifested by those *galant* kings of the Gothic tribes, each of whom (beginning, as it was fit, with the *French* Charles—"the eldest son of the church,") the Roman Lady has taken, at one time or another, into her especial favour, and honoured with some peculiar title of dignity, as a mark of her high regard, who

has been raised up by God, *or else by the Devil*, to bestow kingdoms and empires, as well as all ecclesiastical honours and emoluments, even upon whomsoever she will!!! These things, I say, are all but dreams and fancies, or else are to be overlooked as mere trifles not worthy of being taken any manner of notice of by the historian; and maugre the late signal discomfiture of the scheme, which the ambition of an upstart individual had conceived, and his military abilities and prowess had attempted to bring to pass, of re-uniting in his own person that kingdom of "iron and clay," which God's word had destined never again to coalesce into one, but in that very divided condition to be broken to pieces and utterly destroyed—in spite of all these things, both *events* and *predictions*, the world is yet again to see an Augustus—a mortal man—sitting upon the throne "*orbis terrarum*," and "sustaining so many and so great concerns, ALONE!!! Now, how so great an *inconvenience* as this can be sustained by men of observation and learning, acquainted with history, and, above all, acquainted with, and reverencing their Bibles, I am certainly at a loss to conceive. Is it probable, I ask them, that the very *inchoation* almost of so many of the things, which must *shortly* come to pass, has been deferred for so long as eighteen centuries, and is still to be looked for among the events in the womb of time?—the Antichrist not yet come, and the man of sin not yet revealed! R. D. and those of the sceptico-prophetical school, may think me, in the good company in which I find myself, *over-credulous* in ap-

plying past events to these predictions, as their *exact* fulfilment: but I confess myself wanting in the degree of HYPER-CREDULITY that I find to be necessary, if I would discard my scheme, and undertake the advocacy of their's as a substitute for it. But I pass to

II.—The *second* inconvenience, that attaches to the conjectural scheme of prophetical interpretation to which my respected brethren, whom *in this instance* I feel it my duty to oppose, have become inclined:—and it is this, that there is then no prophetical notice whatever of the long night of the middle ages—during which, as “men slept,” so, I suppose, the spirit of the prophets went to sleep also, until of late, when the signs of the “*last of the days*,” or of the *συντελεια του αιωνος*, awakened it to give to the church (which needed neither warnings nor consolations during the years that are past!) some note of preparation, respecting events that are *now* coming, after that a “silence in heaven” of *more than* “half an hour” has been broken!

But is this probable, I ask, that all the marked events that are past respecting the papacy—its tyranny over the saints, and the manner in which that tyranny was *tolerated*—and more than tolerated—*supported* and *enforced*—by the bewitched nations of modern Europe, and their kings, for so many ages,—and that such an event as the reformation from popery in the sixteenth century, and the tragedies that followed, in which the Papacy and the Papal sovereigns of Europe, as instigated by the demon of idolatry and



persecution, were the chief actors,—is it probable, I say, that all these momentous events, in which so many of our ancestors and predecessors who were true Christians, were called to the task of doing, and the glory of suffering, so nobly,—that all these prominent events upon the page of real faithful history have no parallels whatever existing upon the page of *anticipated history*, that must be realized—which is “the sure word of prophecy,” but are passed over as a blank, devoid of any interest which would render them worthy of being foretold:—and that all, or almost all, that the prophetic spirit has judged it necessary to record beforehand, concerning things to come, is to be crowded up into the very contracted space of twelve hundred and sixty *natural* days, or three years and an half, yet to come; is this, I again ask, in any degree probable? or, is it even credible? I confess that to me it is not:—it is not, because I believe that our ancestors, who lived in the days when “the whole world wondered after the beast,” and “worshipped him and his image” to which the juggling craft of the Roman See gave life, needed directions how to conduct themselves, that they might not be “defiled with women,” when “mystical iniquity covered over with the name of piety” was the almost universally prevailing order of the day, fully as much as we do now, or yet shall, in the days that are before us: and I cannot bring myself to believe that then, when Jezebel wrote letters in Ahab’s name and sealed them with his seal, commanding Naboth who was of *Jezreel* (the seed of God) to be stoned,

that then—or for those typical *three years and an half of dearth*—there was no “*writing from Elijah*,” (2nd Chron. xxi. 12.) to comfort the poor widowed spouse of Christ, and the elect remnant of her seed who were still reserved in the land, or to bring down the plagues of God upon the heads of the relentless persecutors.—I cannot receive the *hypothesis* of R. D. because I cannot believe that the true church of God was *then* left destitute of “a light shining in a dark,” or squalid, “place,” (the foul chambers of imagery, or *αυχηροφοι τοποι*, of the Papacy) *when* she as much as ever—or perhaps most of all—needed the prophetic lanthorn, to show her the narrow and rugged road, marked at every step with the cross, in which she was to walk—that she might still “after that way *which they call heresy*” be found worshipping the God of her fathers, “believing all things which are written in the law *and in the prophets*,” and “following the Lamb whithersoever he goeth;”—that so she might escape the apostatical mark which was borne by all, in those times, “whose names were not written in the slain Lamb’s book of life from the foundation of the world.” Again, I cannot adopt the hypothesis of these *conjectural* interpreters of the great almanack of prophecy, because I find, along with John Wickliff, and John Huss, and the Waldenses, and *St. Bernard*, and Luther, and the whole host of German, and Swiss, and Scotch, and British reformers—and the immediate followers of the reformers, the Protestant apologists and controversial writers of that and the succeeding century—that,

without “wresting” either Scripture to make it correspond with history, or history to make it correspond with Scripture, I have in the events which are recorded in BOTH—so that he that runs may read—such a correspondence, or parallel, presented to my view, that I must either be *credulous* enough to believe that much—very much, of what has been foretold, has been also accomplished already; or else I must be HYPER-CREDULOUS to disbelieve, at once, the divine pre-monition of coming events, *and* the faithful testimony of experience, that they have so come, accordingly. But I hasten to

III. The *third* inconvenience, inseparable from the *hypothetical* hypothesis of R. D. which is, that if these prophecies have not already been fulfilled *in part*, they cannot now ever be fulfilled AT ALL! For let us consider what we, in that case, have. The fourth great empire not yet revealed! and yet the third (as I suppose will be granted,) has fallen. And was there to be any such *hiatus* between the times of the third and the fourth? or, was the fourth, itself, to swallow up the third, as the third did the second, and that again the first? And if the fourth empire has “come up,” (as can scarce, I think, be by any denied,) and if it be also divided into *a number* of independent kingdoms—whether ten or no, no matter at present, (as can, I think, be as hardly denied,) then—if the little horn after them or *behind* them, (אחריהם) has not made its appearance even yet, notwithstanding the lapse of more than twelve centuries since, when, I would wish to be informed, are we to look

for the rise of that eleventh horn: or how can it hold the saints under its tyranny for a period *synchronical*, both as it regards its beginning and its ending, with the reign of these kings? These are questions which R. D. and those who with him (unintentionally, I am convinced) have shaken the faith of some of their weaker brethren upon the subject of prophecy of late, have need—and ought, if they are able—to answer.

They say, that the 1260 days must be understood to mean so many natural days, and no more.—Then I would observe, if the marked events, which were forthwith to follow when those *days* should be expired, (viz. the destruction of the papacy itself, and of all the nations and kingdoms that have agreed to support, or to tolerate, that hideous imposture,) have not already, and long since, *commenced* their RAPID course, (for “the third woe cometh quickly” after the second, which is, the fall of Constantinople and of the whole Eastern empire into the hands of the Turks,) then, I say—upon the supposition of the 1260 days being only days—and the fact of the partition of the Roman empire among the gothic kings of the middle ages not being to be disputed against—it follows, that the prophecy, concerning judgment to sit upon this forestaller of the kingdom of Christ, when his dominion should be taken away “to consume and destroy it unto the end,” if not already fulfilled, can now, *in the manner foretold*, never be fulfilled at all! Now the power of the Popes, so far from its beginning to be “consumed and destroyed” after the expiration of 1260 *days*

from its commencement—place that as low down as has ever been proposed—did not arrive at its zenith, until about the middle period of a whole *chiliad* of years (for Anti-Christ must have his parody too upon the promised Millennium) afterwards : that is, about the time of Hildebrand, A. D 1073. Is not this an inconvenience then, that the man of sin, the son of perdition, has actually (with or without the leave of R. D.) been revealed in his time : and lo ! 1260 *days* expire after THAT *apocalypse*, and then that wicked one, instead of being consumed by the breath of Jehovah's mouth, as was foretold, and destroyed by the brightness of the coming of one like unto the Son of Man, only waxes stronger and stronger still, until no man may either buy or sell, who has not his "Catholic" brand impressed upon his forehead—or at least upon his hand, and has not learnt the catechism which teaches how to spell, as the watchword among "Catholics," the number of his renegade name ! With me this is a very serious inconvenience indeed : as I am sure it will be with many others. But I pass on to

IV.—The *fourth* inconvenience that strikes me ; which is, that hereby the testimony of all the Protestant reformers of the sixteenth century, and of all the precursors of the reformation from Wickliffe, or rather from Claudius of Turin, downwards, against the papacy as ANTICHRISTIAN—yea, as being the very predicted ANTICHRIST, is to a certain degree invalidated, if not destroyed. Admitted that a discovery closely connected with that of the Antichrist

tian character of the papacy, viz. that its duration, *in a state of dominance*, after it was revealed, should be for the space of forty and two *prophetical* months, was not made by them, but was reserved for subsequent times: still, that discovery having been since made—that those *months* measure out the length of the night of Antichrist's evil ascendancy over the house of God, we must now therefore, plainly, either maintain the “months” in question to be mystical months of years, corresponding to the type of the three years and six months of famine in Israel in the days of Elijah, or else admit, that our Luthers and Knoxes and Calvins and Cranmers and Jewells and other *Apologists* for our reformed churches were all mistaken, when they called the see of Rome, as by its true name, the VICARIATE OF SATAN, where ANTICHRIST had fixed his cathedral seat on high, “sitting in the temple of God, and showing himself as God.” Now, I ask, is not this an inconvenience? Far from us be it, after refusing to acknowledge any of the “Catholic” fathers of the Church to be infallible, to think of setting up the doctors of our own, or of any other particular reformed church, as invested with that prerogative of Him, who alone can never err! But though any man, or church, under heaven may err from the truth, or be deceived, still it is to be maintained, that fallible men are sometimes right, and may certainly themselves know—and others, concerning them, may know too—that they are so.—I may commit an error in accounts, and therefore it is fit, that in presenting a statement of

them, or in auditing them, I should add, before I sign my name, the usual letters E. E. or the words at full length, "errors excepted." Still I am certain, and may with perfectly MODEST assurance maintain it against all gainsayers, that TWO AND TWO MAKE FOUR. So, I think that the FATHERS of our English, and the other reformed churches, though in themselves weak and fallible men, and all of them, more or less erring in some things, were nevertheless right here:—and so far I think it highly inconvenient that their valuable testimony should be hastily invalidated, or, through our want of profound theological information in comparison with them, surrendered to every, or to any, forward modern assailant, who chooses to carp at what he has not made it his study, first, thoroughly to understand and digest.

It cannot be unknown to R. D. or to those others of our evangelical brethren who seem inclined to adopt his unsettled and doubtful opinions upon the subject of prophecy, (as they themselves must all acknowledge them to be,) that there is in the present day a strong disposition manifesting itself in more than a few—and those by no means *all* of the more ignorant or ill conditioned sort of Protestants, (especially in England) to leave their parish churches, and become reconciled once more to the see of Rome. To enter fully here into the causes of this retrograde movement, which in some places has been made to an extent, which would not have been believed to be within the range of possible occurrences a few years ago, would be foreign to our present object,

and would draw out this article, already sufficiently extended, to an inconvenient and inadmissible length.

But it is evident, that, since such is the FACT—and R. D. who has been in the North of England, and elsewhere, in districts where Jesuits are neither wanting, nor inactive, well knows it—any sentiments, of however little real weight they may be in themselves, which the Devil can entrap good men, and men of name among Protestants, unwarily and unwittingly to advance, tending directly to impeach the testimony of the fathers of the reformation against the Papacy, and to lead the *sciolists* in divinity of the present day to regard those venerable men as *mistaken* in much of what they wrote, or said, concerning the grounds upon which they broke off all connexion—not merely of dependance, but of communion—with the apostate and antichristian see of Rome:—it is evident, I say, that such unguarded or improper admissions will be eagerly caught up, and made the most of, by those crafty seducers who lie in wait to deceive; and the faith perhaps of many, whom otherwise the *sufficiently* discernible accordance of events with their apocalyptic counterparts might have proved the means of “stablishing strengthening settling,” will be for a time distressingly shaken, or even finally subverted. I know that R. D. would tremble at being the means of causing a “weak brother for whom Christ died” to perish, by receiving in these evil times, when false Christs and false prophets abound, the apostatical mark of the beast, or the beast’s image, in his forehead, or in his hand. But I put it to his con-



science, and to the conscience of all those who, respecting the 1260 days, think with him—is not an opinion put forth by so respectable, and pious, and useful a man as himself, which tends to disparage and supersede such works as “Jewell’s Apology” and “The Defence of the Apology,” (which in the good olden times of the reformation used to be provided at the expense of each parish, and deposited upon a desk in the Vestry, for all freely to consult, who were minded to strengthen themselves in their Protestantism, or to deal with Popish recusants in order to their recovery out of the snare of the devil,) and to induce us, who live in a smother and more polished and *liberal* age, to think that we must read the works of those Giants of the sixteenth century *cum grano salis*,—whose thunders against the Vatican were too impetuous, too vehement, and, *now that we have cooled*, requiring on our part a *liberal* acknowledgment to the “Catholics,” that they went sometimes too far!—is not such an opinion put forth by such men, an INCONVENIENCE? If it be really necessary that Protestants should take these humiliating steps backward, and confess to their “brethren of the Catholic persuasion,” that the *anticatholic* zeal of a Luther, and a Melancthon, and a Calvin, and a Cranmer, and a Knox—and their immediate followers, a Chemnitius, and a Beza, and a Jewell, and a Hall—as well as that of their forerunners, a Wickliffe, or a Cobham, had led them into some errors and extravagancies, which we now are become sensible of, and anxious before the world to confess—then, I

say, let it be done—FIAT JUSTITIA: but if, on the contrary, any such concessions on our part are really uncalled for and inadmissible, (as we should see if, like the men of those days, we had been more at our studies) then, I entreat R. D. and his companions in prophetic speculations, to consider, whether their putting forth of their rash opinions in periodicals, or otherwise, as they are doing, be not calculated to bewilder the public mind, and still more unsettle the faith of some, who (like a correspondent in your July number) will be asking, “since R. D. has demolished this mass of evidence from prophecy (as we supposed it to be) in favour of Protestantism, what have we still remaining in the Scriptures to cling to, or build upon?”

I cannot avoid here expressing my surprise and grief, that such a man as Mr. Faber (whose learning is on all hands admitted) should have questioned the propriety of applying to the Papacy the appellation of Antichrist.\* His reason is, “Because Popery has never

---

\* Let a simple appeal to scripture at once, and for ever, decide the question concerning *who* THE ANTICHRIST is? and *where* he is to be sought for? and *when*? The word is used only four times in the New Testament: viz. three times in the first Epistle of St. John, and once in the second. Where it occurs first, viz. in 1st Epistle, ii. 18. we find St. John stating, that as the church had heard that “the Antichrist is coming,” (ο ἀντίχριστος ἐρχεται) so, even then many Antichrists had made their appearance, or, as Beza translates it, had begun to be; (γεγονασιν) from whence the inspired Evangelist deduces the conclusion, that it was the last time,

*formally, or openly, denied the Father and the Son.*  
It has been always orthodox, in profession, respecting

---

(ἐσχάτη ὥρα.) And he further says, chap. iv. 3. That every spirit that confesseth not Jesus Christ *who is come in the flesh*, (i. e. which does not truly call him Lord, 1 Cor. xii. 3, and render to him true homage) is not of God; but is of the false prophet, and of the world:—that is, it was that very spirit of Antichrist, whereof they had heard, and which even then was in the world.

Now it is plain, that this spirit, which accommodates itself to the world, and is of it, and is therefore received and followed by it,—and which appears to be *identical* with the ‘false Prophet’ of the Apocalypse afterwards, began to be, or *was born* in the primitive times, and existed in many who would have occupied its chair even then, if it were permitted them. And if I be asked to name one of these, *in whom the soul of the future papacy seemed to be formed already*, the third Epistle of St. John supplies me with it in a “Diotrephes,” who “loved to have the preeminence”—who received heretics and promoted them in the church, and “cast out” the faithful brethren, and forbid his dupes to hold any communion with them: and who received not the Divine and Apostolical WRITTEN traditions, but prated against the INSPIRED messengers of God with malicious words. This is an ANTICHRIST, according to St. John. But is he a heathen? Is he a *professed* unbeliever, or open infidel and scoffer, such as those who should come, not in the *latter*, but in the LAST days of the last times.—Is he found within the pale of the visible church, out of it? or, is he an ecclesiastic or no?

It is plain that he is in profession a Christian, and a Christian teacher also: and it is also plain, that his “coming was soon to be expected after the primitive age. Now every body that knows church history is aware, that the spirit of

the Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, and the atonement."

But is it ascertained to be necessary, that the Anti-

infidelity—that "noisome and grievous sore" which, as the leprosy plague, has broken out in the forehead of the men who worshipped the beast and his image, *in this last age*, did not appear at all in the primitive times. On the contrary, the spirit of superstition and demon-worship, or fornication from Christ the only mediator, covered over with the fictitious holiness of monasticism and austerity, was the form under which apostasy made its appearance at first. And this spirit denied not indeed the fact that Jesus Christ had come in the flesh; neither is this charged upon it by St. John, when his words are rightly understood; but it denied Him *who had come in the flesh*, by advancing "the mystery of iniquity" in opposition to the "great mystery of godliness," which proclaimed that God who "had been manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, and believed on in the world," was ALONE "received up into glory." In opposition to which, this διδασκαλία Δαιμονιων, whereof Antichrist became the patron, asserted that the Christian martyrs and confessors were received up, from under the altar," into glory too; and they together with Christ were mediators, if not of redemption, at least of imprecation or intercession.

That the Antichrist, who is of the world, and whom the world therefore heareth, should at the last, when his interest so required it, become a "liberal," or an open denier of Him who is come in the flesh, is indeed not denied: but he is "the Antichrist" before this; even from the time when to serve his interest, (to which he is always supremely devoted,) he gave his countenance to the worship of images, and the

christ (ο ἀντιχριστος) should do this? or rather, is it not evident that he should be in profession a Christian, in order that he might be a false Christ and false prophet? Or does a wise man need to be told, that when "hypocrisy" is, added to "lying" the lie is only the deadlier? or has he never read, that

"An open foe may prove a curse;

"But a pretended friend is worse."

Or needs a man, much less skilled in the Greek language than Mr. Faber, to be reminded that the preposition *anti* (αντι) has a double signification—a good, and a bad one?—To me this circumstance

"service of the dead:" as Epiphanius testifies, *εσονται γαρ νεκροis λατρευοντες, ως και εν τω Ισραηλ εσεβασθησαν.*

Dr. Doddridge's note on 1 John iv. 3, is worthy of being considered by those who, following Mr. Faber and other moderns, have questioned the Antichristian character of the papacy. On "*this is the spirit of Antichrist*," that sensible and judicious critic observes,—“From hence some have argued that the Pope cannot be Antichrist, because he confesses Christ; and that it must necessarily be some entirely opposing person or sect, and which does not bear the Christian name: but the interpretation above (of *εν σαρκι εληλυθοτα*), obviates this objection; for it is certain, popery is an usurpation entirely inconsistent with a due homage to Christ, and founded upon principles most opposite to those of his government and religion. It is said to have been already in the world; as the ambitious, imposing, persecuting Spirit, which is the very essence of Antichristianism, did then greatly prevail,

makes ANTICHRIST the fittest name which any language, ancient or modern, could supply for the See and Court of Rome. There sits a man, in the temple of God, the pretended Vicar of Christ—his deputy, or *ανθυπατος*, as the Greeks called it; who was, and is, in reality, his worst foe; as Jeroboam, by his pretended zeal of God, (the type of this “wicked one”) only made Israel to sin the more exceedingly.—Whether of two false witnesses does the more mischief in court—he who speaks nothing but falsehood, plainly and without varnish; or he who tells the truth in part, and prevaricates like the Arians, or, like Judas Iscariot, (another type of this “Son of perdition”) comes as a friend, and as belonging to the college of the twelve Apostles, and betrays the Son of Man with a kiss? And if we view Christ as the husband and head of his spouse the church, who then is his great opponent if not the man, who in his absence from home would take his place, and be called his VICAR? What is this deputy of the bridegroom but an adulterer; and what is this wife but an adulteress; upon both of whom, when the bridegroom comes, the judgment written must, therefore, be executed in flaming fire? (Compare 2d Thess. 1. 8.) I cannot refrain, therefore, here from saying, that I am ashamed of the puerility which is at the foundation of the cavil raised by Mr. Faber\*

---

\* To “deny that Jesus is Christ,” is to deny Him in any, or all, of the offices into which He has been ANOINTED. And

against the honest and TRUE witness of our forefathers to the ANTICHRISTIAN character of the Papacy: in short, against their belief, and declaration, that THE POPE IS ANTICHRIST.

---

again, thus to deny his unction, is to deny the Father that anointed him. Now the Roman Episcopate thus eminently “denies that Jesus is Christ,” and “denies” therefore both “the Father and the Son,” First, in asserting its own infallibility, and maintaining its own decrees and traditions as of equal authority with that Word which the great Prophet of his church hath spoken; Secondly, in advancing its pretended high priestly character and function in opposition to the eternal and *untransferable* high priesthood of Jesus Christ—“an high priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec;” and Thirdly, by assuming to itself that character of sovereignty, which belongs unto Him only and alone, who is “King of kings, and Lord of lords”—God’s king, upon his holy hill of Zion. The spirit of the papacy then, or of the ARCH-HERETICAL See of Rome, is eminently a spirit *qui solvit Jesum*, (see 1 John iv. 3, in Vulgate,) and thus, by their own confession who have so translated *ο μη ομολογει τον Ιησουν Χριστον εν σαρκι εληλυθота, is το του αντιχριστου*, or that spirit of Antichrist that should come.

And yet, Mr. Faber, while he admits that “every one who entertains heretical opinions respecting the nature of the Messiah,” (or the *anointed* Jesus,) “is an individual Antichrist,” (see his Sacred Calendar, vol. i. page 124,) asks with an air of triumph, in a preceding paragraph, (page 118,) “can the most lynx-eyed anti-papist *here*” (in the description by St. John of “THE SPIRIT OF THE ANTICHRIST”—or of “*that speculative principle, by which the Father and the Son are denied*,”) “discover the portrait of

I come now, in the last place, to examine the solidity of the objection which 'R. D. and a few others, following Mr. Maitland, have made, against those

---

the Roman Pontiff?" I answer, yes.—Whether I be lynx-eyed or no, I cannot conceive a more striking resemblance to the Roman Pontiff than what this *portrait*, drawn by the Spirit itself which spake so expressly concerning the apostasy of the latter times, exhibits. I say, when the beloved disciple, as the pencil in the hands of this painter of things as they are and "for eternity," would thus in a few strokes supply the church with a likeness *before-hand* of the Antichrist, (*or dissolver of Jesus—who denies Him as Christ*) that she might know, and fly from him into "her place in the wilderness" as soon as "he should be revealed in his time," it is utterly impossible to conceive a picture more exactly faithful, or more happily fitted, if it were attended to (as it was by the Albigenses and Waldenses) to produce its intended effect, of tearing the mask from the face of an arch-hypocrite, and exposing to the flock of Christ the WOLF, who had got in among them, in sheep's clothing, than this was.

It seems to me as *unscriptural*, as it is, by Mr. Faber's own confession, *novel*, to distinguish between the little horn of Daniel, and man of sin of St. Paul, and false prophet of the Apocalypse—and "the Antichrist" of St. John's first Epistle, as though they were not all intended for one and the same moral, or corporate body, of THE PAPACY. And it is also strongly impressed upon my mind, from a careful consideration of the manner in which the last mentioned inspired writer introduces the mention of "the Antichrist," in his first and second Epistles, that this most formidable enemy which the church should ever have to encounter until the sounding of that trumpet of judgment which announces that "the kingdoms



views of prophecy which I have been advocating, upon the score of a want of agreement among interpreters respecting the ten Gothico-Roman kingdoms

---

of this world are to be made the kingdoms of our Lord Jesus Christ," was to be looked for, not in the very *last* of the days of the last times—or Christian dispensation; but in the *latter* of those last times; i. e. after the primitive of those last times had passed away. "Little children, it is the last time, and as ye have heard that the Antichrist cometh, even now are there (γεργονασι) many Antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time." These words, "even now," do not lead us to look for the actual coming of "the Antichrist" to be delayed, until the vials of judgment should begin to be out-poured, and the destroyers of the earth destroyed. If enough of "evil men and seducers"—or *Antichrists*—were then born, or had then *begun to be*, are we to suppose that they entered a second time into their mother's womb, like the progeny of the opossum, and lay there unseen and unknown in the world, from the Revelation of THAT WICKED ONE, until the twelve hundred and sixty years—or the greater part of them at least, as Mr. Faber would contend, which were allotted for his continuance, had expired? I cannot believe this: and how unpleasant soever I may find it to differ from so learned, and in many respects so useful, a commentator on prophecy, as Mr. Faber is—from whom, as the reader will perceive, I have drawn much of the information that is here brought forward respecting *the ten kingdoms*, still, with the great body of "Protestant expositors," I must maintain that the *Seer Horn* of Daniel, the *wicked one* of St. Paul, the *false prophet* of St. John the Divine, and the *ANTICHRIST* of the same St. John in his first and second Epistle, all immediately refer to the same subtle OPPOSER, *qui solvit Jesum*. Following the example

into which the empire of the Western Demi-Cesar, or of the seventh short-lived head of the Roman Wild Beast reigning in the city seated upon seven

---

then of the Author of the "Sacred Calendar" (and of that very useful compendium of "the difficulties of Romanism,") whose "position," however *novel*, or "however commonly received among Protestants" *now*, I hesitate not to controvert, I too will throw my argument into the form of a syllogism, thus,—and if he or any person be able to confute me, I shall be very ready to own myself mistaken. .

*Major.*—According to St. John, he who denieth the Father and the Son, this is the ANTICHRIST.

*Minor.*—But the line of the Roman Pontiffs *have denied*, and *do deny*, both the Father and the Son.

*Conclusion.*—Therefore the line of the Roman Pontiffs is THE ANTICHRIST.

If Mr. Faber, or any person, shall undertake to set aside this conclusion as "absurd," in the only way that is possible, which is, by "denying the *minor* proposition" and maintaining that the line of the Roman Pontiffs is to be ranked among the noble CONFESSORS of Christ before men, and not among "them of the synagogue of Satan" rather, "who say they are Jews (confessors of Jehovah) and are not, but do lie,"—if any protestant, I say, shall publicly maintain so *inconsistent* an opinion, and utter a *negative* of my *minor* proposition, I do not feel that I am pledging myself to any very difficult or laborious task, (if I be spared, and with the help of God) when I engage to show that Popery, properly so called, from the beginning of it to the end, is a DEPARTURE *from the faith*, (1st Tim. iv. 1,) or, in other words, A DENIAL of the Son of God—or the man Jesus—"taken up into glory," and therefore is A DENIAL of the Father likewise. Indeed, to perform this task, nothing more will be necessary than to transcribe, or

hills, has been divided:—which, in the opinion of those gentlemen, vitiates that entire scheme of interpretation of the Apocalypse, which is founded in the assumption that that empire *has been* so divided.

---

refer to, the paragraph that lies in 1st Timothy between chap. iii. 16, and iv. 3, and to place in antithesis, as *αντιστοιχα*, the great “mystery of Godliness” and “the mystery of iniquity.”

Having stated above, that the Albigenses and Waldenses, whom with Mr. Faber I believe literally to be the two witnessing churches, whose candlestick remained and showed light during the night of papal darkness, (of which we read in Rev. xi.) were able, from this very picture of Antichrist drawn by the pen of the beloved disciple, to know the bishop of Rome (even from the days of Pope Sylvester) to be THE MAN, it will be not unsatisfactory to the reader to be presented with the following quotation from Milner's Church History, in the chapter towards the latter end of his third volume, relating to *the doctrine of the Waldenses*.

In a treatise concerning Antichrist, which, in the form of an old manuscript bearing the date of 1120, was preserved by the Waldenses of the Alps, the following brief summary is contained: “He (the Pope) is called Antichrist, because being covered and adorned under the colour of Christ and his church, he opposes the salvation purchased by Christ, of which the faithful are partakers by faith, hope, and charity. He contradicts the truth by the wisdom of the world, and by counterfeit holiness. To make up a complete system of religious hopocrisy, all these things must concur; there must be religious orders, pharisees, ministers, doctors, the secular power, and lovers of this world. Antichrist, indeed, was conceived in the apostle's times, but he was in his

I will offer, in reply, a few observations, first, upon the *principle* of this objection; next upon the alleged and admitted *fact* itself.—Upon the princi-

---

infancy, unformed, and imperfect. He was therefore the more easily known and ejected, being rude, raw, and wanting utterance. He had then no skill in making decretals, he wanted hypocritical ministers, and the show of religious orders. He had none of those riches by which he might allure ministers to his service, and multiply his adherents: he wanted also the secular power, and could not compel men to serve him. But he grew to a full age, when the lovers of the world, both in church and state, did multiply and got all the power into their hands: Christ had never any enemy like to this, so able to pervert the way of truth into falsehood, insomuch that the church with her true children is trodden under foot. He robs Christ of his merits, of justification, regeneration, sanctification, and spiritual nourishment, and ascribes the same to his own authority, to a form of words, to his own works, to saints, and to the fire of purgatory. Yet he has some decent qualities, which throw a veil over his enormities, such as an external profession of Christianity, tradition, and catalogues of episcopal succession, lying wonders, external sanctity, and certain sayings of Christ himself, the administration of the sacraments, verbal preaching against vices, and the virtuous lives of some who really live to God in Babylon, whom, however, Antichrist, so far as in him lies, prevents from placing all their hope in Christ alone. These things are a cloak, with which Antichrist hides his wickedness, that he may not be rejected as a pagan. Knowing these things we depart from Antichrist, according to express scriptural directions. We unite ourselves to the truth of Christ and his spouse, how small soever they appear. We describe the causes of our separation from Antichrist, that if the Lord be

ple:—where numbers are introduced into the Sacred writings, we frequently find that, after the manner of men, round or decimal sums are used with a certain indefinitiveness, to express a sufficient, or a great number: while unequal or fractional ones are *always* employed in the most definite manner imagi-

---

pleased to impart the knowledge of the same truth to others, those who receive it together with us may love it. But if they be not sufficiently enlightened, they may receive help by our ministry, and be washed by the spirit. If any one have received more abundantly than we ourselves, we desire the more humbly to be taught, and to amend our defects. A various and endless idolatry marks the genius of Antichrist, and he teaches men by that to seek for grace, which is essentially in God alone, exists meritoriously in Christ, and is communicated by faith alone through the Holy Spirit."

And now I ask, is Mr. Faber, from whose later writings it is that I have derived my opinion and *belief*, that these two flocks of sheep, pasturing on the two sides of "the Alpine mountains cold," the Albigenses and Waldenses, are indeed "the two olive trees, and the two candlesticks standing before the God of the earth," who, being "followers of the Lamb *whithersoever he goeth*," were for his sake killed all the day long, and counted as sheep for the slaughter, Rev. xi. 4. xiv. 4. & Rom. viii. 36,---is Mr. Faber, who justly, as I believe holds up the Waldensian Confession of Faith, or "Noble Lesson," as the very testimony of God's two weeping prophets during the antitypical "three years and an half" of spiritual famine, under the tyranny of the antitypical Jezebel and her eight hundred and fifty priests of Baal, and of the Groves, (or rather OF THE FEMALE BLESSER, *וְיִשְׁרָאֵל*, *the Virgin Mother*,") is he, I ask, of all men, and of all "Protes-

nable. Thus, and for example—if the opinion of Mede will be for a moment allowed—the “two witnesses,” in Rev. xi. ought to be understood of a small but sufficient body of witnesses—whose testimony was, according to the law, to be received in court; rather than of two men, or two bodies of men, precisely. He would therefore translate the Greek Dual (*δvo*) as intended to express, at once, more than one, and less than many: *binos testes meos*—my pairs or duals of witnesses (or martyrs)—my Moses and Aaron, my Joshua and Caleb, my Elijah and Elisha, my Zadoc and Nathan, my Josua and Zerubbabel, my Ezra and Nehemiah, my Paul and Barnabas, my disciples going forth by twos (*ava δvo*) into every place where the world is to be reprov'd concerning sin, and concerning righteousness, and concerning judgment. So again, where the number of the sealed out of the twelve tribes of the *surrogated* Israel is to be expressed in Rev. vii., round numbers are employed throughout—twelve thousand out of each tribe, (leaving out the two which were the ringleaders of the revived worship of images and demons) and making the large round number, of 144,000, of the whole. Not surely to express to us the very exact number

---

tant expositors” under heaven, the one, who after all, will question the truth of this Vallensic testimony to the essentially Antichristian character of the fallen Roman Episcopate; ---nay, will go farther, and undertake positively and dogmatically to pronounce that in this respect they were, after all, entirely and altogether mistaken!

of the elect remnant that should be in those days ; so much as that, notwithstanding the awful prevalence of apostasy in the evil times that were coming, and the small number of those who, at any given period of it, should "follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth," and keep themselves from spiritual fornication, in comparison with that CATHOLIC MULTITUDE, who should worship the Beast and his Image ; still, the unbelief of some should not make the faith of God of none effect, nor should the gates of hell be able to prevail against "God's husbandry," or "God's building." And though the seceders from the Catholic apostasy from age to age were but a few, until the era of reformation came ; still the collective body of them, throughout the platform of the ten kingdoms—whose "bones lay scattered at the grave's mouth as when one cutteth and heweth wood upon the earth," and whose "souls were under the altar, crying, how long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth,"—though not to be compared to the Palin-bearing multitude that should be brought in afterwards, (for of the increase of Christ's kingdom there is to be no end,) were—even in those apostatical times—to be twelve times twelve thousand—a goodly product of the faithful exhibition of the doctrine of the twelve apostles, who in the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit upon the throne of his glory, are to sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. Again, when the "innumerable company of angels" encircling the throne,

and extolling the Lamb, in Rev. v. 11, is to be described, their number is said to be ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands. (*μυριαδες μυριαδων, και χιλιαδες χιλιαδων.*) But did the inspired Evangelist here aim to convey to us an exact idea of their number, who stand before God, as flames of fire, so much as to tell us, that *he could not number them?*—who, nevertheless, are known unto Him, who “tellet<sup>h</sup> the number of the stars, and calleth them all by names.” Here are instances of round or decimal numbers in Scripture,—from two, to myriads of myriads, and chiliads of chiliads—having not a precisely definite, but an average and indefinite signification. But, on the other hand, when unequal or fractional numbers are introduced, we always find an *ad amussim* exactness. Thus, the flood must come exactly in 120 years,—the seed of Abraham are to be in bondage in Egypt until the expiration of 430 years, and then—*on the self same day*—the children of Israel go out of Egypt, by their armies,—within three score and five years Ephraim must be broken that it be not a people; and it came to pass accordingly. So also we admit, and are agreed, that the 2300 days, and the 1260 days, (whether they be understood to mean days or years) describe a most exactly determined period; as did the 70 weeks, or 490 years, after which Messiah was to be cut off. Observe, I am not maintaining, or meaning so much as to insinuate, that round or decimal numbers, in Scripture, may not *sometimes* have as determined a signification, as those which are made up of broken



fragments. For this is sometimes the case. For instance, the ten days of persecution, to which the church of the Smyrneans was to be subject, may (and most probably did) refer to the ten years of the Dioclesian persecution, as commentators generally are agreed in observing. And again, here, I do believe, that the ten horns of the Demi-Cesarean head of the Roman Wild Beast, and the ten toes of the image bearing the figure of a man, which was showed to Nebuchadnezzar, were both intended by the Holy Ghost to bear a most definite meaning, as well as to have a most exact counterpart in the eventual history of the fourth great Empire: but this I say, that from the foregoing, and not ill-grounded observations, that have been made upon round numbers and decimals in Scripture, generally, it may be gathered, that, even if the case were otherwise in the present instance, the objection of R. D. and his associates, when examined in its *principle*, is ill-founded, and would not serve, as they take it for granted, to invalidate our whole system. Be it that we cannot agree to make out our number of *ten* Gothic kingdoms, into which the empire of the Western Augustuli should be divided. Still it is unquestionable, as long as the world stands, that that Empire has been divided into *about* that number of independent kingdoms, contemporaneously with the rise of the Popedom: and this, even if we had nothing more definite to advance, were sufficient to establish the historical fulfilment of the sure word of prophecy. I put to the understanding of any candid

man, (always excepting those who have undergone the preparatory education, necessary to constitute them *special pleaders*,) whether, if the symbol of a *human figure* were to be employed at all in setting forth the prophetic history of "the fourth kingdom upon earth," it would be possible, or proper, to represent that figure with either more or less than TEN toes? or whether, upon the whole, without going into those historical niceties about which writers may differ, a more exact symbol, or more admirably suited to the truth of what we have heard and known concerning the *fata Imperii Romani*, could be devised, than that which the Holy Ghost, in the visions of his head which were presented to the imagination of the sleeping Chaldean monarch, has actually selected for that purpose? *Verbum sat sapienti.*

I feel that now the ground is cleared to TAKE THE BULL BY THE HORNS, and grapple with the *fact* of the objection itself. What does it amount to? Why, forsooth, to this—that about *some* of those ten kingdoms, *some* of those who have written, or favoured the world with their sentiments upon the subject, have a little differed. *Ergo*, these gentlemen cry, "there can be no truth at bottom in the scheme, about which a debate is thus raised among them." But is this a "*sequitur*" or not? Must all be in the wrong *intirely* when there is any difference of opinion whatever?—Then farewell to all discoveries of every kind for ever!—"But if this partition of the fourth kingdom, which is the subject of prophecy, had ever really taken place, it would have been all so plain

and so clear, that no controversy could ever be raised upon the subject : *nor could scepticism itself here find any occasion for cavil or for doubt.*"—But who (I beg to know) told the objector this, that, in the matter before us, the wicked should be able to understand, as well as the wise and prayerful searchers of the prophetic intimations concerning things to come? I am sure that Daniel, at least, did not. Until therefore they tell us, whence they had this knowledge—that in these things there should be *nothing* "hard to be understood," they must bear with me in treating it in them as a mere presumption, or begging of the question. Seeing then that the Roman Empire of the West (for with this alone we are here concerned) has unquestionably been broken up, since the latter end of the fourth century, or the beginning and progress of the fifth, and subsequently, into a plurality of independent kingdoms—*perhaps* more than ten, or *perhaps* less—if the Holy Ghost has actually named ten, our not all seeing, or agreeing about, this exact number, or about the specific designation of each of them, not only may be, but actually is to be attributed, not to the ignorance of the all-seeing and all-searching Spirit of God concerning that which was to be, (which it were blasphemy, far, I am convinced, from the mind of R. D. to assert) but to the imperfect knowledge of the historians themselves who have written of those times of confusion and of barbarism, or to *our own* ignorance of that which they have truly and profitably written for our instruction, if it had been a part of our education at school, or at col-

lege, (as it was not) to make us better historians than we are.

But let us look the objection itself in the face, and see what it amounts to. The objection itself is, that if the opinion that the 1260 days are years were well founded, and if it were true that the fourth great kingdom upon earth fell into ten pieces, or smaller kingdoms, (symbolized by ten toes, in Dan. ii. and by ten horns, in Dan. vii. and in Rev. xii, &c.) in or about the time that is alleged, that is, after the partition of the Roman Empire between the two sons of Theodosius, and before the elevation of Charles the Great to the rank of Emperor of the West,—then we should be able to know with absolute certainty, so that there could possibly be no second opinion about it, not only the very year when that long period commenced, but also what were the names of each of those smaller kingdoms, and what were their exact geographical boundaries,—both of which also would have remained unaltered until the expiration of the same period, or until this very day.

Now, to the former part of this objection, which relates to this period and its commencement, (and termination also, when the vials of judgment should begin their course) we have replied already, and need here say no more. My present business will be to deal with the latter part of the difficulty, which to the mind of R. D. appears so serious, and so formidable, as to induce him to abandon the entire system of interpretation with which it stands connected.

Now the difficulties with which we find ourselves

encompassed at the outset of our inquiries, will be abated somewhat when we recollect, that at no very great interval of time after their first developement, we shall not have to look for *all* the ten kingdoms remaining in a distinct and separate state. For it is plain, from Dan. vii. 8, that **THREE** of them should soon be plucked up, before the eleventh horn of mysterious appearance, which the prophet beheld from a state of littleness coming up among them, until it overshot them all. If, therefore, we find mention made, in the *subsequent* prophetic history of this beast, of ten kingdoms, or "kings," (as we do in Rev. xvii. 16.) it is plainly *necessary* that we should understand, either, that this number of kings, upon the given platform of the Western Roman empire, was complete once; or else, that in the last stages of its existence, and when it is hastening to its destruction, (as it evidently is now,) it should be resolved back again into those same elementary or component parts, which obtained originally, when the irruptions of the barbarians were completed. We must, then, for the length of the *dominant* state of the little horn, or Papacy, and until the time comes when, those years being expired, "the ten horns" shall be turned to "hate the whore" and destroy her, (as Jehu did Jezebel,) subduct three kingdoms, viz:—that of **SOUTHERN** Italy, having **ROME** for its capital, where the Herulo Turingi, under Odoacer, established themselves after the deposition of Augustulus: and that of **CENTRAL** Italy, with **RAVENNA** for its capital, when Theodoric reigned as king of the Ostrogoths—

whose Mausoleum is to be seen there to this very day: and, lastly, that of NORTHERN Italy, whose capital is MILAN (in which city Buonaparte would therefore be crowned) where the Longobardi, or Lombards established their dynasty under Alboin their leader—whose kingdom subsisted until it was subverted by Pepin, and his son Charlemagne, who gave all to the pope “*for the remission of his sins;*”—we must, I say, subduct these three, which together comprehend the whole of Italy—the country where the *triple crowned* priest and prince has sat usurping all authority and power in heaven and on earth for 1260 years—and concerning which there is really no place for controversy—from the number of the ten: which leaves us afterwards only SEVEN Gothico-Roman kingdoms to inquire after.

Now, respecting these remaining seven out of the ten horns of the fourth beast, the difficulty will be still further abated, when it is stated, and admitted, (as I think it must,) that they are to be looked for, and found, not in the more advanced period of the beast's history, when he is approaching to his consumption of “both soul and body” after having been ridden by the harlot of Rome for the appointed “time, times, and an half;” but then, when that last, or seventh, Demi-Cesarean head of the beast became, by the *intrigues* of the “court of Rome” with the military leaders of the Gothic tribes “clothed with blue, captains and rulers all of them, desirable young men, *chevaliers* riding upon horses,” (Ezek. xxiii. 6,) decked with those disgraceful ornaments, which

amounted to a proof positive, that she, whose business it was both to practise and preach subjection, and undivided allegiance, to the powers that be, as unto the ordinance of God, (Rom. xiii. 1, 2,) had herself, in temporals as well as spirituals, cast the law of her God behind her, and had taught her new *converts* among the feudal chieftains of the people of a strange lip, to do the same:—in short, we are to look, not for seven *perpetuated* Gothico-Roman dynasties subsisting unbroken and unaltered in name, and limits, and other circumstances, during the whole of the “days” that were to follow until the time of the end: but we are to look for—and if we will look for we shall easily find (with *very little* difference of opinion indeed,—and that, *not difficult to dispose of, or reconcile*—as shall be showed)—extrinsic of the territory of Italy, which comprehends the three eradicated horns—seven PRIMARY kingdoms, formed out of the remainder of the *full plurality* of the provinces of the Roman empire in the West, extending from Britain and the transalpine Gaul, eastward to the boundaries of Hungary and Pannonia. And if, in conformity with the constant mutations of all earthly things, these kingdoms are found afterwards changing, from time to time, their names, along with the dialects of the dominant or stronger party in them, and also extending or else contracting their ancient boundaries, according as their hand, or that of some more powerful neighbour, happened to prevail,—this no more affects either the prediction itself or the interpretation of it, than the parallel fact,

of the vicissitudes to which the four horns of the Grecian he-goat, *viz.*—Syria Egypt Thrace and Macedon; which came up in the stead of the notable one after that it was broken, were subjected, affects either the prophecies of Daniel about them, or the interpretation, which, with the highest consent, has been put upon those prophecies, by all the commentators who have written upon the subject for ages past.

What then are the names of the remaining seven out of the ten PRIMARY Gothic kingdoms, into which the dominion of the *Augustuli* of the West was broken, after deducting from the full number those three of the Herulo-Turingi, the Ostrogoths, and the Lombards, which embraced the whole of the three ancient and well known divisions of Italy—southern, central, and northern; and which fell before the rising power of the bishops of Rome, who in the glory of their pride resembled “Lucifer, the bright star of the *morning*?” I think that they have been well ascertained to be as follows, *viz.* 1. the Vandals; 2. the Suevi; 3. the Alans; 4. the Burgundians; 5. the Franks; 6. the Visigoths; and 7. the Anglo-Saxons. The far greater majority of the historians, or commentators, who have written upon those subjects, have mentioned all these; and if some of them have, in a few instances, lumped two of these together, and then, to make their number complete, introduced, as they were compelled, some others which are not included in the above list, these are manifestly such as, for evidently sufficient reasons,



cannot be admitted: and thus the apparent difference in stating this matter, which at the first must strike any observer, and which has, as it appears, inclined some to reject the whole scheme altogether, is reduced to next to nothing, and leaves us as great a harmony as we need to desire, or have any sober reason, in a case of so complicated a nature as the apocalyptic history of the *middle* ages, to expect. Nay, I will put it to any sober and unprejudiced mind,—if things that were to come to pass during such a period as has elapsed, from the fourth century downwards, were to be made the subject of symbolical prophecy at all, could any symbols more admirable, or exactly corresponding with *events* in every particular, be possibly conceived, or devised, that those, which, *ex dictamine spiritûs*, Daniel and St. John have brought forth for the purpose? Truly, if so large a part (but not the whole) of the Catholic Church was taken unawares by Antichrist, at his coming, and became infected to the very heart with a sickness which is unto death, before she knew that any thing ailed her, it is not because warnings—and warnings sufficiently “express” and intelligible, had not been given her in the scriptures, of the danger that was then at hand, when the letting power of the ancient Cæsars was taken out of the way. And if, after the church first beheld Emperors bowing down at the soles of her feet,—after the political birth of a Constantine in the fourth century, and again, of a Charlemagne—“the eldest son of the church”—in the eighth, the *widowed* bride of the man of sorrows

espoused unto Him, as "a chaste virgin," against his coming again, forgot that she was still a sufferer here below, and began to entertain the thought of reigning, in a state of glory and prosperity, for a MILLENNIUM, *without* HIM, (for the parody upon the kingdom of Christ, acted in the "Chambers of imagery" of the Papacy, would not be a complete piece, if the *time* occupied in the performance of it, did not extend to such a length of years as it has been from A. D. 800 to 1800,)—if, I say, a whole world of professed Christians has fallen into this snare of the devil, who all the while lay hid as "a snake in the grass," and was then practising his deadliest and most effectual device—his very master-piece—"the mystery of iniquity" against the woman, whom he was to beguile through his subtlety, and so corrupt from her singleness to Christ, (2 Cor. xi. 3.)—who has therefore gone a whoring after the beast and his image; the Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son, who was to show unto the church things to come, and the holy prophets and apostles of the Lord and Saviour who, as moved by the same Spirit, have provided for Christians a full, perfect, and sufficient **RULE OF FAITH** in the holy Scriptures, are not to be blamed for this: for, if the Catholic multitude has become apostate, and has "greatly erred," it is because they have not known the Scriptures, and because they have suffered their blind guides to take away from them the key of knowledge, and, instead of it, to teach them for doctrines the commandments of men. Let R. D. and all others beware, lest though their darken-

ing of counsel by words without knowledge they be found, in these last of the last days, increasing this fatal ignorance, and promoting the cause of error; instead of labouring, by a manly and sober manifestation of the truth, to "banish and drive" all such "away."

Is it because I love them not, that I thus admonish my brethren? God knoweth. And R. D. (I trust) also knoweth, that "faithful are the wounds of a friend." In the same affection then to him, which moved a Paul to withstand a Peter to the face when he was to be blamed, and which moved a greater than Paul to call Peter "Satan," when he spake ignorantly against what was written, I would entreat my brethren, R. D., and all who with him are now unsettling the minds of Protestants upon the subject of FULFILLED prophecies, and putting arguments into the mouths of Papists and scoffers against us, by the vain and unnecessary manner in which they are calling the expositions of these prophecies by the fathers of the reformation in question,—I intreat them, I say, before any further mischief is done by them, to desist—or at least, to betake themselves for a while longer to their studies, accompanying their reading with prayers to God for his Holy Spirit that they may have "a right judgment in all things," before they give any thing more to the public, of their *prognostications*, or speculations, upon a subject on which, I cannot but think, that, as yet, they have only very briefly and superficially, themselves, thought, and which evidently, as yet, they so little understand. Let them not be offended with my well meant plainness. I know

that, as I set out with saying, truth will bear a great deal of rough handling; and the more of the attrition of controversy to which it is subjected, the more will its imperishable *illatency* (*αληθεια*) be made to appear. But still, I cannot shut my eyes to the palpable matter of fact, that since the ingenuity of the human mind can so easily cause error to be mistaken for truth and truth for error, and make "the worse to appear the better reason," therefore it is highly inexpedient that controversies upon important subjects should be needlessly provoked: and it is the part of charity in us towards the weak, to endeavour to suppress these, by quiet and legitimate means, as far as we can. For this end, as well as for the eliciting, and defence, and confirmation of the truth of the interpretation of Prophecy, which, I conceive, has been unnecessarily and hurtfully impugned of late by Mr. Maitland, and some who have read, and, (like R. D.,) are pleased with his pamphlets, I have taken up my pen, to the length to which it has run, in these two numbers. To the consideration of intelligent Christians I submit what I have written; invoking the blessing of the Father of Lights upon it, so far forth as it **TRULY AND PROPERLY** contends for the accomplishment of that which has been written.

For the further satisfaction of those of your readers who feel an interest in this subject, and may not have the opportunity of consulting the various authors who have written upon it, or comparing them one with another, I subjoin a schedule, which I had made out for my own satisfaction, of the suffrages in favor

of the list I have proposed, which are found in the works of the writers whose names are added.

Number.	Names of Gothic King- doms.	Machievel.	Mede.	Bp. Lloyd.	Sir I. Newton.	Bp. Newton.	Whiston.	Faber.	Total.
1	Vandals,	1	1	1	1	-	1	1	6
2	Suevi,	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
3	Alans,	1	1	1	1	1	-	1	6
4	Burgundians,	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
5	Franks,	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
6	Visigoths,	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
7	Anglo-Saxons,	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7

Thus, respecting those seven kingdoms, about which there was *most* scope for difference of opinion and controversy, which lay beyond the confines of Italy itself, there is, in point of fact, scarce any difference of opinion, or controversy, at all: and where there is in fact the *least* room for it, that is, where the three eradicated kingdoms are concerned, all of which had their seat in Italy, and which together embraced the whole of it, from Calabria to the Po, there it is found that the *greatest* diversity of opinion exists:—Mede, and the two Newtons, omitting the kingdom of the Herulo-Turingi, and the two Newtons that of the Orthogoths, and Whiston that of the Longobardi or Lombards. And, to make the number ten complete, some of these propose the addition of the Exarchate of the Greek Emperors in Italy, of the Huns in Pannonia, and of the Britons

in Britain. But is evident that none of these can properly be admitted into the number of the seven remaining *Gothico-Roman Kingdoms* of the West. For, first, the Exarchate, where the lieutenants of the Greek or Eastern Emperors held their court for a time, at Ravenna, upon the eastern shores of central Italy, though it indeed was established upon the ruins of the Ostrogothic kingdom which the victorious troops of Justinian had put an end to, yet in itself it was not a Gothic kingdom—there was *in it* none of the miry clay mixed with iron ; but it was purely Roman, or Romano-Hellenic. Again, the kingdom of the Huns in Hungary, though certainly Gothic, lay too far eastward to be considered an integral part of the Western, or Roman Empire, when it came to be separated and distinguished from the Constantinopolitan, or Eastern. And lastly, the Britons, though unquestionably, since the invasion of Britain by Julius Cæsar, forming a part of the Western Roman Empire, yet they formed a part of it, *before* it began to be overrun by the nations of barbarians from the North, which for distinction's sake, are called by the general name of Goths ;—they were, in fact, the aborigines of the country, the remnant of whom retired into the mountains of Wales before the Anglo-Saxon invaders, who began their destructive descents upon its coasts, followed by the Danes, as soon as the Romans were compelled by the necessity of the times to withdraw themselves :—they (the Britons) therefore are plainly not to be reckoned among the *Gothic*

kingdoms, since in them the *mixture* was wanting, of a people whom the rough-riders of the Roman legions had tamed and disciplined into an obedience to the wholesome restraints of Law—who had, consequently, in them “of the strength of iron,” and “a seed” of new comers, who had no law, except the will of a feudal chief to whom they voluntarily chose to attach themselves, and who therefore had in themselves the principle of decomposition and weakness—like unto “miry clay.” And thus, having got rid of those dynasties which, with manifest impropriety, some writers have introduced into their proposed lists of the ten kingdoms, we are eventually, and satisfactorily, as it were forced to adopt and settle in that catalogue, which Mr. Faber (who justly observes that all the kingdoms must be PRIMARY, and are to be sought for no further,) has drawn out in his “Sacred calendar of prophecy,” from whence I readily, with thanks to that author, own, that I have made the above catalogue. And I will take this opportunity of declaring my full coincidence in the opinion advanced by Sir Isaac Newton, that if the ten horns be spoken of afterwards (as they are—Rev. xvii. 16.) in the subsequent period of apocalyptic history, this is to be understood mainly of those rulers, (be they of what *sort* or *number* they may,) who then should govern the countries over which the ten kings *once* reigned: and that we are by no means compelled by such passages, or allusions, to expect that the political condition of Europe must, before the end, become again exactly the same as it was when

the seventh head of the beast was actually first seen bearing ten horns, and upon every one of the several horns a several crown, or emblem of independent barbaric sovereignty.

By favouring me with a place in your periodical for this article, as well as the preceding one, of which it is a continuation,

You will oblige, Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

D.



FINIS.